

Politicization in Practice: Learning the Politics of Racialization, Patriarchy, and Settler Colonialism in the Youth Climate Movement

by

Joe Curnow

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Leadership, Higher, and Adult Education
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Joe Curnow 2017

Politicization in Practice: Learning the Politics of Racialization, Patriarchy, and Settler Colonialism in the Youth Climate Movement

Joe Curnow

Doctor of Philosophy

Leadership, Higher, and Adult Education
University of Toronto

2017

Abstract

As anti-pipeline struggles have become a central focus of the North American environmental movement, the Whiteness, masculinity, and settler-coloniality of the mainstream movement has come under more scrutiny than ever. Though the mainstream environmental movement has long been acknowledged as a White default space, committed to strategies and tactics rooted in settler-colonial logics, and managed by White men at the highest levels, there is a broad conversation emerging right now arguing that the movement needs to unsettle those norms, and urgently. This study looks at one climate campaign as a case study with the potential to reveal both how mainstream environmental spaces become default spaces of Whiteness, masculinity, and settler-coloniality, as well as how these activist groups can become politicized, resisting social relations of dominance and centring reconciliation in their approach to climate justice. Using sociocultural theory as the lens for theorizing learning within the climate movement, this dissertation brings learning within social movements into focus, examining cognition, participation, ways of knowing and being, and identity development across a two-year activist campaign.

This dissertation examines Fossil Free UofT, the University of Toronto campaign for fossil fuel divestment. I ask how participants learned to understand and disrupt social relations of racialization, settler colonialism, and patriarchy. I examine what participants in the campaign learned and how they mobilized their learning collectively to reproduce and resist racialized, gendered, and colonial power relations. I also question how sociocultural theories of learning enable theorizations of politicization, as well as how they can be strengthened through sustained attention to the ways that social relations shape opportunities to learn in movements.

This dissertation contributes to an emergent field in the learning sciences, where social movements and community organizations are increasingly analyzed for their ability to foment unique learning opportunities. I theorize politicization within this context, providing a framework for sociocultural learning theorists to bring together disparate conversations about learning, civic engagement, sociopolitical development, and critical social analysis.

Acknowledgments

0.1 Territorial Acknowledgment

My research and writing took place within the traditional territory of the Nishinaabeg and Haudenosaunee peoples, and as a settler in this land, I have a responsibility to acknowledge the longstanding relationships they have with this land, as well as my responsibility as a guest/settler/occupier in the territory. Given that this dissertation focuses on solidarity, colonization, anti-racism, feminism, and the environment and land, this recognition is particularly salient. Recognizing this territory as Indigenous invites us to think about the violent colonial histories that made it possible for many of us to be here as settlers, and to recognize the ongoing settler colonial project which shapes our lives, dispossessing Indigenous peoples in the interest of settler occupier regimes. Territorial recognition also requires that we think about the teachings of this territory and remember that there are alternatives to the settler colonial relationships of dispossession and erasure, lessons that will be fundamental to engaging in discussions of reconciliation for settlers and resurgence for Indigenous peoples.

My work examines and takes up anticolonial and decolonizing learning in response to the responsibilities I have as a settler on occupied territory. This requires accountability to Indigenous peoples and the land. Since this research was conducted with the environmental movement, we need to reckon with the imperialist histories of mainstream environmentalism. The environmental movement has long been known for its role in dispossessing Indigenous people, in promoting views of nature and wilderness that are racist both in their terra nullius logics of empty land and their portrayal of Indigenous peoples as wild and in need of taming (Derman, 1995; Grove, 1996). These environmental movement legacies of course are not only histories—the whiteness of mainstream environmental movements is widely acknowledged today (Jones, 2007; Arp & Howell, 1995; Blain, 2005; Bullard, 2000; Taylor, 1997, 2014). Within Turtle Island (North America), Indigenous people have been calling for a different environmental movement that works in solidarity and centres Indigenous sovereignty (Lameman, 2015; Lee, 2011; Aijazi & David, 2015; Robinson, et al., 2007). Thus far, that call has been very limited in its uptake. If we take our territorial acknowledgments seriously, if we think about what it means to be guests/settlers/occupiers on this land, then there is a necessary relationship of reciprocity and accountability to those calls, which is what we try to do in this research project.

The learning process that we engaged in and analyze in these pages attempts to respect those relationships and build alternative ways of being and knowing within a small segment of the environmental movement in order to build solidarity and work toward decolonized futures. While this project is a small and insufficient contribution to the work of decolonizing this territory, we have attempted to do it in a good way, attentive to the relations that surround us and cognizant of our responsibilities.

0.2 Personal Acknowledgments

Many people have contributed to the completion of this dissertation, and while I am grateful for all of the support and participation, a few contributions require special mention.

Fossil Free UofT and Toronto350, for participating in the research and providing us all the space to learn from our process. I appreciate the trust you placed in me and the solidarity you strive to do, even as it is a difficult and clumsy process.

The activist participant research team: Lila Asher, Jody Chan, Amil Davis, Tresanne Fernandes, Keara Lightning, Ariel Martz-Oberlander. Without your participation, I could not have done this, and would not have wanted to. You are thoughtful, committed, curious, and politically righteous. Working with you has made the PhD worth it for me.

To my committee, Indigo Esmonde, Jean-Paul Restoule, and Peter Sawchuk, thank you for your engagement in this process, reading and commenting on drafts, and supporting my development over time. Your mentorship has taught me so much about how to be a mentor and your feedback has made this project better.

Kate Schneider, for encouraging me to go and accompanying me to the People's Climate March. Without your pushing, this project literally would not have happened.

For facilitating the development of Relational Epistemologies, Indigo Esmonde and Jean-Paul Restoule. Through conversation, courses, and feedback on drafts, you have challenged my ways of knowing and helped me to embody decolonial research in more complicated ways.

For constructive feedback on *Doing Expertise*: Kate Curnow, Indigo Esmonde, Anjali Helferty, Caitlin Henry, Andrew Kohan, June Larkin, Victor Lorentz, Omar Sirri, and the Rachel Carson Centre workshop on Men and Nature at the University of Munich.

For *Politicization in Practice*, thanks to Jade Wong and Tresanne Fernandes for helping develop our earliest analysis. For feedback that gave the paper a more structured argument, Angela Booker and Indigo Esmonde. And for careful readings of the text with productive feedback, Jody Chan, Sinéad Dunphy, Ben Kirshner, and Andrew Kohan. To the GLITTERati, especially Thelma Akyea, Paul Matthews, and Allison Ritchie for sharing the lab space, being supportive of our work, and being so welcoming to the ducklings, politically and intellectually.

For support struggling through *Resituating Situated Learning* over many months, thanks to Thelma Akyea, Indigo Esmonde, Andrew Kohan, and Genevieve Ritchie.

Additional support from my family members Kate, Margaret, and Bob Curnow, Susan Weber, Tom Kohan, Bill and Mildred Walker.

To my network of activist friends and colleagues in USFT and Global Justice who politicized me and led me to questions of politicization. To Ora Grodsky and Jonathan Rosenthal for your mentorship on popular education, transformation, and anti-racist leadership.

For the activists at Jane Addams Senior Caucus, who taught me to do intergenerational organizing and showed commitment for the long haul.

And to my network of politically accountable activist scholars who have kept me from losing myself in the process of doing the PhD: Rebecca Bartel, Chandni Desai, Anjali Helferty, Caitlin Henry, Dan and Holly Huizenga, Victor Lorentz, Jen Ridgely, Genevieve Ritchie, Youssef and Armida Sawan, Omar Sirri, and Maddy Whetung.

And to Andrew Kohan, my partner in crime and life, for everything.

0.3 Funding Acknowledgment

This dissertation was generously supported by the Tri-Council Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship.

0.4 Dedication

For Ora, for teaching me to do anti-racist teaching, learning, and mentorship for the long haul.

And for Amil, Jade, Lila, Keara, Ariel, Tresanne, and Jody, who also, differently, taught me how to teach, learn, and mentor.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	iv
0.1 Territorial Acknowledgment	iv
0.2 Personal Acknowledgments	v
0.3 Funding Acknowledgment	vi
0.4 Dedication.....	vii
Table of Contents.....	viii
List of Appendices.....	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Reconciliation, Alliances, and Climate Justice	1
1.2 Before Reconciliation, Some Truth	3
1.3 Guiding Research Questions	7
1.4 Context of the Study	10
1.5 Learning in Social Movements.....	17
1.6 Structure of the Dissertation	24
1.7 Politicization in Practice.....	28
Chapter 2. Relational Epistemologies, Participatory Methods, and Radical Political Vision.....	32
2.1 Relationality and Radical Political Vision.....	32
2.2 Relational Accountability	33
2.3 Militant Ethnography and Accountability to Movements	36
2.4 Feminist Antiracist Participatory Action Research	38
2.5 Self-Location	41
2.6 Methods	44
2.7 Limitations.....	56
2.8 Significance of Relational Ontologies and Politicization in the Group.....	57

Chapter 3. Doing Expertise: Racialized and Gendered Participation in an Environmental Campaign	61
3.1 “Why are so many White men trying to save the planet without the rest of us?”	61
3.2 Gender, Race, and the Environmental Movement	63
3.3 Doing Gender and Masculinities	64
3.4 Doing Expertise	65
3.5 Methods	68
3.6 The Default Space: Positioning, Registers, and Modes of Engagement	71
3.8 Doing Environmentalism Differently	78
Chapter 4. Politicization in Practice	83
4.1 “What do we want? Divestment! When do we want it? Gradually over five years!”	83
4.2 Conceptual Framing: Learning in Politics and the Politics of Learning	85
4.3 Methodology	87
4.4 Context	90
4.5 Politicization in Process	92
4.6 Weaving the Strands Together	106
4.7 Conclusion	107
Chapter 5. Resituating Situated Learning within Racialized, Gendered, and Colonial Social Relations	111
5.1 Learning, Power, and Social Relations	111
5.2 Revisiting Situated Learning and Communities of Practice	113
5.3 Social Relations in Situated Learning and Communities of Practice	117
5.4 Racialization, Gender, and Colonialism in the Situated Learning Literature	119
5.5 Situated learning in a Multiracial, Multigender, Settler-Colonial Community of Practice	120
5.6 Conclusions	137
Chapter 6. Conclusion	141

6.1 Chapters in Review.....	141
6.2 Central Themes.....	145
6.3 Theoretical Significance.....	152
6.4 Limitations.....	156
6.5 Further Research.....	158
6.6 Revisiting Relational Accountability.....	160
References	164
Appendices	186
Appendix 1.1 Division of Labour Statement.....	186

List of Appendices

1.1 Co-author Statement on Division of Labour.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Reconciliation, Alliances, and Climate Justice

As I write, tens of thousands of water protectors, Indigenous and settler, are celebrating a hard-won victory, having stopped pipeline construction on Oceti Sakowin, near the Standing Rock Sioux reservation. Months ago, Indigenous youth organized, putting their bodies on the line to stop the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL), and over time the encampments have grown to include as many as 12,000 people, including Indigenous peoples from nearly 300 nations, environmental justice activists, mainstream environmentalists, military veterans, and others committed to stopping DAPL from being built (CBC, 2016, December 4). The news of their victory is a rare moment for celebration, not just for the easement which temporarily prevents pipeline construction through Indigenous land and under Lake Oahe (US Department of the Army, 2016, December 4), but also for the relationships it has built across different communities. While the No DAPL water protectors are clear that there is much work to be done and that the fight is far from over, they are also celebrating the alliances that have been built over the last years as Indigenous sovereignty, environmental justice, and mainstream environmentalist activists have come together to protect water, land, and future generations by opposing pipeline developments across North America.

In the past several years, there has been a rise in this type of alliance, where multiracial coalitions have been built that account for Indigenous sovereignty as a central piece of climate change work targeting pipeline infrastructure. Today we see the No DAPL struggle winning a major concession in the rerouting of the pipeline. In November 2015 we saw the Keystone XL pipeline rejected by the Obama administration after large scale mobilizations (CBC, 2014, April 22), and in particular the work of the Cowboy Indian Alliance (www.rejectandprotect.org, n.d.), a coalition of settler ranchers, Indigenous people, and environmentalists. As Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau approved the Kinder Morgan pipeline in November 2016 (Tasker, 2016, November 29), Indigenous peoples and environmentalists have again promised to block pipeline construction through legal strategies (Tsleil-Waututh Nation Sacred Land Trust, 2016, November 29) and public legislation (Harrison, 2016, November 29), as well as mobilizations, encampments, and other direct action strategies (Hudema, 2016, December 2). These

partnerships are significant in that they bring together historically distinct social movements: the mainstream environmental movement, the environmental justice movement, and Indigenous resurgence and sovereignty movements. They represent a move toward reconciliation and solidarity, rooted in critiques of settler colonialism, racialization, and heteropatriarchy.

Reconciliation has become a buzzword since the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) released its final report in 2015 after six years of collecting testimony on the atrocities of Residential Schooling in Canada (TRC, 2015). Reconciliation has been defined as “an ongoing process of establishing and maintaining respectful relationships. A critical part of this process involves repairing damaged trust by making apologies, providing individual and collective reparations, and following through with concrete actions that demonstrate real societal change” (TRC, 2015, p. 16). The TRC takes an expansive view of reconciliation that is justice-centred and requires a radical re-articulation of the Canadian national mythology in order to acknowledge and reckon with the ways that settler colonialism, racism, and patriarchy are foundational to the existence of the Canadian nation state. We are also in a moment where there are careful calls for decolonization, not as a metaphor (Tuck & Yang, 2013), but as a substantive process of re-matriating Indigenous land and life, including resurgence of Indigenous languages and ways of knowing and being. This call goes beyond reconciliation, at least as it is understood in popular discourses. For settlers it requires even deeper engagement with the histories of these territories and a deep understanding of settler colonialism’s desire to replace Indigenous ways of knowing and being. For settlers to get on board with the demands of decolonization, we need to not only learn the content of the histories, but significantly change our identities as Canadians (or Americans), change our ideas of what counts as a valid way of knowing, shift how we interact with others, whether it be people or the more-than-human, and take seriously demands to recognize Indigenous governance, sovereignty, and claims to the lands we inhabit. Decolonization must be part of reconciliation, and for settlers, this requires an intensive learning process. However, the TRC notes that before settlers and Indigenous peoples can repair the relationship and move toward reconciliation, there must be truth. Thus for mainstream environmentalists, a discussion of reconciliation and solidarity in pipeline struggles must be contextualized within the broader historical truths of environmentalism’s colonial and racist foundations.

1.2 Before Reconciliation, Some Truth

For many involved in the mainstream environmental movement, the history of environmentalism is proud, with popular images of saving whales, pandas, and polar bears, protecting forests, stopping nuclear projects and acid rain, and saving the rainforests. While these campaigns have been significant, they expunge some of the unpleasant histories of environmentalism, erasing the very real struggles that Indigenous peoples and communities of colour have fought with mainstream environmentalists over decades.

Environmentalism has a long history within North America. Indigenous peoples, as original protectors of the land, practiced environmental stewardship and living in a good way long before the terminology was widely used. *Mino bimaadiziwin*, within Nishinaabeg philosophies, for example, frames people's relationship with the land as the central component of living in a good way (Simpson 2011). Stewardship is inadequate to understand First People's ontologies that centre relationship and reciprocity with the environment and non-human nations as core values. There is a thousands of years-long history of relationship between people and the land on Turtle Island, and this relationship predates environmentalism and conservationism. Yet this relationship is rarely considered within environmentalist narratives, except to mobilize racialized tropes of the noble savage, at one with nature (Nadasdy, 2005), and increasingly to commodify traditional ecological knowledge (Stevenson, 1998).

Some historians locate the beginnings of environmentalism within the colonial project, explicitly tying it to dispossession and imperialism. Grove (1996) links early environmentalism explicitly to colonial expansion, starting from techno-administrative projects within the colonial apparatus of the East India Company, along with its Dutch, German, and French analogues. Scholars have also tied environmentalism to the theological-pastoralist reaction to the enlightenment (Worster, 1994); revolutions in the organization of agricultural and extractive capital (Henderson, 1998); vigorous and sometimes violent disputes over evolving and precarious land tenure relations (Mitman, 1992); manifest destiny (McCoy, 2014), the invention of 'recreation' and labour discipline in the 19th century (Kohler, 2013), and to the financialized booms, busts, and crises of westward rail expansion and settlement, abandonment, and resettlement of the hinterland of the Americas (Kohler, 2013). These historians situate what we would understand as environmentalism within racialized colonial logics that use environmental discourses as a ruse

for the expansion of capital, the dispossession of Indigenous peoples, and the exploitation of slaves and workers. This legacy is important to acknowledge as it is often unwittingly woven through the ideologies of the environmental movement.

The environmental movement dates back to the early conservation movement as a move against industrialization, but was tied to racist, sexist, and classist notions of wilderness and environmental protection that benefited bourgeois White men's ability to construct themselves as rugged frontiersmen (Collier, 2015; Thorpe, 2011). Early conservation campaigns were run by wealthy White settler men attempting to claim "the wilderness" for themselves (Aguilar and Marten, 2011; Shabecoff, 2012). Their logic was based in bourgeois identity which articulated White men as rightful claimants to the land to preserve. Their claims were used to justify land theft based on the idea of terra nullius – that the land was empty and available for the taking—and as part of a larger project of Indigenous dispossession and erasure (Dowie, 2011).

Over decades, environmentalism has shifted and grown to include ecological approaches that combat pesticide use, fight toxic waste contamination, launched Earth Day, protect endangered species, especially whales and forests, fight the seal hunt, promote recycling and ethical consumerism, and many additional campaigns (Shabecoff, 2012). It is a transnational movement, though for the purposes of this discussion, I centre the North American movement. Though there are many grassroots, community-led organizations embedded in the mainstream environmental movement, it has been represented as the big environmental NGOs, like the Sierra Club, World Wildlife Fund, Greenpeace, and others. Over decades, the environmental movement has been increasingly controlled by non-governmental organizations (O'Neill & VanDeveer, 2005).

As the mainstream environmental movement has grown and become increasingly institutionalized, it has often leveraged communities of colour and Indigenous people, using them as props rather than engaging as partners. As early as the 1970s, mainstream environmentalist organizations aired ads featuring "the crying Indian" to promote anti-pollution campaigns (Keep America Beautiful, 1971; Krech, 2000). These deploying racialized images of Indigenous people as noble, yet powerless victims of environmental degradation. The mainstream environmental movement has continually prioritized campaigns that ignore the disproportionate racialized and classed impacts of environmental damage, particularly in the siting of toxic waste (Bullard, 2000). Mainstream campaigns have also clashed with Indigenous

people's livelihoods, most notably the campaign against the seal hunt (Kitossa, 2000; Arnaquq-Baril, 2016). They have also prioritized solutions that reproduce colonial relations of exploitation and dispossession, like buying up tracts of rainforest (Cox and Elmqvist, 1993; Lizarralde, 2003) and REDD strategies (Cabello and Gilbertson, 2012), which locate the solutions to environmental damage caused by those in the Global North in the Global South. For decades mainstream environmentalist organizations have faced public criticisms for their whitewashed approach to the environment, yet they have largely continued to frame the goals of the environmental movement in narrowly constructed, technocratic, and de-historicized ways.

By the 1980s the environmental movement, which was already functionally several loosely connected movements rather than a single coherent movement, split. Black organizers started naming their work as environmental justice (Bullard and Wright, 1987; Taylor, 1997) rather than environmentalism. Environmentalists of colour explicitly dis-identified with the environmental movement, and by contrast, their movement defined itself by its attention to relations of racialization and class. The environmental justice movement has grown astronomically in the decades since, and there is extensive academic work documenting environmental racism and resistance (Bullard, 1993, 2000; Cole and Foster, 2001; Taylor, 2014, 2000; Pulido, 2000). Indigenous peoples have also rejected the frame environmentalism offered. Instead, Indigenous environmental work in Turtle Island has often been framed within sovereignty movements, where returning the land or managing extraction fits within a larger decolonial frame (LaDuke, 1999; IEN, n.d., McGregor, 2004; Varese, 1996). Both environmental justice and Indigenous environmental sovereignty work tend to be glossed over by mainstream environmentalist organizations, and while their work may be recognized and valued, it is often seen as outside the scope of "real" environmental work.

As climate change has become the central issue uniting the environmental movement, climate activism has been implicated in the pattern of centring White, Eurowestern frames of climate change. The climate movement has been critiqued for claims that impacts of climate change are only now beginning to be felt, as many communities of colour, especially post-colonial coastal states, have been severely impacted for years (Our Power Campaign, n.d). Climate campaigns have been critiqued for their target goal of limiting global warming to 1.5 or 2 degrees, a goal that impacted communities – again, overwhelmingly Indigenous or communities of colour – argue accepts their destruction and attends only to the impacts of climate change that will be felt

by wealthy countries in the Global North (and more specifically, middle and Upper middle class White communities within them) (Democracy Now, 2009, December 18). Critiques also circulate regarding environmentalists' inattention to the disproportionate burden of adapting to climate change (Adger, et al., 2006). Climate movement strategies have largely included technocratic and bureaucratic "solutions" which seek to manage carbon emissions, which communities of colour have critiqued as, at best, inadequate, and, at worst, a strategy which reinforces inequality and inequitable wealth distribution through the financialization of green energy and climate crisis management (Klein, 2014). In response to these critiques, the mainstream climate movement has begun to shift toward the discourse of climate justice (Curnow & Gross, 2016), but the shift remains largely semantic, with most of the proposed policy solutions that are advocated for staying at the level of technocratic management of fossil fuel emissions, rather than a redistributive approach or strategies which seek to address legacies of colonialism and disproportionate impact on communities of colour.

Within this context of meaningfully racialized and colonial environmentalist organizations, strategies, and frameworks, the pipeline alliances that are emerging are particularly important. They create a potential rupture through which some mainstream environmentalists have come to see their issues aligning with a broader coalition of actors. For some, though certainly not all, it has meant a decentring of White, settler approaches to environmentalism. Yet even as these campaigns have grown, the relationships are difficult to navigate, as different ideas about the environment and its relationship to settler colonialism and racialization surface. Different ways of knowing and being, different relationships to land and community, different exposure to risk, and long histories of mistrust because of exploitation have created a difficult environment for reconciliation work. Indeed, in many of the narratives emerging from Standing Rock, Indigenous people have noted the challenges of working with settlers, and particularly White settlers, who are often unfamiliar with the histories of settler colonialism and racialization, are unprepared to check their own Eurowestern ways of knowing and being, or who slip into problematic performances of White saviourism (Cram, 2016, November 20; @sydnerain, 2016, November 23; O'Connor, 2016, November 28).

Within this context, how do we reconcile? Settler environmentalists need to learn different practices and politics, take up different ways of knowing and come into a new identity as environmentalists and activists, one that centres racial justice and decoloniality. This is a tall

order, but reconciliation demands nothing less. To disrupt the reproduction of racialized and colonial practices in our movements, we have to learn our way into something different.

1.3 Guiding Research Questions

In this dissertation, I examine the emergent processes of reconciliation and decolonization in which settler youth developed new practices, learned political concepts and systemic analyses, shifted their ways of knowing and being, and transformed their identities as environmentalists toward new identities as climate justice activists. I ask how climate movement participants in the University of Toronto fossil fuel divestment campaign, Fossil Free UofT, learned to understand and disrupt social relations of racialization, settler colonialism, and patriarchy. Given the messy histories of the environmental movement, and many other settler-led movements in North America, I looked at how young people invested in activist projects came to recognize historicized social relations of power, how they developed political critiques of those relations, and how they worked collectively to disrupt and recreate other ways of working together that reflected their emergent politics, identities, and epistemologies.

This dissertation takes up these questions, tracing Fossil Free UofT participants' learning about Indigenous solidarity, settler colonialism, and formal colonialism, racialization and anti-racism, and patriarchy, gender, and feminism through their activism. Over the course of two years, many of these climate change activists transformed their thinking and action on these issues, becoming deeply politicized and changing the face of their campaign in the process. Their experience offers interesting and useful ideas about how educators, policy makers, and activists might engage in a public conversation around reconciliation, decolonization, and anti-racism.

Theirs is one small story, but it offers insights into the learning process of politicization. To tell the story, I draw on sociocultural theories of learning to explicate the interactional, collective process of politicization. It serves as an example of the struggles of a new generation of environmentalists, one that is rooted in the movement structure of mainstream White-default settler environmentalism but in the moment of growing social justice awareness and solidarity focus of campus activism.

To theorize how we might shift the politics of the mainstream environmental movement, I focus on Fossil Free UofT, a local climate campaign. I do so because I am interested in the collective

learning processes that happen on the ground through social interaction. Drawing on Dorothy Smith (1987), this choice is premised on the understanding that social relations are enacted by real people: they are not abstractions that simply happen. Thus, examining social interaction in detail allows me to describe and analyze how patriarchy and gender, racialization, and settler colonialism are enacted, and how through participation these may become naturalized to participants. This approach is rooted in studies which argue that through ethnomethodological (Garfinkel, 1967) and interactional analyses (Erickson, 1992, 2004; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992; Schegloff, 1993) we can understand how learning contexts are constantly being created and recreated, and in them, social relations of power are reproduced and resisted (Leonardo, 2009). Our use of ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, and interaction analysis as foundations for theorizing the ongoing enactments of social relations draws on critical predecessors (Wetherell, 2003, Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Billig, 1999; Kitzinger, 2000, 2009; Stokoe & Smithson, 2001) from conversation analysis, discourse analysis, and discursive psychology. They contest arguments that ethnomethodology, and conversation analysis in particular, should be confined to participant talk, and should avoid politicizing speaker utterances or reducing them to gendered categories (Schegloff, 1992, 1997; Beach, 2000, Ochs, 1993). They argue against conversation analysts' claims to neutrality (Billig, 1999), arguing that moves to decontextualize talk from its sociopolitical and historical context is artificial and unnecessarily limiting (Kitzinger, 2000, 2009), and that social relations of power can be relevant across utterances, even when not made explicit (Weatherall, 2002; Ehrlich, 2002). While we do not conduct formal ethnomethodological analysis or conversation analyses, their processes and ways of examining interaction influence the types of questions we ask and where we look to see the enactment of social relations in communities of practice.

While interactional analyses that examine the enactment of social relations are fundamental to both post-structuralist (Leonardo & Shah, 2016) and Marxist (Contu and Willmott, 2003; Roth & Langemeyer, 2006) approaches in the learning sciences, I approach these from a Marxist feminist stance (Smith, 1987, 1990; Mojab & Carpenter, 2011; Carpenter, 2012; Bannerji, 2005),

which argues that relations of the local and extralocal¹ are dialectically related and co-producing. Drawing on Marx, “dialectics” refers to a way of conceptualizing social relations as processes, not things, where movement and relationality are central to understanding and theorizing the everyday world (Ollman, 1993, 2003, Allman, 2001). In particular, dialectical analysis attends to the inner relations of processes (Allman, 2001; Colley, 2012), relationships of scale (Smith, 1993), both the essence and appearance of phenomena (Ollman, 2003), and the historicity of relations (Allman, 2001). These approaches theorize the relationship between the local and extralocal not as a comparison, but as co-constituting. There may be particular manifestations of social relations in local sites, but transhistorical relations coordinate the local experiences, while also being reproduced through the local practices. As Bannerji (2005) argues, this provides “a more complex reading of the social, where every aspect or moment of it can be shown as reflecting others, where each little piece of it contains the macrocosm in its microcosm – as ‘the world in a grain of sand’” (p. 146). In the context of the climate movement, this means that I theorize micro-level interactions as both the site where social relations of power are enacted while also being sites that reproduce dominant social relations across scales. That is, where racialization is reproduced through the participation with Fossil Free UofT, those relations are not unique to the group. They are reproducing relations that are pervasive throughout the climate movement, yet those relations can only be enacted, reproduced, or resisted in the sensuous participation of people. In this way, the different scales of the climate movement, from the interactions at the grassroots to the international movement, are dialectically related and co-produce each other.

For me this means that to study how the climate movement is enacted as a racialized, patriarchal, and colonial space, I have to look at the sensuous involvement of people on the ground. The same is true for questions of how we might learn reconciliation and decoloniality. These processes do not happen in abstracted forms across movements; they happen in the interactions of real people. To ask how the climate movement can learn and become a justice-oriented movement, we have to look at the actual participation of people.

¹ I use translocal when I am centring movement across time/space, extralocal when I am talking more specifically about scale or the relationship between 'here' and 'there'.

Certainly there are limits to focusing on one campaign. In doing so we gain much detail on how a campaign may function and how learning may unfold. As with all case study research, the detailed findings bring these analyses richness. However, in their specificity, we may also lose some of the ability to abstract beyond the specificity of this context and this group. Holding these truths in relationship together allows us to be attentive to both the essence and the appearance of social relations and learning. While I use Fossil Free UofT as a site of intensive analysis that helps us to understand the interactional dynamics of the environmental movement, I am also aware of the limits of the claims. This study can offer specific analyses of this group, which I believe are instructive for other environmental campaigns without making claims to their universality. All of the fossil divestment campaigns across North America are steeped in specific contexts of their campuses and participants, and these will shape their particular enactments of social relations and learning. However, they are also steeped in the same era of neoliberal capitalism, embedded in a similar campaign framework and strategy, and situated within dominant social relations, shape their work, but do not strictly limit it. Agency and context will always play a role in the interactional enactments of the campaigns, though the historical moment and social relations do as well, since they are bound dialectically. This is why we look at the specifics of one environmental site: to understand, in detail, how this group reproduces and resists racialized, patriarchal, and colonial logics, practices, ways of knowing and identities. Through theorizing these processes at the local level, we can begin to abstract out and theorize beyond this group toward broader claims about learning and resistance in the environmental movement.

1.4 Context of the Study

1.4.1 Fossil Fuel Divestment Campaign

Fossil fuel divestment, coordinated by the international environmental non-governmental organization 350.org, is the most common student campaign to address the climate crisis in North America. The campaign works with students on their campuses as they encourage their governing councils, boards of trustees, and other leadership bodies to divest their endowments from the 200 fossil fuel companies with the largest reserves of fossil fuels. The fossil fuel divestment campaign represents the greatest focus of the youth climate movement on campuses right now, yet little has been written about this topic in academic spaces.

The first fossil fuel divestment campaign originated at Swarthmore College in early spring of 2011. Swarthmore was joined over the following eighteen months by a handful of campus groups campaigning for coal divestment, united around the Divest Coal coalition in the fall of 2011 (Grady-Benson, 2014). Less a movement than a loosely connected conglomeration of campaigns and organizations, it was not until 350.org's "Do the Math" tour in November of 2012 that mass action for divestment gained traction across the country. The tour was headlined by environmentalist Bill McKibben and a rotating panel of movement celebrities. The tour was complemented by a short documentary called "Do the Math" (Nyks & Scott 2013) and a Rolling Stone article by McKibben (2013). These materials launched the campaign internationally. Following the "Do the Math" tour, where attendees were encouraged to join by starting their own divestment campaign, the campaign ballooned through the easy-access kits and resources made available by 350.org to provide a template for the campaign format. Templates found on the websites GoFossilFree.org (US) and GoFossilFree.ca (Canada) ask students to form a team and create a petition outlining the standardized demands of the campaign. The petition asks universities to "freeze new fossil fuel investments and drawdown current holdings over the next five years" (Fossil Free USA, 2015; Fossil Free Canada, 2015). Alongside a series of actions used to put pressure on campus targets and engage the campaign's base of support, this format is the standard for US and Canadian fossil fuel divestment campaigns, with variations based upon campus context.

By April of 2014 – just three years after Swarthmore's first calls for divestment – the campaign had grown to over 560 campus campaigns worldwide (Grady-Benson, 2014). Today, the numbers have grown to more than 400 student groups, with 33 commitments from colleges and universities to divest (FossilFreeUSA, 2016). In Canada, there has been explosive growth around the divestment campaign. Twenty-five schools have launched campaigns since 2013. Concordia and University of Ottawa have been the only campaigns to experience some success, winning partial divestment. Dalhousie, McGill, University of British Columbia, and University of Calgary have seen high-profile rejections of their divestment proposals. Many of these schools' faculty and students have passed resolutions in favor of divesting, and Queens has established an ad hoc committee to evaluate the moral and fiduciary responsibility that the institution has vis-a-vis climate change and fossil fuel investments (CYCC, 2015).

The campaign kits coordinating the fossil fuel divestment campaigns put forward the dominant frames of the mainstream environmental movement. They argue that divestment is an easy and logical solution to a technological, mathematical question. McKibben and 350.org boil the problem of climate change down to “the simple math” – 2,795 gigatons of CO₂ in reserve, and 565 gigatons of CO₂ available to burn to stay under 2°C (350.org, 2016). McKibben argued that “[the fossil fuel] industry has behaved so recklessly that they should lose their social license, their veneer of respectability” (Stephenson, 2012, para. 4). To divest, then, is to act upon the simple mathematical reality of the growing climate crisis, and publicly point the finger at the fossil fuel industry as culprit.

While some have argued that this is a strategic framework designed to be mainstream-able and palatable to a broader public (McKibben, 2013; Grady-Benson, 2014) it reproduces many of the problems of previous campaigns in the environmental movement, in particular a striking inattention to racialized, colonial, and gendered dynamics in terms of the impacts of climate change, the causes, and the strategies for combatting them. The fossil fuel divestment campaign guidebooks do not have any necessary hook to environmental justice or Indigenous sovereignty, and thus the official framing of the campaign does not centre racialization or colonialism. Indeed, in the US kit, there is nothing about gender, race, or colonialism. Interestingly, the only differences between the divestment toolkits in the US and Canada is that the Canadian guide explicitly addresses –very briefly – Indigenous land rights, settler solidarity, and the tar sands being on stolen Indigenous land (Fossil Free Canada, 2016, p. 9). These kits, and the campaigns that are being carried out on campuses internationally, are thus reproducing the same dynamics of mainstream environmentalism that have been critiqued since before many of these university-based students were born.

Despite the lack of explicit connection to justice frameworks in the fossil fuel divestment campaign strategies, framing, and tools, issues of justice continually crop up (Curnow & Gross, 2016). We can see it in some of the Divestment Student Network (DSN) (www.studentsdivest.org) materials, webinars, and conferences, as well as in the Canadian Youth Climate Coalition’s (www.ourclimate.ca) conferences. The DSN, in particular, has an active people of colour caucus which coordinates a mentoring network and plans reading groups and educational events that expressly centre analyses of racialization in the climate movement. While these initiatives are incredibly important, perhaps representing the greatest contribution to the

environmental movement (Curnow & Gross, 2016), they remain marginal in the campaigns nationally. Across campaigns at the campus level, the politics are disparate, and the anti-racist, anti-colonial framing is not the coordinating ideology of the campaigns overall. Yet, we do see ideas and practices of climate justice come up organically and travel across campaigns. This travel of a politicized approach to fossil fuel divestment reflects a learning process where students and their campus campaigns are extending the mainstream divestment frame to accommodate radical politics.

Fossil fuel divestment is an important campaign to examine because it is a way many youth are brought into the climate movement. This study has the potential to show how the environmental movement reproduces the racializing, colonial, and masculinist tendencies, and how those can be contested and transformed across multiple scales. We look at the dynamics and the frames within the fossil fuel divestment campaign so that we can understand how those logics and practices travel, but also how they can be disrupted and resisted. In the contestation over the ways environmentalism is framed and practiced in the fossil fuel divestment campaign, we might learn how some environmentalists are re-situating themselves and the goals of the movement to become more decolonial, anti-racist, and feminist, to create a climate justice movement where social relations of power are more than empty talking points. This process of learning and transformation is where the hope of building a different environmental movement rests.

1.4.2 The University of Toronto Campaign

At the University of Toronto, the fossil fuel divestment campaign is coordinated by a group of undergraduate and graduate students who have developed an extensive brief on the issue of divestment and climate change (Toronto350.org, 2013/2015). From October 2014 through May 2016, Fossil Free UofT met weekly throughout the school year to plan events and coordinate the divestment campaign on campus. Meetings lasted two to three hours and were facilitated by rotating members. The group had three main sub-committees responsible for 1. interacting with the Governing Council (referred to as the “inside game”); 2. mobilization and outreach to students (the “outside game”); and 3. ally outreach, building relationships with other clubs, faculty, and alumni. The group was composed of undergraduates, masters and PhD students. Between 15 and 35 people attended regular planning meetings and there was a core group of around 15 central organizers. Participation shifted weekly, but the group tended to be majority

White, with roughly even numbers of men and women attending, and no openly identified non-binary students participating.

In spring 2014, Fossil Free UofT collected the necessary signatures to trigger the university's divestment process, which established an ad hoc committee in the fall of 2014 to advise the UofT president and governing council on whether or not to divest the endowment. From fall 2014 to spring 2016, the period analyzed for this project, the group worked to build awareness on campus and persuade the president's office. The group met with and advised the ad hoc committee members appointed by the university president. They held Divestment Action Week, with events including a signature drive called "Cookies for Climate Change", a panel of environmental and financial experts, and a march. Additionally, they hosted divestment meme parties, did hundreds of short talks at the beginning of classes, submitted interventions to the National Energy Board, recruited at Frosh, screen printed t-shirts, dropped banners, made valentines for the president, and organized direct actions. Over the course of the campaign there would be three marches of more than 200 students through central campus to the doors of the office of the president.

In December of 2015, the ad hoc committee appointed by the University of Toronto president released a substantial report (Karney, et al., 2015), taking the stance that:

Some fossil fuels companies engage in egregious behaviour and contribute inordinately to social injury. These are the fossil fuels companies whose actions blatantly disregard the international effort to limit the rise in average global temperatures to not more than one and a half degrees Celsius above pre-industrial averages by 2050 [the "1.5-degree threshold"]. Such actions, if unchecked in the near term, would make it impossible to achieve internationally agreed limits to the rise in average global temperatures and would greatly increase the likelihood of catastrophic global consequences. In the Committee's view, fossil fuels companies engaged in such activity are properly the focus of divestment action (Karney, et al., 2015, p. 3).

The committee recommended the university should begin principled divestment from "firms that derive more than 10% of their revenue from non-conventional or aggressive extraction" (Karney,

et al., 2015, p. 3), “firms that knowingly disseminate disinformation concerning climate change science or firms that deliberately distort science or public policy more generally in an effort to thwart or delay changes in behaviour or regulation” (Karney, et al., 2015, p. 4), and “firms that derive more than 10% of their revenue from coal extraction for power generation or Canadian and American power generation firms that derive more than 10% of their revenue from coal-fired plants” (Karney, et al., 2015, p. 4), among other recommendations for meeting the University of Toronto’s responsibilities toward managing climate change. Their report was heralded internationally for its thoroughness, and their detailed recommendations earned the moniker “the Toronto Principle” (Franta, 2016, February 8).

In March 2016, despite the recommendations of the committee and the actions coordinated by Fossil Free UofT, the University of Toronto president, Meric Gertler, declined to divest, rejecting the student campaign’s demands and opting for an Environmental Social Governance approach, commonly known as ESG, which argues that managing the university’s long-term investments according to ESG factors would allow the university to make more significant impacts in the realm of climate change (Gertler, 2016). Gertler also called for a range of institutional consumption changes, like purchasing environmentally-friendly cleaning products, renovating institutional property to be more energy efficient, and investment in research and innovation related to energy efficiency (2016). Gertler’s decision was consistent with the decisions of other Canadian institutions, and the University of Toronto has aggressively promoted the decision and related policies.

The move to reject divestment in favour of an ESG approach was widely criticized by students, who called the move “cowardly” (CBC, 2016, April 1) and mobilized an emergency rally to demonstrate their dismay. The ad hoc committee publicly argued in *The Globe and Mail* that the approach they were suggesting would be more effective than Gertler’s approach (Hoffman, et al., 2016, April 5), and ad hoc committee members have spoken out against the university’s decision (Burns, et al., 2016).

From the outside, the campaign appeared coherent, and for the University of Toronto campus, quite politicized. However, the internal dynamics of the group were anything but coherent. From early the first year, it became clear that participants did not necessarily share political views. Within the group there was not a shared political analysis of why divestment was the best

strategic choice, but there was also an implicit assumption (occasionally made explicit) that everyone was fighting for the same cause. During the first year, there were few conversations about climate change or of what winning on our campus would contribute to the broader environmental movement or world. At the time, it was assumed that the group had a shared analysis of the root causes of climate change and the strategic intervention that divestment offered. Halfway through the first year, these different views of politics became very visible when one member proposed a statement of values that identified colonialism and other historical systems of oppression as the sources of climate change. What came to be known as the “intersectionality clause” was a statement that the group was opposed to racism, sexism, and hetero-patriarchy. The clause faced serious opposition from some members. The opposition argued that these systems were unrelated to climate change and a distraction from the real work of divestment, and that the intersectionality approach was dangerous in that it promised to alienate the mainstream students on campus that they hoped to attract to the campaign, in particular the business, law, and engineering students.

Over the course of the next year, these conflicts would vacillate between low-level disagreements, with many of the more progressive students staying quiet in meetings, to arguments in meetings, replete with yelling, crying, and storming out of the room. The disagreements over the purpose of divestment, the root causes of climate change, or the tactics that would be effective reflected the debates across the mainstream environmental movement. While students in our group may not have been immersed in or acquainted with those long-running debates, they were embroiled in them.

These debates over tactics, politics, and purpose also became wrapped up in emergent critiques of privilege and power within the group as many members came to notice and articulate patterns of participation that were highly racialized and gendered, with White men participating far more frequently and making decisions disproportionately. In part, the awareness of participation patterns was a product of this research project, as focal participants examined videos during stimulated recall interviews and as the research that became chapter three developed. The draft of Chapter Three fueled that dissatisfaction, and helped shift participants’ political identities. This process, wherein the internal dynamics of the group and the political analysis of the divestment campaign and the environmental movement became fused, co-producing and continually politicizing members that were often marginalized in the large group, drove a

dramatic schism in the group. As some members, mostly women, Indigenous people, and people of colour, shifted their politics and claimed more space for participating, fights became more frequent and focused more explicitly on questions of political alignment, and the racialized, colonial, and gendered logics behind the mainstream environmental positions.

Since their loss, Fossil Free UofT has split. One small group continues to work on the fossil fuel divestment campaign, attempting to get meetings with the University of Toronto Asset Management firm (UTAM), who is tasked with overseeing implementation of ESG, as well as doing outreach to members of the Governing Council and the office of the president. They have launched Freedom of Information requests and continue to pursue the divestment strategy. Another group of students have left the campaign and have said they will not be involved in similar activism. The third set have shifted their focus, but remained committed to 350.org's campaigns, working now on the Kinder Morgan campaign to stop the pipeline from being built. Since the UofT divestment decision, they have mobilized a new set of students on campus to go to Ottawa to be arrested to demonstrate their opposition to Kinder Morgan, and organized community meetings and vigils in Toronto. With Trudeau's recent approval of the pipeline, their work seems likely to escalate in the coming months. A fourth distinct group has spun off into a new organization, which they are calling the Environmental Justice Collective. Their mission is still emerging, but centres on a climate justice framework that integrates anti-racist and anti-colonial practice into environmental movement building.

1.5 Learning in Social Movements

Despite, and arguably because of, the campaign's failure to accomplish its goal, students involved say that they have learned immensely from the campaign. Participants learned instrumental tasks, like how to chair a meeting, while also learning the ways of participating that were legible in the group—how to act, how to speak, which discourses were appropriate, etc. They learned about campaign strategy and movement framing. They learned how to do outreach, how to coordinate a march, how to negotiate with the police and marshal traffic during a rally. But they also learned political critiques that spanned beyond the day-to-day work of their campaign, questioning patriarchal social relations in the group and the movement, as well as in their classes, families, and communities. They learned about Indigenous ways of knowing and being (though Indigenous participants were already conscious of these differences), and sought

ways to engage with Indigenous peoples in solidarity, working toward something decolonial, even if that varied dramatically across participants. They learned about other social movements and different tactical repertoires. They developed different critiques of grassroots and grassroots organizing models that they drew from, disagreed with, experimented with, and iterated on.

Participants' individual claims about what they learned through the divestment campaign vary widely. In many ways, Fossil Free UofT mirrors the cleavages in the environmental movement, with members becoming differently politicized, some toward technocratic and instrumentalist approaches that align with liberal ideologies, and others rejecting the liberal frame in favour of a more expansive critique of social relations of power. While many students argue that they were radicalized through the process, several believe that institutional appeals to morality have been proven through this process to be the only hope for social change, while others have learned that organizing is ineffective and toxic. In many cases, their learning affirmed and reinforced what participants already knew, while for others, it radically reshaped their ways of knowing and being, fashioning new identities, individually and collectively. I want to be careful to clarify that it was not only those who took up radical identities that learned; certainly those who participated and actively rejected the anti-racist, feminist, and anti-colonial frameworks and theories of power that emerged among many in the group were also learning, shifting their identities and their politics. Both of these factions were actively learning and prefiguring different social relations.

I focus attention on those who became radical, because their learning trajectories named and attempted to challenge the dominant relations that were naturalized in the group, as well as in the environmental movement, and North American society more broadly. Their learning is interesting because they shifted toward recognizing, interpreting, and contesting what was considered "normal" and "natural" to others in the group. For the politicized student activists, fighting for an organization and an environmental movement that challenged everyday racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism internally, as well as through their campaign strategy and framing became a central way that they embodied and expressed their learning and continued to develop their learning and identities. It became such a deeply embedded part of their political analysis, ways of knowing, and identities that they can see no way of intervening on climate change without working on Indigenous sovereignty fights as part of a broader feminist, anti-racist strategy to combat climate change, a dramatically different stance than they entered Fossil Free UofT with.

Given this focus, we must ask, what is learning? How do we know when someone has learned? And how does politicization fit into a broad conceptualization of learning? To answer these questions, I look to the learning sciences. Sociocultural theories of learning understand it as a collective process centred not just on what an individual participant in a community knows, cognitively speaking, but also what the community does (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1996; Rogoff & Lave, 1984). Participation becomes a central point of analysis (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990; Rogoff & Lave, 1984). Sociocultural theorists frame learning in context, arguing that learners become able to act in appropriate ways in the appropriate contexts (Lave, 1988; Rogoff, Najafi, & Mejía-Arauz, 2014). Here content is always wrapped up with context, and learning is understood as a process of becoming (Lave, 1996).

While studies of social movements have been mainstream within sociology and political science for decades, attention to these questions of learning and context have remained marginal in the field (Sawchuk, 2010). Social movement theorizing has contributed significantly to our understandings of social movement trajectories (Morris, 1986; Mansbridge & Morris, 2001; McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2003; Polletta, 2012; Tarrow, 2011), state-building and political processes (Tilly, 1964; 1978, Gamson, 1990, Tarrow, 1998), framing (Benford & Snow, 2000; Johnston, 1995; Oliver & Johnston, 2000; Poletta, 2009), resource-mobilization (McCarthy & Zald, 1977), networks (Diani & McAdam, 2003; Osa, 2003; Klandermans & Oegema, 1987), and other areas. Throughout this work there are hints of interest in the learning transformation process (Goodwin & Jasper, 2003), and yet these have rarely been borne out analytically. This may be because, as a field, these projects tend toward structuralist analyses of movements—often based on historical and mainstream media documents which identify patterned behaviours not of learners, individually or collectively, but of states, targeted institutions, and configurations or networks of social movement organizations and their resources. While these studies are valuable, they largely do not address learning at the interactional scale; when they do so, they tend to operate from an individualized, cognitivist framework (c.f. Garrison, 2002; Klandermans, 1996). In their work to understand large-scale, institutional shifts across time and place, social

movement theory overlooks questions of process, learning, and transformation as enacted by grassroots activists².

In response to this gap, social movement learning studies within adult education have described learning in movements for nearly 30 years. Early work argued for the need to examine the pedagogical practices of movements (Holford, 1994; Welton, 1993), and subsequent authors have done extensive work to describe what participants have learned through their work in social movements. This work assumes that movement actors are intelligent, intentional, and agentic, and engaged in purposeful, collaborative forms of learning and teaching. The studies showcase the educational processes of movements, considering trainings and workshops, flyers, social media, propaganda, activist research, and everyday processes as pedagogical tools in their own right (Choudry, 2015; Choudry & Kapoor, 2010; Clover, 2002; Cunningham & Curry, 1997; Gleason, 2013; Hal, et al., 2011; Foley, 1999; Harley, 2014; Meek, 2011; Scandrett et al., 2010; Scully-Russ, 2006; Endresen & Von Kotze, 2005; Walter 2007; Crowther, 2006; Kane, 2000; Magendzo, 1990; Escueta & Butterwick, 2012).

The social movement learning literature, academically and in movements, highlights the significance of learning and transformation for movements (Choudry, 2015) and the need for revolutionary theory to inform social movement praxis (Carpenter, Mojab, & Ritchie, 2013). Across this field, though, there are significant hurdles that need to be addressed to meet the needs of social movements trying to design pedagogical strategies and facilitate environments that are conducive to politicization. Most of the adult education social movement literature plays very loosely with ideas of learning. This scholarship tends to conflate learning with teaching, pedagogy, or praxis, using the concepts interchangeably. The writing in the field rarely

² Social movement theory has tended to treat the day to day activity of activists derisively, either through explicit framing of protest activity as mobs (Hoffer, 1951; Hobsbawm, 1971), or through analyses that assume that activist agency is peripheral to the trajectory of social movements (Flacks, 2004). While the assumption of mob behaviour is no longer an animating orientation of the sub-discipline, more social movement studies in the last decade have framed their analyses of movement through the lens of movement targets, asking how firms and states might anticipate, mitigate, neutralize, and otherwise interact with movements (c.f. King & Pearce, 2010; King & Soule, 2007; Soule, 2009, 2012; McDonald, King & Soule, 2015). Their focus on structural analysis and responsiveness to targets has produced a body of theory that has been labeled as unhelpful to activists (Bevington & Dixon, 2005; Barker, 2007). The guiding ethic of my work is accountability to the kinds of anti-racist, anti-colonial, and feminist work that emerges in social movements, as will be described in Chapter Two, and so I orient to understanding learning in these locales that serves the goals of movements. For these reasons, I do not engage substantively with mainstream social movement theory.

articulates what learning is, nor ties analyses to theories of learning (Choudry, 2015). There is significant slippage in the concept of social movement learning when it is used interchangeably with teaching, training, pedagogical interventions, or praxis, with each of these really attending to separate aspects of engagement, few of which necessarily include learning as an accomplishment. While it is valuable to document the teaching strategies mobilized in social movements, theorizing the learning process is a distinct project. Further, the level of analysis in this social movement learning research is inadequate for theorizing learning in interaction. Most research provides descriptive accounts of *what* movement participants learned, rather than *how* the learning process unfolded. What's more, these studies rarely account for racialization, gender, or colonialism in their analysis of social movements, knowledge production, or opportunities to learn, so even where movements are explicitly addressing race or migration issues, they tend to be glossed over, neglected as significant aspects of learning and participation in the movements.

This is where the learning sciences have the potential to offer significant value to studies of social movement learning. Where adult education studies of social movements use underdeveloped notions of learning, learning sciences conceptualizes learning as social, collective, active, and ecological (Lave, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990; Barron, 2006; Gutiérrez, et al., 2006; Nasir, et al., 2006; Cole & Engeström, 1993; Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000). Where social movement learning studies have not accounted for the interactional engagement that produces, sustains, and interrupts learning, the learning sciences offer useful tools, methodologically and theoretically, that demand attention to learning, understood not as merely cognitive or psychological processes, but as participation in a community of people united through joint work and shared repertoires of practice.

Situated learning theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991) understands learning as a social act where meaning is co-constructed within a community of practice. Through social interaction, knowledge and practice are maintained and transformed in an ongoing way, and are always dependent on the context. Knowledge and action are dialectically related and co-constituting; learning is inextricable from practice. Legitimate peripheral participation describes the process by which new members become recognized as full members within a community of practice by mastering the practices of the group. Lave and Wenger suggest that learning occurs through “centripetal participation in the learning curriculum of the ambient community” (1991, p. 100),

and warn that this is not merely imitation, but a gradual process of immersion and reproduction of the core practices. Members achieve full participation not only by learning skills or reproducing types of talk, but also by developing the ability to participate in the full practices of the community. As participants become more acculturated and more competent, they move toward roles of mastery in the community, becoming further entrenched in the group.

Communities of practice are groups of people who are mutually engaged in joint work using a shared repertoire of practice (Wenger, 1998). Identity is key within a community of practice, and is understood not as something acquired, but as a process of becoming. Lave argues that in the process of learning, “people are becoming kinds of persons” (1996, p. 157). The focus on learning reflected in identities emphasizes the dynamic ways that identities are produced within certain contexts and communities. Lave and Wenger (1991) claim that newcomers’ increasing sense of identity as full members is the most significant learning in a community of practice, and indeed, a key indicator that they have achieved mastery.

Since social movement spaces often exist outside of institutional schooling and formal training, situated learning is effective in describing and theorizing the ways that people learn and become particular types of activists (Curnow, 2013, 2014a, 2014b). Moving toward full participation in an activist community of practice is often a process of learning the particular repertoires of practice and frames of a social movement and moving from peripheral involvement to full participation through active engagement in campaigns. Co-negotiating processes like facilitating meetings, planning, protesting, and coordinating public messaging is a process of participation, and ultimately of becoming. Situated learning theory allows us to understand how the practices and tactics – that is, what activists do – produce the community, and thus the movement.

Therefore, sociocultural learning theories’ articulations of learning-as-becoming are particularly apt for social movements (Curnow, 2013, 2014a).

There are only a few examples of social movement research that rely on sociocultural conceptions of learning to theorize the dynamics of participation and cognition, yet these theories offer valuable tools for understanding the dynamics within social movement organizations.

Within the learning sciences, where sociocultural learning theorists have explored social movement contexts, they deepen our understandings of the process of learning, the communities that enable learning, and the practices that shift across scales of time and place. Rather than stay at the level of description, as many of the social movement learning studies tend to, sociocultural

research offers a more detailed view into the cognitive and social processes that enable people to create change in their communities. The emergent sub-field helps to explicate the specific learning dynamics at play within social movement contexts, whether it is learning to engage with elected officials (Kirshner, 2008), to challenge school closings and fight for equitable education (Kirshner & Tivaringe, 2016), to coordinate community gardening (Teeters & Jurow, 2016; Jurow & Shea, 2015), to resist transphobic policies (McWilliams, 2016), to contest the gendered norms of participation within an activist group (Curnow, Davis, & Lightning, 2016; Curnow, 2014), to build resistance in racialized communities (Daniel, 2016; Prudhomme, DiGiacomo, & Van Steenis, 2016) or a range of other community-engaged learning sciences research (Smirnov, 2016; Holland, Fox & Daro, 2008; Jurow, et al., 2014; Esmonde, Curnow, & Rivière, 2014; Kilgore, 1999). This literature lays the groundwork for further interactional and process-oriented investigations of learning in social movements, while centring analyses of learning that are context-specific, social, and attentive to relations of power. However, there is still much work to do to bring social relations of racialization, settler colonialism, and gender into focus analytically. Even as we discuss power in these articles and poster sessions, we have not plumbed the cases deeply to examine how the racialized, colonial, and gendered power dynamics and practices are shaping interaction and learning in ongoing ways. There is little work that examines how social movement participants learn about social relations of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism, nor how these relations shape the social movement environments and opportunities to learn.

Looking back to mainstream social movement theory, several theorists have made a shift toward theorizing movements within a sociocultural lens, attending to social movement processes, as well as individual and collective development from a Vygotskian perspective. Tarrow (2008) and Krinsky and Mische (2013) have argued that social movement theorist Charles Tilly, one of the most entrenched and prolific theorists of the field, began to shift toward a more dialectical analysis of process that moved between the interactional processes of participants in movements and the macro-level directionality of movements in his 2008 book. Indeed, Tilly (2008) demonstrates a shift toward sustained attention to the activity of movement participants, and lays the groundwork for the field to take up a new direction, moving away from the structuralist stance of most social movement theorists, toward a study of movements that is attentive to interactional processes of learning, collaboration, and activity. Another small group of

sociologists has engaged a similar process of theorizing movement activity from a sociocultural stance, rooted in Marxist dialectics. This group has similarly moved to expand social movement studies to accommodate development, habitus, and activity (Krinsky, 2007, 2008; Barker, 2007; Crossley, 2003; Krinsky, Cox, & Barker, 2013; Crossley, 2014; Barker & Krinsky, 2009). In particular, several of these publications argue for social movement research to integrate Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) (Engeström, Miettinen & Punamäki, 1999; Engeström, 2014; Leontiev, 1981, 1978; Sawchuk, Duarte, & Elhammoumi, 2006) as an analytic framework for theorizing movement activities. In that vein, CHAT studies of social movements have grown in recent years (Stetstenko, 2008; Sawchuk, 2011, 2014; Sawchuk & Stetstenko, 2008; De Smet, 2012; Sawan, 2011; Kim, 2012). This work theorizes the transformation of social relations as a process based in purposeful human activity.

Across this body of work, sociocultural analysis demonstrates the social, interactional, and scale-making processes that shape the political engagement of participants. They do not merely document what participants have learned, but explain *how* they are learning. While this may seem like an insignificant difference, it has substantial repercussions. Documenting how participants learn provides tools for those involved in social movements to understand the learning dynamics and design social movement interventions that accommodate learning and identity development. Despite this, few researchers have looked thoroughly at the ways that activist identities and practices are co-produced and are an ongoing accomplishment within the community of practice. In subsequent chapters of this thesis, I show how individuals were brought into a process of legitimate peripheral participation, how their participation *was* learning and *produced* learning, and how that learning enabled new members to become activists and shape the meaning of activism within their community.

1.6 Structure of the Dissertation

1.6.1 Question

This dissertation asks *how* participants in Fossil Free UofT learned about racialization, settler colonialism, and patriarchy through their participation in a social movement context. Using the fossil fuel divestment campaign at the University of Toronto as a case study, we examined how the community of practice learned and transformed itself in terms of the political analysis, the shared practices, the ways of knowing and being, and the collective identity that they developed

as radical activists. Each of the following chapters engages in a different aspect of analysis, but collectively the chapters tell the story of how the participants in this campaign became politicized and embarked on a struggle to remake the organization as a decolonial, feminist, and anti-racist space where they could participate equitably and practice prefigurative politics based on a climate justice framework. Theorizing the learning process in this multi-racial, multi-gendered, settler-colonial community of practice leads to several significant interventions in how situated learning theory is commonly used, and opens new directions for sociocultural learning theorists to engage in studies of social movements and politicization.

1.6.2 Manuscript format

This dissertation follows the Oxford Manuscript format for theses. It is a compilation of three publishable articles, plus this introduction (Chapter 1), methodology (Chapter 2), and a concluding chapter (Chapter 6) that makes explicit the connections between the chapters. Each article-chapter stands alone and has been submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Two of these chapters are co-authored with participants in the research, and this choice and the distribution of work is discussed in more detail in Chapter 2. However, each of the articles reflects on a specific aspect of the analysis, and the chapters fit together to provide an overview of the research, reflecting the different scales of analysis.

1.6.3 Outline of the dissertation

Chapter One (this chapter) is an introduction that provides an overview of the political urgency of questions of how people learn anti-racism, anti-colonialism, and feminism, noting the particular importance for environmentalist communities of practice to take up this work. It provides a short history of the struggle within the mainstream environmental movement to deal with relations of racialization and settler colonialism before introducing the fossil fuel divestment campaign and the University of Toronto divestment group. It sketches the importance of examining learning in social movements and identifies the significance of work that bridges studies of social movements and the learning sciences. It provides a brief overview of sociocultural theories of learning, and situated learning in particular. It concludes by reframing the questions of the study and their significance for both social movement activists and learning theorists.

Chapter Two is entitled Relational Epistemologies, Participatory Methods, and Accountability to Political Vision. This chapter outlines the relational epistemology that underpins the research. I draw on Indigenous research methodologies as well as militant ethnography and discuss the rationale in detail. I then describe the Participatory Action Research approach and describe methods of data collection and analysis. Though each subsequent chapter includes its own specific methods section, this chapter provides an overview of philosophical commitments and the research activities.

Chapter Three is entitled Doing Expertise: Racialized and Gendered Participation in an Environmental Campaign. This chapter is co-authored with Jody R. Chan and provides an interaction analysis of the ways expertise was constructed through Whiteness and masculinity in order to privilege the participation of White men while marginalizing women and people of colour. Drawing on theorizations of doing gender and difference, we frame expertise as an ongoing, situated, interactive, and relational performance that is dialectically related to social relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism. Through interaction analysis of video, we analyze positioning dynamics, including register, exclusive talk, affirmation, and hierarchical ranking mechanisms. We argue that doing expertise relied on unevenly available White masculine modes of engagement, creating a dynamic where White men's participation was co-constructed by all participants as more valuable than that of women and people of colour. We argue that the conflation of hegemonic White masculinity with expertise drove the perception that environmental campaigns are a White masculine "default space", with little room for expertise and engagement from people of colour and women.

Chapter Four is entitled Politicization in Practice, and is co-authored with Amil Davis and Lila Asher. This chapter argues that politicization should be understood as a learning process that is social and which shifts not only participants' conceptual understandings of social relations, but meaningfully shifts their epistemologies and identities through collective engagement. In the student-activist group Fossil Free UofT, some participants became radical. Participants who were politicized shifted from mainstream environmentalist frames, practices, and identities toward anti-racist, decolonial, and feminist praxis. We analyze their transformation through a learning sciences approach, using longitudinal video data to track students' political development. We argue that politicization is not merely cognitive, but a holistic process that involves shifts in

practices, ways of knowing, and identities. Through the use of ethnographic sketches, we trace the ways that these elements worked together to politicize student activists.

Chapter Five is entitled *Resituating Situated Learning*. This paper makes a theoretical intervention into situated learning and communities of practice theories, arguing that they must account for social relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism. I contend that the repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies of a community of practice are embedded in social relations; therefore, neglecting power dynamics dilutes theorizations of learning, participation, resistance, and identity. I draw on vignettes from an environmentalist community of practice to demonstrate possible gaps in the ways situated learning theory is mobilized; gaps that allow relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism to escape scrutiny. I call instead for sustained analysis of the ways power relations shape and are shaped by social relations. The vignettes demonstrate opportunities for analysis that is more fully situated within the historical context of power relations, and which offers us different perspectives on learning in communities of practice. I argue that the field of situated learning needs more robust tools to theorize the practices of both privilege and resistance, in order to understand learning in multiracial, multigendered, settler-colonial communities of practice.

Chapter Six serves as a conclusion chapter. It revisits the research question and key findings of the chapters. It highlights the major themes across the chapters, stressing the importance of participation, relationality, identity, power, and dialectical approaches to scale-making in each of the analyses. I then discuss the significant contributions this work has for the learning sciences, for social movement learning studies, for participatory action research, and for the climate movement. I conclude by revisiting the political commitments of the research project and reviewing the impacts and implications of this research on Fossil Free UofT, the divestment campaign, and the environmental movement more broadly, and explore what the campaign's learning trajectory tells us about decolonization and reconciliation in the current moment.

Each of the empirical chapters attends to different phenomena that occurred during the course of the campaign. The sequencing works to tell a more comprehensive story of learning in the community of practice, one that began with women and people of colour in the group noticing and contesting their marginality, which we can see in Chapter Three. Their inability to become recognized as experts and leaders in the group politicized many of them and served as an impetus

to develop their own spaces and practices, which generated new sets of politics and politicized identities, which we analyze in Chapter Four. Chapter Five draws out some of the challenges we encountered when mobilizing a situated learning framework in our analysis. In it, I identify several gaps where the assumptions of situated learning were inadequate for theorizing the learning processes we encountered. Together, the chapters provide a more complete narrative of the process of politicization for students in the fossil fuel divestment campaign at the University of Toronto than any of the chapters is able to individually.

1.7 Politicization in Practice

In the past several years, sociocultural theorist Barbara Rogoff has been sharing a story that likens the idea of recognizing dominant perspectives to the 1990s poster craze, the Magic Eye. These posters used repeating patterns to obscure three-dimensional images that, if viewers focused their eyes just so, could be revealed. Rogoff (2016) argues that these posters are an apt metaphor, because for viewers to see beyond the obvious pattern, one has to believe that there is the possibility of seeing something else, and one has to actively look—and in a different way—in order for the hidden image to be revealed. I love this metaphor, because it fits so well with the data we have collected and analyzed over the last three years. When I hear her metaphor, I think of the ways that racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism seem to be so difficult for the environmental movement to see and address. In order for the movement to intervene in the racialized, patriarchal, and colonial dynamics that pervade the movement's practices, frames, and institutions, we have to acknowledge that there is something to see. That is, we have to interrogate the naturalized social relations we are immersed in if we are to recognize them and change our way of thinking about the problem. What's more is that, with Magic Eyes, once you have seen the hidden image, it becomes hard *not* to see it.

Across our years of collective organizing, data collection, and analysis, what we as a research team have found again and again is that those in positions of power and privilege in Fossil Free UofT were unwilling to look at the social relations being problematized by people of colour, Indigenous people, and women in the group. White men in positions of mastery within the community of practice perceived that they had little incentive to look for other ways of knowing, being, and participating. They often refused to consider that their social locations benefited them significantly in ways that moved beyond the myth of meritocracy. When others in the group

raised this, those in positions of power and privilege consistently argued that other members were biased, and that they themselves were neutral arbiters of their own position within social relations. Our research, unfortunately, does not reveal the magic bullets for meaningfully politicizing all group members, and indeed, our frustration over certain members' refusal to look for or believe evidence of social relations and systemic disadvantage animated many of our meetings and analysis sessions.

However, in the group, we also traced those who have caught a glimpse of the hidden image in the corner of their eye, and worked collectively to discern what they were seeing, to explore the contours of the hidden image, and to try to find the boundaries of what now pops out at them. Their learning process rendered them able to see and know differently. The learning helped them to develop new identities, both individually and collectively. It fostered new interactional practices, repertoires of practice, and campaign tactics that reflected their learning and their values. And this ability to see and know the world in new ways means that they are both demanding and creating a different type of environmental movement that attends to and shapes its strategies around the revealed images.

In the sections that follow, I describe and analyze different aspects of Fossil Free UofT members' individual and collective politicization and what it tells us about the learning processes within communities of practice. Each chapter engages with different data from the two years of video data collection, and together they tell a story of how some members of the group learned to see and theorize social relations of racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy, while others in the group often denied their existence. Through the process of naming the racialized and gendered dynamics in the group, certain members became politicized around issues of justice and power, and worked collectively to shift their politics and concepts of injustice, to shift the way they understood knowledge and worldview, and to shift who they understood themselves to be, and who they felt accountable to. Their story is an important one to share and to critically interrogate because it offers us insights into how politicization happens in social movements and may provide direction for anti-oppression educators seeking to facilitate students' process of becoming able to see the perspectives that are often obscured through relations of White supremacy, settler colonialism, and patriarchy.

This research is important and useful for us, as activists and scholars, in thinking about the broader transformations that will be necessary in the environmental movements if we are to take reconciliation and decolonization seriously. If we want to meaningfully address climate change in the face of both conservative and liberal governments that prioritize pipelines over consent processes and livability, we need to learn to look at and to see the social relations of power that are too often concealed or not paid attention to. Fossil Free UofT's process of learning to look at these social relations, to interrogate them and shift their practices, beliefs, and identities is a crucial piece to understanding how we build movements. This learning enabled some participants to contest the racialized, patriarchal, settler-colonial relations that produce climate change and enable and require land theft and genocide.

Chapter 2 Relational Epistemologies, Participatory Methods, and Radical Political Vision

2.1 Relationality and Radical Political Vision

Social movement activists and learning scientists share at least one core principle: design matters, and how we organize our spaces has meaningful repercussions for the communities we build, the questions we ask, and the results we circulate. These are more than logistical questions; they are epistemological, ontological, and axiological questions of accountability. This section presents the philosophical underpinnings of this research project and explains the practices of our research group as a way of laying the groundwork for the empirical chapters that follow. The political orientations of this research are very tightly integrated with the methods of this research, stemming from relational, feminist, anti-racist, and anti-colonial ways of knowing and being, and reflecting (and reinforcing) my and my co-authors' identities as activists and scholars. Our research should be understood as a politicizing project: one that stemmed from a particular political stance, and which sought to further political goals through the results and the process of data collection and analysis.

For a dissertation written in the learning sciences, this work may seem unconventionally “political”. It is. While the learning sciences have often positioned themselves as an “objective” science, this project rejects the lens of objectivity and instead embraces a relational ontology that centres the context of learning and knowledge production historically, politically, and interactionally. This ontology has major ramifications for the content, design, and data analysis of this project. This chapter provides an overview of the political and epistemological foundations of this research project, providing the philosophical rationale for the practices and methods of the research collective and highlighting the ways that the research practices prefigured particular politics and identities.

Because this approach is so unusual for a series of learning sciences analyses, I use this section to introduce the methodologies that form the foundation of our work, briefly reviewing Indigenous research methodologies which stress relational accountability, militant ethnographies which emphasize political accountability and embeddedness within social movements, and

feminist, anti-racist approaches to Participatory Action Research (PAR). After laying the groundwork, I discuss my location as a researcher and activist, explaining my motivation for undertaking this study and my political goals for this research process. Next, I provide an overview of the research project methods, including the research collective, the data collection, the analysis, and the mobilization of results. Though each empirical chapter includes a methods section, this overview gives readers a global view of the research practices and the ways that they reflected and reinforced our political, epistemological, and ontological commitments. Finally, I highlight the significance of our methodologies and methods in terms of the prefigurative political practice that they enabled, and reflect on our research project itself as a learning process that politicized members of the research collective, as well as the members of Fossil Free UofT.

2.2 Relational Accountability

My work is strongly influenced by Indigenous research methodologies (Hampton, 1995; Wilson, 2008; Kovach, 2009; Absolon, 2011; Smith, 1999), in particular the focus on relationships, accountability, relevance, respect, responsibility, reciprocity, and community ownership. I embrace relational epistemologies and use the concept of relational accountability as the backbone of my methodology. This ethos has informed the practices of data collection and analysis, as well as the conceptual and theoretical mooring embedded in our questions, and the identities our team has developed as researchers throughout this collaborative, politicizing project.

Relational accountability refers to the inter-connectedness of the relationships a researcher engages in with ideas, source material, the community, respondents, readers, the environment, and other components of the research context. Responsibility, reciprocity, respect, and relevance must be imbued in each of the relationships in order for a researcher to establish deep accountability. These relationships then determine the topics that researchers research, the ways they engage in research, how they analyze data, and how they use the knowledge that comes from the relationships they cultivate (Wilson, 2008). Wilson claims that:

We are mediators in a growing relationship between the community and whatever is being researched. And how we go about doing our work in that role is where we uphold relational accountability. We are accountable to ourselves, the community, our

environment or cosmos as a whole, and also to the idea or topics that we are researching. We have all of these relationships that we need to uphold. (2008, p.106)

In facilitating the sharing of knowledge, researchers play a role in developing a new understanding of the world. While the researcher's role is, in part, to play the midwife to the new understanding, it is crucial that this be done in a good way, such that all participants in the research are engaged in relations of respect and reciprocity and the knowledge that is mobilized is understood within its cultural context, owned and controlled by the community, and accountable to participants.

Accountability to the relationships researchers have with participants and their relationships with their ideas is paramount. Researchers striving for relational accountability engage with respondents in iterative cycles to ensure researchers are capturing the relationality of their ideas and strengthening relationships of reciprocity and accountability. Authenticity and credibility can be achieved through continuous feedback with research participants, allowing participants to check the accuracy of the analysis, extend the ideas they shared, and learn from the contributions of other participants (Wilson, 2008). This approach highlights the relationships that are embedded within research projects, between the respondents and the researcher, respondents and respondents, respondents and ideas. Inviting participants to not only read transcripts, but also to critique the analysis and to strengthen the argument, ensures that the writing captures the participants' intent and experiences in the most accurate and authentic way possible. Though this may create more work for participants, which they can opt in to or not, the invitation and the access to the arguments that emerge from analysis create opportunities for deeper conversations and more accountability on the part of those authoring the reports.

Upholding relational accountability requires that researchers allow participants space to hold us accountable for the ways their ideas are represented and also to learn about and engage with the analysis, deepening a relationship with the ideas that have synthesized with other respondents' ideas. Again, this is complicated, and often aspirational, since participants may experience our research and findings in different ways, depending on their social locations and the way the results impact their practice. Researchers need to be responsible for how participants' experiences are described and analyzed, while also attending to larger relations of power and with clarity about who and what we are ultimately accountable to. Accountability to participants

must be context dependent, as I discuss below. In this study my accountability politically is oriented toward representing the stories that are prioritized by and are in service to Indigenous and people of colour student activists. If there are contradictions because of oppositional relationships of power, as there were in this group, I make decisions based on the political project of decolonization and reconciliation. This means that I am still in relationship with all participants, and, in particular I am responsible for other White settlers, but the relationship of accountability and the ways I engage will be grounded in the politics of reconciliation and anti-racism, and attentive and accountable to Indigenous and people of colour participants.

2.2.1 Designing for Relational Accountability

I focus on building relational accountability in several ways within this body of work. First is through simultaneously mobilizing militant ethnographic principles, which require me to acknowledge and centre my relationship to the politics within the project. Rather than approaching this research project as a disinterested and unbiased researcher, I name the relationship I have with the questions and how they've developed through my relationships with other social movements. I also centre my political commitments around anti-racist, feminist, and anti-colonial praxis so that it is clear how I am framing problems of injustice (like climate change) and so that I am explicitly committed to intervening on racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy alongside participants. My commitment to anti-racism and reconciliation work underpins the design, questions, and process of this project, and I intentionally try to model decolonization in our research project at the same time that I study and analyze learning processes that contribute to reconciliation and decolonization, particularly within the environmental movement.

Additionally, I work alongside participants through a participatory action research process. While I designed the methods, we jointly decided on the questions and collectively analyzed and wrote up the results. This piece is most important for me in terms of living relational accountability, because it ensures that the analysis is accurate and rooted in all of our experiences and our relationships to each other and other members of the group. It means that the analysis is not a product of me individually making sense of what has happened or ascribing meaning that is not shared by the group, and it also ensures that our analysis is useful and relevant within the group.

Another way I strive to be relationally accountable is in the moments of conflict within Fossil Free UofT. While most discussions of relational accountability do not discuss conflict and tend to treat participants as a unified field, in my research, conflict has been an important space for me to navigate accountability. I try to do this by engaging openly and honestly, especially with the participants that have voiced concern about the analysis and findings of our work, often because these participants are implicated in reproducing racialized, gendered, and colonial dynamics. In these moments, I strive to explain myself, my analysis, and my politics to participants, while also maintaining accountability to other participants, as well as anti-racist, anti-colonial, and feminist politics, and the integrity of our work as researchers. Relational accountability is thus an ethic that we strive for, imperfectly at times, that manifests differently depending on the context, especially since not all participants have the same relationship to power and privilege. In these instances, relational accountability has required careful navigation based in respect and responsibility, rooted in a commitment to the political projects of reconciliation and decolonization.

2.3 Militant Ethnography and Accountability to Movements

As a way of centring accountability within political movements, I situate my work within the realm of militant ethnography. This approach to research extends the commitments of community based research and situates researchers within the social movements they participate in (Juris, 2007; Maeckelbergh, 2010). Developed from Scheper-Hughes' (1995) discussions of militant anthropology, the commitment to militancy reflects an ethical imperative. Scheper-Hughes argues that it is inadequate for researchers to merely observe or even accompany the political contestation that has such significant consequences for research-subjects' lives, but that researchers must be engaged in their struggle. For Scheper-Hughes this is both a question of conscience and a way of understanding the phenomena being studied in an embodied and experiential way. Colectivo Situaciones (2005), Juris (2008, 2007), Maeckelbergh (2010; 2011), and Lewis (2012) extend Scheper-Hughes' work, applying it to their respective studies on the alter-globalization movement. Their works are rooted in the participation as active members in the networks they have studied and their work strives to build from the organic intellectual contributions from within the movement in order to put forward useful knowledge that is situated within the practices of the movements.

Militant ethnography argues that “simply taking on the role of the ‘circumstantial activist’ (Marcus, 1995) is not sufficient; one has to build strong relationships of commitment and trust, become entangled with complex relations of power, and live the emotions associated with direct action organizing and transnational networking” (Juris, 2005, p. 20). Militant ethnography prioritizes explicit, ongoing political commitment to the activist work that the research is bound to, as well as collective visioning, reflection, analysis, and distribution that supports the work of the partnering activists and their movements. The methods section will further outline this ethic of accountability, but it is important to identify here that this research is not simply a thought exercise, but an expression of anti-oppressive politics in the interest of supporting the learning in and deepening the analysis of the organizing community.

In addition to reflecting a political commitment and accountability to participants, I find this approach highly appropriate for my study for its commitment to praxis and prefiguration on the part of the researcher. Maeckelbergh (2011, 2010) claims that through engagement in social movement democratic practices, she was able to actually understand the logic and the practices in an embodied, more complex way. She argues that by doing, rather than just observing, she was able to understand the adjustments movement actors make when they transform abstract values into context-specific practices (2012). This ethic of research is highly aligned with my theory of learning, as it understands learning as necessarily social, as researchers engage with their collaborators in an ongoing process of meaning making through action, reflection, and prefiguration.

Essentially, Scheper-Hughes (1995), Juris (2007), Lewis (2010), and Maeckelbergh (2011) argue that one must become a member of the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), engaging in the legitimate peripheral participation of the group, in order to fully understand the logic and the components of participation. Although they do not reference communities of practice theory, their epistemological foundations demand engagement in the collective work in order to understand and contribute to the practices of the community.

Lewis (2013) argues there is a significant convergence between militant ethnography and Indigenous research methods, especially in relation to social movements. Lewis (2012) argues that social movement research should be centred in anticolonial methodologies rooted in Indigenous approaches to knowing and being. He demands that militant social movement

research address dominant social relations through data collection and analysis which integrates the politics fully into the research practices, in addition to the social movement work (Lewis, 2012).

While these approaches stem from different theoretical and political commitments, they share a foundation in a desire to do research in ethical and relevant ways. I strive to be accountable to the social movements where I have learned so much, in an effort to understand the learning dynamics at play and provide analysis that benefits the individuals and the collectives of participants as they strive to understand and undermine patriarchy, colonialism, and capitalism.

2.4 Feminist Antiracist Participatory Action Research

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is an approach to research that focuses on the process of research and the relationship between researchers and researched. PAR's process is based on social investigation, education, and action to share the creation of social knowledge with oppressed people (Maguire, 1987). Participatory research typically involves marginalized people as researchers investigating the problems and issues in their daily lives (Brown, 1978; Fals-Borda, 1979; Freire, 1970, 1974; Hall, 1981; Tandon, 1981). In PAR, the power to dictate the questions and terms of the research is held by the community, and community members are actively involved in planning and administering the research. In the process, community researchers build research skills, analyze data from their daily experience, and collaboratively develop answers to questions that are meaningful to them, in order to change the systems that impact them. Many PAR projects have worked with community organizations to study anti-poverty interventions (Bolland & McCallum, 2002; Gellis, 2001), health promotion (Flynn, Ray, & Rider, 1994; Michael, et al., 2007; Minkler, 2000), other community development initiatives (Paradis, 2009; Campbell, Copeland, & Tate, 1998; Alvarez & Gutiérrez, 2001), and community organizing (Kwon, 2008; Kirshner, 2008; Ginwright, Cammarota & Noguera, 2011; Cammarota & Fine, 2008).

While PAR was initially developed as an intervention against exploitation of marginalized communities by enrolling them in research process and carving out spaces for the voices of disadvantaged groups, the methodology is also appropriate for other groups. It serves to disrupt many of the power dynamics and ethical conundrums created by traditional research relationships where university-based researchers control the questions, design, budgets, and

reporting for research, often in communities that they are not part of. These disruptions are important in communities that are not historically and institutionally marginalized as well, and provide a process for actualizing relational accountability through shared responsibility for research design, implementation, and reporting. In this project, using a version of a PAR process with university activists enabled me to prefigure the types of politics and relationships I am committed to in the research project, holding the premises of relationality, reciprocity, responsibility, relevance and militant ethnographic principles front and centre in the design, implementation, analysis, and writing of the project. Additionally, following militant ethnographic aims, this type of design allows a research collective to build feminist, antiracist, anticolonial analysis into the movement to strengthen the campaign work and support climate justice framing and strategy within the environmentalist movement.

With the approval of Toronto350, the sponsoring organization at the time, and the leadership of Fossil Free UofT, the collaboration began with less intentionality and planning than many PAR projects. It was not clear how involved participating student activists wanted to be in the project, beyond designing broad questions and allowing data collection. I initially developed the questions and framework for the study and then worked collaboratively with the student leaders of Fossil Free UofT to refine the research questions and add additional ones to make sure that the research was useful to them. While my questions are more attentive to learning and process, their questions have been more concrete and specific to their campaign work. They added questions like 1. How do we get new members to be more involved and escalate their engagement? and 2. How do we do a better job integrating anti-oppression into our meetings?

I invited focal participants early in the research process, asking them to participate in an initial interview, several stimulated recall interviews (SRIs), and a final interview. I invited participants based on their regular participation in meetings and my commitment to involving a racially diverse group of participants across a range of levels of involvement (from novice members to established but not central members, to those in positions of mastery in the group). Once focal participants accepted, they also each prioritized specific questions for us to attend to. These included specific questions about 1. How people of colour are integrated into their campaign (or not)? 2. How women's participation differs from men's and how women feel about that? 3. How members of the campaign become more willing to take on confrontational tactics? 4. How does the structure of the organization work? I integrated their questions into the analysis process, and

together with the focal participants, these became sub-questions for us to analyze as we reviewed video and coded data together.

Over time, the core research group came to include several of the focal participants, as well as two members who declined to be focal participants and one other participant who requested to be involved in the analysis. The research team member selection was based largely on the analytic processes that developed as part of the SRIs, as I built a deeper relationship with these participants and we learned together what this type of analysis might look like and why it mattered for the group. While I made several open invitations in the large group meetings, no other members joined the research group, though three reviewed video as a way of understanding the type of analysis and coding processes we did. The members of the research team include Lila Asher, Jody Chan, Amil Davis, Tresanne Fernandes, Keara Lightning, Ariel Martz-Oberlander, and Jade Wong, along with myself. The group is racially diverse, includes migrants, settlers, and an Indigenous person, cis women and a cis man, and spans from early undergraduates, recent graduates, a now completed MA, and a PhD candidate. We have worked together in different capacities over the last three years, first as colleagues in the campaign, and later as we developed the analytic schema, codes, and questions more fully. Jody, Lila, and Amil have been involved in writing the chapters of this dissertation, while all the participants have contributed to posters, presentations, and other papers that are still in development. Thus, while the framing of this research project was mine, the implementation, development of sub-questions, analysis of video and experiences, and writing of analysis articles has been collaborative. All of the work has been conducted with an ethos of being useful to the campaign and the members of the campaign, so that participants will be better able to do their activism. Their collaboration has been the key to extending my concepts of relational accountability, as our joint ownership and work has been pivotal to this project's development, politically and intellectually. When I use "we" in the sections that follow, I am generally referring to the research team, or to the campaign overall, which we all participated in.

Given the Indigenous, militant, and PAR sensibilities of this project, the research has become a comprehensive politicizing exercise in and of itself. Participants in the analysis say they saw the SRIs and the collaborative data analysis as an important alternative space, an idea that is developed further in the subsequent chapters. For them, the research has been a process of naming the social relations of patriarchy, racialization, and colonialism within our group and

within the environmental movement, a process that has been both cathartic and politicizing. As such, they have taken a very active stance in developing the questions and analytics and advocating for particular types of data collection. As Lila, now a third year Environmental Studies student and focal participant said to me, “It’s not just your research anymore.” Lila and other focal students talked openly within meetings and public presentations of our data about how the research project has become a core part of the campaign, something we jointly own, direct, and learn from. This intensity of ownership and politicization fits within the learning and consciousness-raising emphasis of the project.

2.5 Self-Location

One of the ways I work to integrate non-dominant epistemologies and ontologies into this project is centring Indigenous methodologies, which I’ll describe in a subsequent section. As part of that commitment, I begin with disclosures about who I am and my relationship to the questions, movements, and people within this study. Drawing on the theoretical contributions of Indigenous researchers (Hampton, 1995; Wilson, 2008; Kovach, 2009; Absolon, 2011) and feminist researchers (Bloom, 1998; Ramazanoglu, 2002), it is important to locate myself within my research question and explain my choice of topics, contexts, and participants. Indigenous epistemologists argue that who we are as researchers matters for what we investigate and how we do our work, and that making our standpoints and political commitments known is foundational. Absolon (2011) argues that this strategy directly challenges positivist Eurowestern research presumptions of objectivity and neutrality by modeling an alternative wherein the standpoint of the researcher is disclosed up front and the relationships the researcher is embedded within can be made apparent. Kovach (2009) makes a similar argument, alluding to the myriad ways that researchers’ experiences influence what they research and how they research it, as do many feminist theorists (Harding, 1991; Collins, 1990). In revealing who the researcher is and how they came to understand the world, Indigenous theorists argue, researchers allow readers to understand the ways that methodological choices and interpretations of data are shaped while simultaneously developing a deeper understanding of the ways identity is shaped. According to Hampton (1995), Indigenous research requires that researchers reflect on and reveal the reasons why they want to conduct specific pieces of research, claiming that as a researcher becomes clearer on their motivations, they are better able to engage in the work and strengthen all the other interconnected relationships that surround the research project.

Indigenous researchers also emphasized the importance of relational accountability and context (Wilson, 2008) in allowing readers and research participants to fully understand why we commit ourselves to certain questions, and how the lessons we learn from the research fit into a broader theory of change that will benefit the communities we are accountable to. Given the importance placed on self-location, I begin by explaining my standpoint, articulating how these research questions developed for me and my rationale for why I think this research is critical for student activists, and by situating myself within the alter-globalization and environmental movements as well as anti-racism and anti-oppression networks.

For more than ten years I worked as a student organizer, community organizer, and popular educator. Through my experience as a community organizer, I developed questions about how community members become actively engaged, how organizations and individuals balance processes of adult education against collective direct action strategies, how movements integrate equity strategies into their structure and practice, and if/how building systems analysis that encompasses race, gender, class, and ability moves individual learners to become politicized, long-term activists.

From 2004 to 2008, I was deeply involved in the fair trade movement, as a student leader and later as the staff National Coordinator of United Students for Fair Trade (USFT). My engagement as a student, beginning as a volunteer and moving into increasingly radical anti-capitalist activist circles was and is a product of my communities of practice. I was raised in a very conservative military town, and yet, through my experiences in USFT and other justice movements, I took up radical politics and became a professional organizer. As a university student activist, I learned about colonialism, patriarchy, and capitalism through popular education, international exchanges, and immersion in a radical community.

For me, student movements were sites of politicization, and my belief in the potential of students to engage in radical politics is core to why I continue to work with these movements. I believe that university students learn about social relations and about their ability to shape social relations interpersonally and institutionally through their engagement in organizing. This study emerges from this philosophy and fundamentally seeks to understand in a more specific and granular way why students become radicalized as anti-colonial, anti-racist, anti-capitalist activists, especially when the campaigns they are engaged in are not any of those things.

It was through my work with USFT that I encountered anti-colonial, anti-racist, and anti-patriarchy work that centred not only on systemic interventions like campaigns, but also on the personal work of understanding White privilege/complicity and patriarchy as they play out within my life and relationships. Though my heritage is a mix of Cuban and Swiss and other Western European ethnicities, due to the long tenure of some of my people as colonists and settlers in North America and their subsequent legacy as slave-holders, my White body, cultural experiences, and status within a classed system work together to firmly entrench me within the project of White supremacy and settler colonialism. I identify as a White cis woman and a settler in North America, and I have attended elite/ruling-class universities for all of my post-secondary education. My experiences as an activist and an organizer have motivated and enabled much of my anti-oppression work. I am committed to doing accountable anti-colonial/decolonizing, anti-racism work with settlers and White people because I believe upending systems of White supremacy and colonialism depends on broad based movements. While it is in White peoples' interest to address these systems as well, it is often harder for them (us) to see and understand systems of White supremacy because of the dominant ideology of North American society. I am also committed to working in multiracial and multi-gendered coalitions to actively change the systems that allow racial supremacy, patriarchy, and capitalism to dominate as social relations institutionally and interpersonally. Throughout my tenure as an organizer I designed and frequently led anti-oppression trainings and was part of national networks of organizers and educators doing anti-racist, anti-colonial, and feminist work.

I do not come out of the environmental movement. Fair trade and trade justice work were much more closely tied to anti-globalization work and Latin America solidarity networks, and so for me, the relationship to environmentalism is not strong. My focus on the climate movement comes out of a commitment to solidarity, anti-colonial, anti-racist work first, and student organizing as a mechanism for that — the environmental movement context is incidental. I rely on participants, then, to centre the relationship to environmental activism (the passion, the motives, the context), as I am a learner in that space.

I have a political commitment to support social justice organizing groups in their work raising consciousness about racialized, colonial, patriarchal, and capitalist social relations. There is a longstanding tradition of academic researchers working within social movements to contribute to social change. I situate myself within these histories and identify most closely with the stated

commitments of militant ethnography (Scheper-Hughes 1995, 2009; Juris, 2007, 2008; Maeckelbergh, 2011; Chatterton, Hodkinson & Pickerill, 2010).

This project is intended to be both a research project and an intervention. The design of the research models relational ways of knowing and being, doing antiracist, anticolonial, and feminist work while also theorizing the ways that anti-racism, anti-colonialism, and feminist ideologies and practices are taken up, stretched, and remade. In this design and implementation, we attempted to not only develop useful knowledge, but through our practice also shape the participants in our group and our overall campaign. Our research design, implementation, and analysis prefigure an anti-racist, anti-colonial, and feminist ethic of accountability, relevance, and relationality.

2.6 Methods

Stemming from this epistemology of relationality, shared accountability, and reciprocity, my methods were developed with participants. They reflect the political goals of the project, to work toward anti-racist, anti-colonial, feminist practice in order to not only understand the process of politicization, but to also support the politicization of our group and push the environmental movement toward decolonial praxis. In this section, I outline the specific method of data collection and analysis, though in each of the empirical chapters I focus on the relevant data and analysis for those questions.

2.6.1 Participation

My ongoing participation in the climate movement community is undoubtedly the most significant point of data collection. For two years, I attended the meetings, planning sessions, actions, art builds, bar nights, and other activities of the FossilFreeUofT divestment campaign. Through participating, I built strong relationships with many of the co-participants. I participated in the politics and strategy of the group and I helped to build the campaign over time. Thus, I understand the logics in an embodied, situated way (Maeckelbergh, 2012; Juris, 2007). Significantly, I also understand personally the way that women's voices are ignored and shut out, and have witnessed and intervened on many of the instances of racialized, gendered, and colonial practices that foreclose opportunities for participation as White men reinforce their positions of power (detailed in subsequent chapters). My interventions ranged from small, like affirming

participation of marginalized people outside of meetings, to more visible, like stopping an interruption by saying, “I don’t think she was finished”, to more sustained support for Indigenous solidarity initiatives by planning sessions with the Deepening Knowledge Project, or participating vocally to put forward another perspective when racialized, colonial claims were made as universal beliefs that were shared. I also participate as a friend, mentor, and confidant of many of the students involved in the campaign. Again, because of my age, I am slightly removed from the day to day dramas of the group, and often serve as a sounding board for women and people of colour in the group to talk through their interpretations of events and their feelings within the community. I have also mobilized resources I have as a graduate student or adjunct professor on campus, and have facilitated trainings and workshops, brought in special trainers I’ve organized with in the past, and tried to help develop skills in ways that the divestment students articulate as a goal.

Because of my age and experience differential, I try not to take up a lot of space within the group. Though I participate actively and intervene on questions of race, class, and gender consistently, I work hard (sometimes unsuccessfully) to raise issues without shutting down opportunities for group members to participate equitably. My participation is more constrained than it might be if I was participating among my peers, but I feel a strong responsibility to enable young people’s participation, and if I occupy space as an expert, that often limits how other participants feel comfortable participating. These decisions are also informed by race, class, and gender critiques of participation that come out of my anti-oppression training and popular education experience. I pay close attention to the racialized and gendered dynamics of participation and strive to avoid reproducing problematic dynamics that tend to silence women, Indigenous people, and people of colour.

2.6.2 Ethics, Anonymity, and Confidentiality

Because of the nature of this work and the approach to relational accountability, especially the question of where and who ideas come from, questions of ethics, consent, and confidentiality are important to touch on. The data for this project are primarily video data, which is described in the next section. Video and audio data are very difficult, perhaps impossible, to fully anonymize. For this reason, in my consent forms, I am clear with participants that if they choose to participate, they will be recognizable through both audio and video streams. I allow them to

choose if they use their real names, select a pseudonym, or have me select a pseudonym. The overwhelming majority have chosen to use their own names, and so names that are included are done so with permission. I believe this allows participants to choose how their ideas are represented, such that if they allow it, we can trace their ideas to their person and their experiences in important ways. Since activists are not a marginalized or at-risk group this has been a plausible solution, though in the middle of data collection, the Canadian government passed Bill C-51, which targets environmentalists, among others, and threatens to revoke status and citizenship for some students. This policy introduces a different level of risk, and so if students had chosen different tactics, it might have changed the ethics of recording and conducting non-anonymized research with environmentalists. Such policies should be part of an ongoing conversation about the suppression of dissent and impacts on academic freedom.

2.6.3 Video Data

Extensive video data were collected across the two-years of the study. Most video was collected at regular meetings, actions, and reflections. Interviews, stimulated recall interviews, and some collaborative data analysis were also recorded. Details of the data collection and analysis are reviewed here, and within the context of the chapters the specific approach is detailed.

Multi-camera strategies allowed us to see what happened in a context that was nearly impossible to capture from only one camera or through observation. A multi-camera strategy captured data on group work by focusing one camera on a focal participant's body, gesture, facial expressions, and use of tools while another camera captured a full view of the whole group so we can make claims about how the group functioned and what the focal participant may have been reacting to. A multi-camera setup also allowed us to focus on individual participants and their talk, gaze, expressions, movement, etc, but when combined across all members of the group, we can see how participants were interacting. This multi-camera strategy is influenced by Derry, Pea, Barron, Engle, Erickson, Goldman, and Sherin (2010), Hall (2007), Heath, Hindmarsh, and Luff (2010), Erickson (2006), and Roschelle (2000), but included more audio and video streams, because of technological advances.

Video-based data collection was one aspect of the research which impacted the relational accountability of the project. While this method of data collection makes analysis more accurate and detailed (Derry, et al., 2010; Heath, Hindmarsh, & Luff, 2010), it also shifts a number of the

relationships. It has the potential to change people's relationships in meetings and how we relate to each other because of the awareness of being recorded. I do not have evidence that this happened often, since the cameras were non-descript and recording was so common-place, but group members did know they were being recorded and in a few instances made reference to the recordings as a reason to not say something. If recording made participants self-conscious, then that impacts the way they relate to each other while on camera. Also, while conducting analysis, our relationship to the video is different than when we were participating in meetings. Our data are often infused with our feelings in retrospect and tends to be less aware of the context at the time the video was collected. In some ways, this is true of most research, where retrospection allows you to identify patterns and themes and make claims about the overall corpus of data. With video, retrospective pattern identification can be even more pronounced because we can see and hear participation through the lens of everything that has happened since, which can allow researchers to reinterpret what was said in ways that are not accountable to the ideas and relationships at the time (Derry, et al., 2010; Vossoughi & Escudé, 2016). This is a struggle to work against, and we attempt to do so through constant contextualization in the other events of the moment, as well as the notes, Facebook chats, and artifacts of the moment.

2.6.3.1 Meetings

Each week when FossilFree UofT met, I recorded the meeting using multiple cameras. Videos lasted from 1-4.5 hours and capture the events of the meeting as it naturally unfolded. One camera captured the whole group and was fixed, while other cameras focused more specifically on focal participants. During the second semester of year one, breakout groups became a weekly practice at the meeting, with two groups meeting in the normal room and one group meeting outside the room. Video of breakout groups from within the room was captured weekly, but the audio and video quality is low because of the multiple conversations. I also collected video of the outside breakout group for a few weeks before deciding it was logistically too difficult. Thus while I have recordings of several of the breakout groups, they have not been included in the analysis.

Additionally, there were many meetings outside of whole group meetings, whether those be planning sessions, nights at the bar, Solidarity Sundays, committee meetings, and others. These were important spaces for learning and sustaining the group. Very few of these were recorded,

and those that were are usually audio recordings made by students using their cell phones. Because these meetings were often informal, unscheduled, and in public spaces like pubs, they were not video recorded. Often I was present for these discussions, but it was impracticable to record, like driving back to Toronto from Ottawa and debriefing an action. In many of these instances I took detailed notes throughout the conversations. When that was not possible, like at the pub, I would take brief notes after returning home or make voice memos documenting the contours of the conversation. These are supplanted with the SRIs, where we often discussed things happening adjacent to our regular meetings, and through joint analysis with participants. In particular, for Chapter Four, Lila kept detailed journals throughout our campaign, and we cross reference her notes, my notes, and the video from events to create a more comprehensive understanding of what was happening across the campaign.

2.6.3.2 Actions

Students frequently planned and held actions, including marches, rallies, deliveries to the President's Office, and these were recorded using handheld camcorders or iphones. Many actions were not recorded because recording was not permitted (like actions within the governing council), an action included aspects that were not legal (per my ethics approval), an event was peripheral to our work but it was not our action (Black Lives Matter, Idle No More), or it would be inappropriate to capture video (Strawberry Ceremony for Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls).

2.6.3.3 Reflections

In many, but not all, instances, I have video recordings from the reflections and discussions that happen within the group. Often those happen in meetings, and just as reliably, they happen after the meetings while still in the room. For this reason, I do not end recordings until everyone has left the room. These discussions reveal some of the less-public discussions of tensions and disagreements and the more frank discussions of dynamics, or of failures within the campaign. The discussions reveal important reflections and learning opportunities. I also captured reflections after actions where possible, as group members immediately debriefed what had happened, made evaluations of what was or was not effective, and made plans for their next actions and how they would be different. These reflections often did not happen immediately after, because of class schedules, so very few of these were recorded, but where they happened,

they provide a rich body of data to see the meaning-making and reinterpretation processes as they happened.

2.6.4 Interviews

Interviews were held with seven focal participants at the beginning of their participation in the campaign. Interviews lasted from 30 to 104 minutes and varied in form. All were semi-structured, with me providing a framework of questions I hoped to engage, but were very flexible and conversational, following feminist approaches to interviewing (Bloom, 1998) in most cases. In these interviews, I invited participants to discuss their understandings of race, gender, colonialism, and capitalism and their relationship to climate change. I also asked how they got involved, how they participated, and invited their suggestions on the types of questions we should be attempting to answer as we developed the research project more fully.

At the end of the two years of data collection, I conducted follow-up interviews with four of the original focal participants, as one withdrew, one did not participate in the campaign long-term, and one preferred to not be recorded. These interviews touched on the same concepts as the initial interviews as a way of establishing explicitly how their views had changed over the course of the campaign. They were asked to describe racialization, colonialism, capitalism, and gender and their relationships to the climate change movement. They were also invited to reflect on specific instances where their views on these areas had shifted. These follow-up interviews provided us with evidence of specific shifts in talk and discourse as well as clues for where to look for shifts across time as we revisited the video data to trace the shifts they identified.

2.6.5 Stimulated Recall Interviews

One way that I worked to centre accountability throughout the process was through my relationships with focal participants. Focal participants were deeply involved in the direction and implementation of the research, which is detailed in subsequent sections of the methods overview. They helped shape the specific research areas we attended, as each suggested focal areas that they thought would benefit themselves and the group. Most significant were the ongoing conversations we had throughout the campaign. SRIs are a technique of reviewing video data with participants as a tool for allowing participants to view themselves and describe their experiences from a first-hand perspective (Lyle, 2003; Bryan, Bay, Sheldon and Simon, 1990) to

highlight the learning instances embedded within a video. Additionally, it centres the voice of participants in part of the analysis process (Dookie, 2015). In this research project, SRIs were fundamental to building relational accountability. Since we met regularly, usually one-on-one, to watch video (in addition to the normal weekly campaign work) we had a lot of time together to shape each other's ideas. In many cases, the SRIs became initial analysis sessions where we talked about what we were seeing in the videos. This sometimes included challenging what the other person put forward, sometimes required looking at clips multiple times, sometimes meant one or both of us shifted our view on what was going on in the group, but for me and the principle of relationality, it meant that I was transparent throughout the process about how I interpreted the events, and I was open to the other interpretations. That meant that focal participants knew where I was coming from and were not trapped or surprised, and also meant that my interpretations benefitted from ongoing iterative conversation with students who were deeply involved in the campaign. It also means that none of these ideas are mine alone—they all emerge from the political and intellectual context of the campaign and the rich conversations with student leaders as we collaboratively made meaning and interpreted our work in an ongoing way.

Stimulated recall interviews were conducted with eight focal participants across the two years, with the majority of SRIs being conducted with four participants. Two graduated after year one, one declined to be video-recorded, and one withdrew in spring of year two. Re-watching video with participants provided a fertile medium that complements broader ethnographic and interview-based recollections of learning in relation to the spatial, cultural, and historical situatedness of everyday practice. It allowed me as a researcher to witness and describe learning after it occurs, and to gain insider perspectives into the experience of participation. Employing these stimulated recall techniques (Dookie, 2015; Lyle, 2003; Bryan, Bay, Sheldon & Simon, 1990) allowed participants to view themselves and describe their experiences, which, while imperfect, highlighted specific learning instances embedded within a video that I may not have been able to identify and centred the voice of participants in part of the analysis process. Feminist anthropologists (Kindon, 2002) argue that video-based research has the potential to destabilize hierarchical power relations, while others have argued that participant-driven video-based work, including SRIs and video diaries, have the potential to dramatically shift whose voices are heard and how stories are told and represented in research (Armstrong & Curran,

2006; Pink, 2007; Carroll, 2009; Forsyth, 2009; Foster, 2009; Grant & Luxford, 2009). Grant and Luxford (2009) argue that SRIs, specifically, introduce a decolonizing approach to video-based methodology by decentring the perspective of the “expert” and instead interrogating their practice, rather than that of the marginalized participant. While I disagree with their use of “decolonization” as a metaphor, they usefully highlight the ways that SRIs can shift the authoritative voice in interpretation and analysis, bringing participants into the conversation in ways that create space for participants. This enables a different type of relational accountability, in that we can hear directly from participants what they see and experience in their re-experiencing the video, and their voices can more directly shape the analytic categories that emerge over time.

Each of these SRIs invited a focal participant to review previous video and talk through the dynamics and their experiences of participating in the group. SRIs lasted from 30 minutes to 2 hours and offered participants a chance to process the day-to-day interactions of the group, as well as their own thinking about strategy, process, and other aspects of participation in the group. Participants were invited to pause the video whenever they wanted, and I would also pause the video at particular points to elicit more specific responses. SRIs proved to be very helpful to me as a tool for building relationships and trust, for politicization through reflection, since the video often led to participants naming dynamics, and for articulating critiques of the ways race and gender played out within the meetings. They also served as a helpful information gathering tool, because the participants would often bring me up to speed on outside conversations that were happening, either on Facebook or in their personal relationships, and thread their relevance throughout the comments on the meeting, providing me with a more full view of the context and the debates surrounding our meetings. SRIs were content logged and used as relevant data where appropriate, as detailed in the empirical chapters.

2.6.6 Focus Groups

After stimulated recall interviews raised questions about the gendered dynamics within the group, Jade wondered aloud how other women in the group felt about what was going on and asked if we could plan a group meeting to talk about it. Jade then coordinated with other women in the group and planned a series of Women’s Caucus meetings, which functioned as a type of focus group, but which provided space for women to reflect on their experiences of gender

within the group, and across their lives. During the first summer, two of these meetings were held, and from them the initial analysis for Chapter Three emerged. After drafting the chapter, Jody and I coordinated another focus group, where we discussed the paper and the dynamics up to that point. Following that meeting, women in the group decided to coordinate several additional Women's Caucus meetings in order to plan for how to present their experiences to the men in the group in the hopes of changing the gendered and racialized dynamics of participation. Women's caucus focus groups were recorded.

During the summer, a People of Colour Caucus also emerged from our conversations, as well as students of colour debriefing their experiences within the group, especially around planning direct actions and police liaison strategies. While I did not participate in these caucuses and did not record them, I did provide the physical space for them at times. Where the content of these caucuses are discussed and analyzed within the chapters, it is based on the experiences and notes of participants of colour involved in the collaborative data analysis, and it is shared with the permission of participants.

2.6.7 Content Logging and Coding

Once data was collected, it was content logged minute by minute using StudioCode software, stamping each minute with a descriptor (Engle, Conant & Greeno, 2007, Heath, Hindmarsh & Luff, 2010), and providing a descriptive account of what sections of video were revisited and what was said. Each minute of video was labeled with the general contours of the discussion and actions that happened during the time period. Content logging makes it easier to find segments of the video later on, by seeing what happened when in a general way. Additionally, content logging is a way of identifying themes early and assisted the emergence of new codes.

Pre-coding happened alongside the content logging, where I labeled segments of video that were directly relevant to one of the large areas I knew I was interested in, like race, capitalism, gender, and colonialism. Like content-logging, these pre-codes mostly served to indicate where relevant discussions occurred within the video, and they were also useful at creating at-a-glance notes to show the ways that participants engaged with these concepts broadly in each instance, as well as the frequency and duration of instances of concept-relevant talk.

Generally speaking, codes were developed collectively by reviewing video and making extensive notes on what was interesting and relevant. Given the density of interesting areas, codes were developed with more specificity, and a codebook was developed in order to clearly articulate a code. The codes were tested by applying them to two to three videos and the codebook was refined to reflect what we actually wanted to be able to analyze. Video was coded differently for each analytic project and is described in the empirical chapters.

2.6.8 Collaborative Data Analysis

Video data were analyzed through a collaborative process that included participants of the project. Processes varied depending on the question and focus, but the participants involved played an active role in refining our questions, developing codes, coding data, identifying themes, and evaluating patterns. The specific analysis process for each analytic chapter is included within those articles, and an overview of the division of labour is outlined in a section below. The analysis process was the most time intensive part of the process, as we went through many iterations of questions, codes, and approaches for surfacing the type of analysis that had the potential to answer the question that both underpinned our activism and had the potential to contribute to our work politically.

2.6.9 Joint Writing

As part of the analysis process, participants and I wrote up our findings collectively. This was an important process of refining the analysis and communicating our ideas in ways that respected our learning process and our community. The details of our joint writing division of labour are detailed in Appendix 1, but here I will flag that the writing process was highly collaborative and my role was both as a more experienced mentor providing guidance and framing for our writing processes and as a co-learner, as we jointly decided on how we would represent our findings. While I have more experience with formalized research and writing than the student participants, it was a shared process.

Chapters Three and Four are co-authored with members of the research team. Each of these students was involved with the research project as a participant and were invited to jointly author a paper. I pursued this strategy for a number of reasons. The first is the commitment to relational accountability, outlined above. Co-authorship enables particular forms of relational

accountability, to individual members and to the collective. Writing jointly ensures the questions that the research project answers are relevant and geared toward the political goals of the group and the project. Additionally, co-authorship represents a more intense collaboration that requires and necessitates shared commitment to the results. In many instances, PAR projects collect data together, but far fewer jointly analyze and report on the analysis. In our view, these stages are perhaps the most important for representing the experience of the group and the analysis, so it is critical that participants be as involved and invested in developing and circulating those pieces.

Collective writing strengthens the analysis, because it included multiple perspectives and social locations of the research collective members. Collaboration among participants who have been differently positioned in the group over time allows us to question other researchers' assumptions, bring in outside information that others in the group may not have had access to, and provides a more robust telling of how we work, while also reining in some of the approaches that do not feel like reliable or responsible ways to frame the findings. The diversity across the research collectives has been an asset, enabling us to identify and disrupt some of the ways that Whiteness acts as a default space in the campaign and in the research analysis. Working in a multi-racial, mixed gender team to write establishes more opportunities for critical analysis that disrupt dominant ways of knowing.

Furthermore, the process of writing jointly has been a process of political development, as mentioned above with the SRIs and the collaborative analysis. Those processes served to deepen our political critique collectively through naming experiences and developing analysis of the patterned behaviours within the group. Additionally, writing it up has supported our political development. This process draws on wider literatures and helps participants to position our experiences in the group within a larger academic conversation about learning, methods, racialization, gender, and solidarity.

This learning process is, for me, a move toward incorporating reciprocity into the process. In part, I prioritize joint-writing because these students were involved in the analysis throughout, and they should have an opportunity to see it through and have shared ownership and control over the outputs. Beyond that, though, I think about the joint writing process as an investment in their intellectual and academic development. Many of them will be applying (or at this point have applied) for graduate school. Mentorship in writing papers teaches them important skills of

writing for this genre, and having publications helps them to build their reputations as scholars and build their CVs as they apply for graduate school and funding opportunities in the future. I clearly benefit disproportionately from our project (in an instrumentalized way of understanding this) because these chapters contribute to the completion of my dissertation. Mentorship, training, and helping them earn presentations and publications on their CV is one way that I ensure that they also benefit professionally.

For these reasons, I have decided to jointly write with the undergraduate students and recent graduates who have been part of the research projects. Two of these writing projects are now chapters of this dissertation.

2.6.10 Sharing and Revising Drafts

Drafts of the analysis were iteratively shared with participants and their feedback was incorporated. This happened most frequently with the students engaged in the analysis collective, where early drafts of the analysis, proposed abstracts for conferences, and early drafts of articles were shared in order to ensure that the results were accountable and accurate. More polished drafts were shared with the larger group, through presentations and circulating drafts and requesting feedback.

2.6.11 Presenting Publicly with Participants

Results were presented publicly in two venues: academic and activist. After sharing drafts of papers within the group, the papers were presented and discussed in the group. Chapter Three was shared first with the women's caucus, where Jody and I presented the results and then discussed as a group. A few weeks later, we shared the paper with the larger, mixed-gender group. A discussion about the paper and gender and racial dynamics was built into the yearly retreat, facilitated by two members of Fossil Free UofT. Jody and I were in Germany presenting at the Rachel Carson Centre that same day, so we did not participate in that conversation.

Chapters 3 and 4 were presented at academic conferences. Jody and I presented Chapter 3 at the Rachel Carson Centre Workshop, "Men and Nature". An early sketch of Chapter 4 was presented by Jade, Amil, and me at the AERA national conference in 2016. I presented a full version at AERA and CSSE in 2017, while Lila and Amil presented at CASAE in 2017. Student co-authors' participation in public presentation was important to me as a way to share responsibility

for the dissemination of our intellectual work, as a way of building their skills and CVs, and as a way of centring the collective, relational accountability of the work.

2.7 Limitations

As with all studies, I am not able to include everything that happens, and this has major repercussions for my ability to account for learning and politicization within our campaign. I knew from my previous work as an organizer that often the most important conversations for youth activists' political development do not happen in trainings but in late night conversations at the pub or in the side conversation during tedious tasks like slicing oranges for a meal at a conference. However, I underestimated the significance and frequency of these important moments that are largely un-recordable. While I captured extensive data that can show when participants have shifted their views and modes of participation, I suspect that many of the spaces that enabled those shifts occur beyond my participation and the view of the cameras. Our data set does not include the copious texts and Facebook chats that participants engaged in, the bar nights, and the hang outs where some or all of the participants gathered. The other places outside of our meeting room were probably the most fruitful for the politicization of participants, but it was not practicable to collect data. So recording the meetings reflects an instrumental choice and is meant to give us weekly weigh stations where we can see what participants are talking about, how they are arguing, who they are aligning with, rather than necessarily being the places where learning is happening. This points to methodological challenges, but also an important dialectical tension between formal and informal learning. The formal meeting spaces informed the informal learning and processing behind the scenes, at bars, and on the streets in protests, while the informal learning that happened in those spaces built the sense of shared identity, discourse, and practices that shaped how participants engaged in the formal spaces. Our video data only documents part of this dialectic, but our participation fills in the gaps of the informal learning spaces.

One way that we try to accommodate this reality is through the collaborative analysis. While I often did not know that students were fighting it out on Facebook, through collective analysis, these important context notes surfaced from the participant researchers. We also relied on collective memories, our personal emails and texts, and our journals and notes from the time to cross check each other on dates, the ways conversations happened, and the meanings we each

gleaned from those conversations. We also circulated our drafts among the group and asked them to evaluate the accuracy of our descriptions, as well as the reliability of our analyses. The limitations are significant—I wish we did have more video recordings of the important spaces where participants were politicized, but we do not. Further, suggesting that the shifts in participation are related to a single moment is a narrow and, we argue, inaccurate representation of how learning happens. What we can see is that many of these moments shift our thinking and practices, and while one space may enable particular forms of thinking or action, the process of mobilizing it and claiming it as one's own takes time and underestimates the ways that it shifts across time, place, and community as those practices are deemed appropriate and as participants become more or less comfortable enacting the practices.

2.8 Significance of Relational Ontologies and Politicization in the Group

Prefiguration is a foundational concept for this work, stemming from social movement praxis (Breines, 1989; Maeckelbergh, 2011) and anarchist philosophy, signifying that what we do enables and constrains how we think and theorize, thus by developing practices that are reflective of our politics and philosophies, we create the social relations we seek through our collective practice. For this project, the design sought to prefigure decolonial, anti-racist, feminist relations, thus these politics are embedded in the ontological and epistemological foundations, shaping the types of questions we asked, the engagement in and accountability to social movements we fostered, the data collection processes we enacted, and the analytic processes we iteratively experimented with and reported on with marginalized members of the Fossil Free UofT community of practice. Throughout these processes, relational ways of knowing and being have underpinned the prefigurative research design and implementation. As a result, the politics, practices, ways of knowing and being, and identities that developed in the research traveled to the larger group, and vice versa. Our research process was part of a politicizing process for the members of the fossil fuel divestment campaign; the research practices were informed by our politics, but also shifted our politics and ways of knowing, and changed how we thought about Indigenous, militant, and participatory approaches to research.

The lived commitment to relationality and decolonial, anti-racist, feminist social movement praxis forced a more complicated view of accountability in research because the findings we

detail in the chapters that follow were contentious and documented significant inequity in the group and across the climate movement. The analysis process and these findings politicized many members of the group, and specifically those involved in the research collective, leading to a fracture in the larger group. This contention and polarization gave us a different view of accountability that foregrounded commitment to ideas and politics and ways of knowing, not just vague platitudes about collective accountability. As the group splintered, in part because of our research, our commitments to reconciliation, decolonization, feminism, and anti-racism were brought into focus and simultaneously drove our alignment with marginalized people (in the group and beyond it) and reinforced the shared identity we held as activists and our commitment to anti-racist, feminist, and decolonial practices. In these moments, our relationship to the movement and to specific politics gave us clarity on what the research needed to question and critique, and who we were accountable to. Our work was critical of normalized social relations of power that diminished women and people of colour's ability to participate and become recognized experts in the climate movement, and so we very much chose sides in the battle over whose participation was legitimate in the group. In much of the literature around relational ways of knowing and being and militant ethnography, the "community" or movement is understood as a coherent group devoid of power inequalities and historicized social relations of oppression. In our work, the community was anything but, and our research exacerbated the contention based on the racialized, colonial, and patriarchal practices and frames that dominated the group. Through navigating these dynamics and contesting them, we gained a new appreciation for what it means to be accountable and in relationship to people, politics, and ways of knowing.

Our discussion adds texture to the narratives of Indigenous researchers and militant ethnographers and their discussions of relational accountability to communities and movements. We did not have a unitary community, and who we were accountable to and what that accountability produced was very different depending on who was engaged in a space. Our experiences made relational accountability to ideas and politics very important, in the same way that underpins a lot of militant ethnography. When the White men in positions of power in the group disliked the findings and thought the research process was too biased, I strove to communicate clearly, to listen to their concerns, to mitigate problems where it was possible. I was also clear that there were other voices and politics that we were accountable to, and that there are other ways of knowing that are legitimate, even when the White men who were

implicated in constraining others' participation attacked the process, the findings, and the ethics. It was not a lovely research project that served the movement and made everyone happy in uncomplicated ways—it made clear many of the racialized and gendered divisions in the group and made them objects of analysis. It contributed to the polarization of debates around the importance of anti-colonial and Indigenous solidarity. It led to women and people of colour claiming more space for themselves and their ideas, which often resulted in conflict. I do think it serves the movement and it serves the group, but not in the ways many of us would have imagined: it has surfaced painful realities, made it difficult for many of us to work together, but always has produced learning environments that are data-driven and committed to accountable conversations. In this way, this research feels like a reconciliation process; not a nice medicine-wheel-logo-on-the-corner process, but a complicated and sometimes painful conversation about how racialization and patriarchy and colonialism shape the movement and our interactions in ways we may not realize or want to change. And what happens because of the conversations is not always what we would hope. Some group members have rejected anti-racist, anti-colonial, and feminist analysis of the group and the movement; but others have engaged substantively and are on a different path because of the research project, their peers' politicization, and the overall campaign process.

In the chapters that follow, readers can see some of the ways that this research design and the methodological commitments outlined above played out. Chapter Three emerged from the SRIs and the collaborative data analysis process, where women and people of colour began to name the persistent dynamics of the large group meetings and asked us to look further. The chapter was then shared with participants, instigating further conflict and contestation in the group, and also politicizing members whose voices had often been dismissed in large group meetings. Their politicization process is described and analyzed in Chapter Four. Chapter Five brings us back to questions of theory and design, as I problematize the assumptions of situated learning theory and its normative application based on the challenges we encountered as a research collective when we tried to theorize the racialized, gendered, and colonial relations that were reproduced in our data. The move to critique and refine situated learning, again, reflects a commitment to iterative, prefigurative practice that centres decolonial, anti-racist, and feminist approaches throughout every level of our data collection, analysis, and theorization.

Chapter 3

Doing Expertise: Racialized and Gendered Participation in an Environmental Campaign

3.1 “Why are so many White men trying to save the planet without the rest of us”?

In 2014, *The Guardian* published an article called, “Why are so many White men trying to save the planet without the rest of us?” (Goldenberg, 2014). The title presumably intends to be a tongue-in-cheek reminder of what has long been known and joked about within the environmental movement: White men are overrepresented in the leadership and executive staffing of large environmental organizations. However, women and people of colour have been the backbone of the environmental movement for decades, with Indigenous women leading the movement to decolonize through the re-matriation of Indigenous land and life (Tuck & Yang, 2012), Rachel Carson’s (1962) intellectual contributions, the Love Canal housewives’ work against toxics (Brown & Ferguson, 1995), women of colour organizing against environmental racism (Taylor, 1997), movements in the global South to protect trees and water (Zelezny & Bailey, 2006), and more. Why, then, does this image of White men at the helm of the environmental movement persist?

In this paper, we look at *why* a particular environmental climate change campaign was experienced by diverse participants as a White men’s space, and use interaction analysis to explore *how* expertise was constructed and used to legitimate the uneven gendered and racialized participation in the campaign. We argue that hegemonic masculine performances of authority and expertise positioned White men in the group as leaders and experts, regardless of their level of actual experience. This had the impact of reinforcing men’s leadership and access to skill-building opportunities, while women and people of colour³ were continually marginalized

³ Within this paper we use this construction while acknowledging that women can be people of colour, and we are wary of reproducing false generics where the category “women” equals White women (Spelman, 1988). Our conceptualizations of women and people of colour centre the co-constitution of these categories and our usage does not exclude women of colour. We include

through a narrowing space of participation, largely relegated to affective⁴ and reproductive labour⁵. Bringing together the concepts of doing gender, doing difference, and doing expertise, we examine how racialization, gender, and colonialism shaped the ways expertise was understood and enacted, reinforcing barriers to participation and recognition of expertise for women and people of colour. This analysis allows us to see how White men's performances of expertise and hegemonic masculinity were continually recognized and validated, and how that impact compounded over time. We argue that doing race and gender – specifically, Whiteness and masculinity – were key to performance of expertise, and that doing expertise, in turn, was an important component of doing hegemonic White masculinity.

In the sections that follow, we analyze the co-production of racialized, gendered expertise within an environmental activist community of practice. We first review the literature, focusing on how gender and race have been treated within studies of the environmental movement. Our analysis is anchored in a doing gender and difference framework, complemented by notions of hegemonic masculinity. Drawing on theories of expertise, we highlight the interactional, relational, and performative nature of doing expertise. Next, we explicate the context and methods of our study. We then examine the interactions of the group to demonstrate how White masculine expertise was co-constructed by all members of the group, as well as how White men performed expertise through the use of masculine registers, positioning themselves as authoritative experts while

Indigenous people within the category people of colour. We use the gender markers that participants self-identify with, while acknowledging multiple genders. Our analysis does not attend to biological sex.

⁴ Affective labour refers to immaterial, emotive, caring work that produces social networks and forms of community associated with human interaction (Hardt, 1999).

⁵ Reproductive labour refers to work that enables labour to continue on an ongoing basis—work that is largely unwaged and undervalued (Duffy, 2007). Within activist circles, this includes providing childcare during meetings, taking minutes, doing the preparatory and clean-up work and doing un-glamorous tasks that are required to sustain an organization, or the “shitwork” as Thorne quips (1975). In activism and environmentalism literatures, shitwork is not associated with forms of expertise, despite the fact that some is skilled work and requires practice and training to do well. Rose (2005) argues that gendered, racialized, and classed dynamics of particular forms of work lead to dismissal of expertise and claims of cognitive rigour.

positioning women and people of colour in the group as lacking relevant expertise. Finally, we argue that this micro-level positioning had significant implications for this campaign and the environmental movement overall, reproducing the notion that the environmental movement is a White, masculine space.

3.2 Gender, Race, and the Environmental Movement

Environmentalism has a long history within North America. Indigenous peoples, as original protectors of the land, practiced environmental stewardship and living in a good way long before the terminology was widely used (Simpson, 2011). White settler environmentalism dates to the early conservation movement as a move against industrialization, but was tied to racist, sexist, and classist notions of wilderness and environmental protection that benefited bourgeois, White men's ability to construct themselves as rugged frontiersmen (Collier, 2015). Over decades, environmentalism has shifted and grown to include ecological approaches that combat pesticide use (Carson, 1962), fight toxic waste contamination (Brown & Ferguson 1995), address environmental racism (Bullard & Wright, 1987; Taylor, 1997, Pulido, 2000) and reckon with the threat of anthropogenic climate change.

As the movement has changed, more space has opened up for women and people of colour to participate in environmentalism, yet they are inadequately represented within both grassroots leadership and academic literature. When research addresses the linkages between gender, race, and the environmental movement, it tends to focus on eco-feminist theories about the relationship between women and nature (MacGregor, 2006; Stoddart & Tindall, 2011), ethnographic accounts of the movement (Cable, 1992; Shriver et al., 2003), or ethic of care⁶ arguments about women and people of colour's greater likelihood of engaging in environmentally friendly behaviours and participating in grassroots activism (Bell & Braun, 2010; Brown & Ferguson, 1995; Neal & Phillips, 1990; Stoddart & Tindall, 2011).

Race is similarly inadequately engaged in environmentalism literatures. While writings about environmental justice necessarily address race in the siting of toxics, exposure to pollutants, and

⁶ The ethic of care argument suggests that because a group, usually women, is closer to nature, they are more likely and better equipped to care for nature (Arp & Howell 1995).

impact of climate change and extractive industries (Bullard & Wright, 1987; Taylor, 1997), scholarship about the mainstream environmental movement has not addressed the Whiteness of the movement or the experiences of people of colour within it⁷. In fact, the presence of people of colour within mainstream environmental spaces is often erased (Blain, 2005). The work that does address people of colour tends to be reductive, claiming people of colour are more attentive to community and more altruistic (Arp & Howell, 1995), or that they are more involved because they are more impacted by environmental degradation (Bullard & Wright, 1987; Taylor, 1989). There is little research that systematically looks at people of colour's experiences of racism, sexism and colonialism within the movement, despite activists having identified this as a problem.

3.3 Doing Gender and Masculinities

We understand gender as an historical social relation with consistent – not fixed or stable – meaning under patriarchy, enacted and produced in an ongoing way and specific to different contexts and groupings. West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that gender is produced in social interaction, using the concept “doing gender” to refer to gender as an ongoing enactment rather than a fixed category. We understand gender as necessarily entangled with race, class, colonialism and other relationships of oppression and exploitation (Collins, 1986; Crenshaw, 1991). The enactment of gender is a situated process, dependent on context as well as on people's location within social relations of racialization, class, dis/ability, and sexuality (West & Zimmerman, 2009). This is not to say people are free to perform their gender(s) in any way they please; their possibilities are constrained by embodiment, history, economic forces, violence, and personal relationships (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

Connell's (1990) work on gender employs the concept of hegemonic masculinity to describe a pattern of practice that maintains men's dominant social position in relation to women. Hegemonic masculinity is the culturally dominant form of masculinity in a particular context, associated with a central position of authority and leadership. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005)

⁷ Following Environmental Justice activists and Indigenous environmentalists, we consider those movements as separate from the mainstream environmental movement. Their work contributes significantly to discussions of racialization and colonialism and the environment, but is rarely considered in the context of mainstream environmentalism (Bullard & Wright, 1987; Jones, 2007)

emphasize the need to address participation of all genders in the co-construction of masculinity and argue for the recognition of the agency of marginalized groups as well as the power of dominant groups in the production of gender. With the idea that people from all genders can do masculinity, we take masculinities to be disarticulated from sex and gender. West and Zimmerman (2009) describe masculinity and femininity as interactional and relational, rather than natural or essential, with interaction sustaining relations of inequality.

Like gender, racialization and colonialism are social relations rooted in histories of exploitation. While settler colonialism refers to the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous peoples through land theft, genocide, and erasure (Tuck & Yang, 2012), racialization is a historically constructed process of marking that has justified land theft, slavery and labour exploitation, and systemic oppression (Collins, 1986). Racialization and colonialism are social relations that operate across institutional scales, but we focus here on the enactment of racialization and colonialism at local scales in order to understand how people reproduce and resist racism and colonialism through interaction. Social relations like gender, racialization, and colonialism at systemic and institutional scales constrain what people do in interaction; that is, people are not free to do difference in whatever way they want (West & Fenstermaker, 2002).

West and Fenstermaker (1995a) also call attention to how people “do difference”, focusing on race, class, and gender as processes operating simultaneously as ongoing interactional accomplishments producing patriarchy and racism. Collins (1995) has argued that their theorization of “doing difference” de-historicizes and de-politicizes gender, race, and class through the focus on the ethnomethodological. While we agree with Collins (1995) that attention to translocal, institutional relations of power is crucial to understanding relations of racialization, class, gender, and colonialism in their essence and their appearance, our attention centres on the ethnomethodological as a way of tracing the enactment of these relations precisely because the local and the translocal are dialectically related—we cannot understand imperialist patriarchy without understanding its expression in the local, just as we cannot understand our experiences locally without understanding the institutional and translocal.

3.4 Doing Expertise

Just like racialization, class, colonialism, and gender, we argue that expertise is something one does—it is an active, iterative, and interactional process (Carr, 2010; Eyal, 2013). We use the

notion of *doing expertise* because it allows us to trace the social production and ongoing enactment of expertise in ways that reflect the same ontological commitments underlying the concepts of doing gender and doing difference. We focus on four interdependent components of expertise: skills and competencies, interaction, performance, and relationality. These categories emerged from our readings of expertise literatures and represent commonly occurring themes across disciplines.

Commonplace understandings of expertise conjure ideas of particularly skilled people capable of accomplishing specific tasks with more efficiency and better results. For many sociocultural theories of learning (Rogoff & Lave, 1984), and in particular situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991), expertise is measured by mastering the skills needed to participate, in a context-appropriate way, in the full practices of a community. The process of moving from a novice position into an established position as a master within the community is a process of legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Within this approach to expertise, learning is as much about practicing skills and competencies as it is about developing an identity as an expert member and becoming recognized by the community of practice as an expert, especially by those already in positions of mastery. Expertise, then, is not just a reflection of ability to perform the practices, but the ability to mobilize them at the appropriate time and in the appropriate ways in order to communicate mastery of particular skills and ways of being.

Expertise does not exist in reified form; it is something that is negotiated through joint work among members in a community of practice and is reproduced, innovated, and evaluated through interaction (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Interaction is thus the crux of the performance and relational aspects of expertise (Carr, 2010). Anthropologists have focused on the micro-interactions that constitute a performance of expertise. In order to demonstrate one's expertise, one must master particular modes of performance that communicate authority. Carr writes, "novices must master a register—a recognizable, if specialized, linguistic repertoire that can include technical terms or acronyms, specific prosodic practices, and non-verbal signs such as facial expressions or gestures" (2010, p. 20). In addition to speech content and delivery, gesture is a key way expertise is performed (Matoesian, 2008).

The interactional and performative aspects of expertise work together to establish its essentially relational nature. Carr (2010, p. 6) observes, "realizing one's self as an expert can hinge on

casting other people as less aware, knowing, or knowledgeable”. Within sociocultural learning theory, the concept of positioning refers to the ways people present themselves, through actions, uses of space, ways of speaking, and physical presentation, as well as how others understand those actions and situate people within the community (Holland et al., 2001). Expertise is thus re-inscribed through the process of undermining other claims to legitimacy and affirming one’s own competencies and claims. In establishing oneself as expert, one reinforces one’s place in the hierarchy and validates one’s claim as someone qualified to be the arbiter of others’ expertise.

3.4.1 Gender, Race, and Expertise

The impact of social relations of difference on participants’ abilities to do expertise is largely unaccounted for. Hodges (1998) and Salminen-Karlsson (2006) look at how practices within communities of practice can be gendered. Masculine practices are often un-reflexively part of community identity, creating inequitable spaces within groups and restricting some members’ access to certain forms of participation and therefore recognized expertise. Azocar and Ferree’s (2015) work looks at how gender is assigned to particular forms of expertise and how they are subsequently valued or devalued. They define gendered expertise as “practices of doing competence and making claims that are organized around perceived gender differences and mobilized through gendered networks” (Azocar & Ferree 2015, p. 2). Expertise, within Azocar and Ferree’s case, was cast in terms of a public-private binary, where men’s ways of practicing law and encouraging reform were framed as authoritative and competent, while women’s were framed as related to temperament rather than training or skill. While their work identifies that expertise can be established and maintained in a gendered way, it does not explain the mechanisms through which this happens.

Notably, a discussion of race is nowhere to be found in the literature on expertise. This is a glaring oversight, given that we know race and colonialism shape interaction in profound ways. Examining racialized expertise is important because we know from other fields that people of colour face barriers in being recognized as capable (Witt Smith & Joseph, 2010) and face discrimination that prevents their full participation in communities of practice, workplaces, and social movements (DeFina, 2007). For women of colour, this is more pronounced and we seek to understand in more granularity how social relations of racialization, colonialism, and gender

work to establish White men's expertise while working against claims from women and people of colour.

3.5 Methods

Our work is rooted in climate activism within the mainstream environmental movement in North America. We work with a public university campus campaign coordinated by an international environmental organization fighting to stop climate change through opposing further extraction and burning of fossil fuels. As part of this campaign, we meet weekly with student activists to plan actions, marches, outreach, and political strategy. This campaign has been quite successful and serves as a model internationally.

We collected video at fourteen meetings over the academic year, captured from one to four angles. Additionally, we recorded video from women's caucus meetings and debrief sessions amongst participants of colour. During coding, these streams were stacked so all four were visible simultaneously, allowing us to see the interaction in the group in real time.

Within our group, there were 11 to 27 participants at each meeting, representing all years in school (1,2,3,4,5, Law, MA, PhD). Men and women attended weekly meetings in roughly even numbers and there were no openly trans or other-gendered students. Racial and ethnic make-up shifted over the course of the year, but the group remained majority White, even as Indigenous, Black, South Asian, and East Asian students became increasingly involved. Women made up from 29 to 73 percent of meeting attendees, with a mean of 52 percent. People of colour made up from 9 to 41 percent of the meeting attendees, with a mean of 26 percent. White men made up from 23 to 45 percent of attendees, with a mean of 35 percent.

Methodologies

This paper is part of a multi-year participatory research project whose questions evolved over two years. We draw on Indigenous (Absolon 2011; Wilson 2008) and feminist (Bloom 1998; Maguire 1987) research methodologies to centre the experiences of participants. These methods rest on epistemologies rooted in relationality and reciprocity, rather than Eurowestern notions of reliability and reproducibility. It may seem odd, then, that part of our study is a quantitative analysis of interaction. Some scholars (Schegloff 1993) have warned against the contradictions

inherent in this approach, and we are wary in the scale of claims we make. Through conversations and stimulated recall interviews, themes emerged around the ways women and people of colour experienced our campaign and the environmental movement. However, as we developed our research project, we continually found ourselves undermining the validity of our own experiences as young people of colour and White women, asking if “it was really as bad as we thought” and questioning if the patterns were real or if we were just being “too sensitive.” As a way of combating these feelings and demonstrating the legitimacy of our claims, read through Eurowestern scientific methods, we conducted detailed analysis to “prove” to ourselves and our community of practice that the positioning dynamics we perceived were observable in interactions within our meetings. The perception that we needed to quantify our experiences for them to “count” is a long-running conversation among feminist scholars (Mattingly and Falconer-Al Hindi 1995). Building from these foundations, we established codes based on our collective experiences, then quantified them so they might count as legitimate, then illustrated them using qualitative analysis to recentre our experiences and demonstrate the mechanisms and costs of our group dynamics. Thus, there are tensions throughout this piece, in terms of audience and method. On one hand, this process and analysis was written for the activist group, and particularly the women’s caucus where these questions emerged initially, though they are reframed here for an academic audience. More awkwardly, perhaps, we are moving between different political and epistemological commitments. While advocating for the legitimacy of experience as a way of knowing, our moves to quantify the turn-taking and interactional practices of the group contradicts our political stance. Again, this was done with self-awareness, where women in the group requested the quantitative analysis as a way of “proving” their claims. They wanted numbers, which they believed were less contestable, to be able to present to men in the group, with the belief that while men in the group had disputed their feelings, they would see, understand, and accept a quantified analysis.

Analysis

Our analysis started from the broad question: how are race and gender made salient in our group? Through iterative rounds of collective coding, the question became more focused, asking how White men’s modes of participation enabled and constrained others’ participation, and how people of all genders co-constructed expertise in a way that undermined the leadership and

engagement of women and people of colour. Analyzing micro-level social interaction is well-suited to our theoretical framework because West and Zimmerman's concept of doing difference looks at the production of racialization, gender, and power through interactions.

After video was collected, it was content-logged using preliminary codes including race, gender, and colonialism. Five women from the group – two White, one South Asian, one East Asian, one Indigenous – and one Black man conducted the first substantial analytic pass of coding, noting “interesting” segments. After coding three segments from the beginning, middle, and end of the year this way, this collective reviewed the segments and determined which codes were most prevalent in the video and in our experiences of the group more broadly. The codes the collective developed included overlapping talk, exclusive talk, affirmation (vocal and gesture), uptake of ideas, positioning, and recognition. All codes were refined by test coding 10 minutes of two videos and iteratively clarifying the codes. After qualitative coding, we (the authors) embarked on a quantitative analysis of the patterned participation the collective identified, using a random number generator to select two segments of five minutes from each of the 14 weekly meeting videos. The samples represent 24 percent of the meeting video.

To create a basic statistical view of the trends, we compiled our results and used paired t-tests to evaluate confidence in the comparisons we examined. We selected paired t-tests as the most appropriate because of our small sample size, and their ability to evaluate the statistical significance of a difference between two groups or results. All t-tests, except for one, demonstrated statistical significance in the patterned difference between men's and women's participation and White and people of colour's participation. We also provide sample means to express the average number of instances of a code, separated out by gender or race, within each 5 minute segment. We circulated the initial analysis among the collective, then shared it with the women's group after incorporating feedback, and then shared it with the overall campaign membership.

The quantitative analysis is complemented by descriptive accounts of talk and gesture collected from the recordings of the meetings and women's focus groups. In this paper, we draw from specific examples to illustrate the trends and the impact racialized and gendered expertise had on participants.

3.6 The Default Space: Positioning, Registers, and Modes of Engagement

Early on in the coding process, we developed the idea that the campaign was a White, masculine “default space” where Whiteness was reinforced, with everyone expected to take up pervasive White men’s ways of being as an assumed norm from which other performances or experiences were a deviation. This is a critical piece of understanding how the environmental movement was constructed as White and masculine, usually through particular examples of talk that assumed the universality of White men’s experience.

From the first meeting of the year, several White men performed a type of hegemonic masculinity that communicated expertise through displays of confidence linked to their forceful delivery of speech, the rapid pace of their contributions after a previous speaker’s, their use of physical space, and their willingness to continue discussions in argumentative and debating modes. At the first meeting, three White men, two of whom were new to the organization, stood at the front of the lecture hall, using the whole stage to explain the campaign to the crowd of members. During breakout groups, they remained the only people standing as they participated in the brainstorming. While they stood in the front, the woman co-president sat in the audience. Rather than speaking in declaratives, she asked questions, hedged her statements, apologized, and ended her statements in a higher key, typical of women her age⁸, leading to her contributions being ignored, her dismissal as less confident by men, or her accomplishments being credited to White men in meeting talk. Turn taking was also skewed in favour of White men, who spoke more frequently and for a longer duration than White women or people of colour, who had the fewest number of turns.⁹

These patterns persisted throughout the year, with White men producing a register of expertise and continually communicating their authority through their tone, frequency of speaking, and

⁸ Our findings align with research on young women’s registers, including practices of uptalk, hedging, and vocal fry (Wolk, Abdelli-Beruh, & Slavin 2012, McLemore, 1991).

⁹ A detailed turn-taking frequency and duration measure is outside the scope of this paper. However, in meetings and focus groups, both men and women said that men spoke more frequently. It was taken as a given, something that everyone already knew and assumed was inevitable. Racialized dynamics were acknowledged far less frequently.

their interaction with other White men as experts without acknowledging or seeking engagement from most women or people of colour. We noticed a recurrent pattern in which women treated their speaking turns as invitations for response and collaboration, while men treated their turns as decisions. Another feature we observed frequently was White men occupying space in a way that required women to take up less, as the White men made large gestures in women's spaces, leaned in to communicate directly with another person, or leaned back, arms behind their head and legs spread widely. Women and people of colour in the group largely accommodated this positioning by moving back from the table, and through other small-scale gestures and speech acts that we outline below. The performance of expertise through particular registers of masculinity positioned men as experts week after week, and other participants recognized that expertise consistently.

3.7.1 Exclusive Talk

Exclusive talk is an exchange between two or more people that does not include the majority of meeting participants, despite being part of a larger conversation (Dookie, 2015). Exclusive talk was established through gaze, body positioning, explicitly naming the speakers who should participate, or discussing issues only certain members had information about. It frequently happened at higher speeds of exchange, with little time between turns, and often ended with a decision made within the closed group of participating speakers.

Our coding revealed 46 instances of exclusive talk across our sample. We measured mixed gender instances of exclusive talk and compared them against exclusive talk including only men. Instances of exclusive talk dominated by men, with two or more men to one woman participating, were more than two and a half times more likely to occur than gender balanced exclusive talk with sample means of 1.11 and 0.42 instances per segment respectively. Exclusive talk that only included men was prevalent, at a sample mean of 0.62 instances per segment, while women were significantly less likely to be engaged in women-only exclusive talk, at a sample mean of 0.077 instances per segment.

Perhaps the most striking finding was that across our sample, people of colour were never included in exclusive talk. Despite the presence of people of colour at all meetings, there were no instances of men or women of colour participating in these exchanges. While White women participated in exclusive talk, especially as some of the new White women moved into positions

of full participation, people of colour were never included. Further, White women reproduced the power imbalances in exclusive talk in the few instances when the dominant men were not at meetings. Again, in these spaces, people of colour did not engage in exclusive talk and their voices were not explicitly sought. This suggests that the practices of hegemonic masculinity that established White men as experts and allowed them to make decisions on behalf of the group were inaccessible to people of colour. White women were sometimes able to do hegemonic masculinity to their own advantage, capitalizing on their positions and reproducing exclusive talk dynamics. Whiteness was, implicitly, one of the key components of hegemonic masculinity in this community of practice.

Exclusive talk among White men also worked to establish that only they were necessary as participants. For example, when discussing who should represent the group at speaking engagements, exchanges often centred on White men's availability. Only if the expert White men were unavailable would they open the conversation to other volunteers, creating the impression that everyone else was only a last resort. This had the unintended consequence of gradually reinforcing for women and people of colour that they were second choice, or worse, a token of diversity. Instead of feeling validated when they were asked to present to a group, women of colour said they assumed they were only being asked because there were "too many White guys" already. White men had their expertise validated and strengthened through requests that they represent the group publicly, but women and people of colour came to question their legitimacy with each invitation.

3.7.2 Affirmations

Affirmations served as interactional indicators of validation, a way of recognizing someone's expertise and of positioning oneself as able to evaluate and affirm others' contributions as valid. It was not uncommon for one particular White man to get enthusiastic, widespread affirmation for any contribution he made. Regardless of the content of his speech, one to six participants would frequently nod along, encouraging his statements. His register was consistently one of confidence, invoking a response from others in the group that validated his expertise. However, White men were not unilaterally validating their own performed expertise; women and people of colour also positioned them as experts and provided positive feedback.

We therefore examined the rate at which speakers received affirmations for their contributions, understanding affirmation as acts that express agreement, acknowledgment, encouragement, or enthusiasm. Affirmation was vocal, gesture-based, or paired. Any time a speaker received a comment during their speech turn that included “yes”, “yeah”, “uh huh”, “mmhmm”, or explicit praise (ie: “that’s a great idea”), it was coded as vocal affirmation¹⁰. Gestures included nods, from slight nods timed to affirm a speaker’s contribution, to large nods that often involved the shoulders and repeated head movements, as well as hand gestures like pointing, thumbs up, and applause.

Although we measured affirmation frequency, it was only one component of the overall experience of women and people of colour. The relative number of affirmations received by different members served as evidence for how women and people of colour’s experiences were different from those of White men, in terms of whether they saw people like them being represented and valued.¹¹

There were 602 instances of affirmation across our sample, averaging 26 instances per segment. We coded these as man-to-man, man-to-woman, woman-to-man, and woman-to-woman. We found men received affirmations more than twice as often as women, with sample means of 17.7 times per sample segment compared to 7.25 times per segment respectively. Men affirmed other men at almost twice the rate of men’s affirmation to women, at 9.6 instances per segment compared to 5.3 instances per segment. Women gave praise to men at four times the rate they affirmed women, at 8.2 instances versus 1.9 instances per segment. The difference between women’s praise of men and men’s praise of men was not significant, at $t=0.4290$, thus we would not assume the rates of affirmation to men by women versus by men are statistically different.

¹⁰ Within Conversation Analysis, these are referred to as continuers (Schegloff, 1993) because they invite speakers to continue. While we do not argue that they are necessarily intended as praise by the speaker, we code the instances because they encourage further contribution and because as observers we cannot know the intent.

¹¹ We chose aggregate counts rather than ratios of speech acts to number of affirmations received because our focus was not limited to the effect on individual speakers alone, but also concerned the impact of these interactions on the entire participating group across the year.

On the other hand, the difference between men's and women's praise of women was significant; women affirmed other women far less frequently than men did.

In terms of race, we coded affirmations as White to White, White to person of colour, person of colour to person of colour, and person of colour to White person. In terms of race, the results were even more stark. We found that White people were far more likely to receive affirmation compared to people of colour, at sample means of 23 instances per segment (including vocal and gesture) for White participants, and only 2 instances for participants of colour. People of colour gave and received affirmation to other people of colour only 3 times across the year, but affirmed White people 69 times, or 2.9 times per sample. White people affirmed people of colour 1.9 times per sample, but affirmed other White people 20.3 times per 5 minute sample.

Women of colour received affirmation at lower rates than White women and men of colour. Of the 175 instances of affirmation directed to women, only 11 were for women of colour. They were also less likely to position themselves as experts or make bids to be recognized, whereas several White women actively sought recognition by the men in positions of mastery. While coding the video, some of the women noted places where they trailed off or abandoned their contribution. They explained that they were looking for encouragement to keep going, which they said they often gave to other speakers. When they did not receive it, they assumed other participants disliked their ideas and stopped. For some, that experience resulted in reduced participation for the rest of the meeting.

Because people of colour spoke much less frequently than their White peers, their turns were not evenly available for receiving affirmation. Nevertheless, we resist the pathologization of silent members of the group; other dynamics influenced the willingness of marginalized people to participate. Our participants of colour commented on the "persistent uncomfortableness" of being people of colour on our campus and in our group, and the difficulty they faced in participating due to the scrutiny they felt. Given the fact that people of colour were in the minority in the group and they interpreted the space as a White masculine default space, we argue that nuanced and complicated decision-making and positioning animated participation of students of colour.

Affirmations were distinct from other positioning moves in this paper, in that they allowed peripheral members to actively position others; while exclusive talk was largely driven by group

members in positions of mastery, affirmations were given by the larger group. It reinforced and legitimated the participation of those being affirmed by the membership, not just those in positions of mastery.

Still, in many cases, participants in positions of expertise were the ones expressing affirmation. This acted as a form of positioning, where the campaign leads were able to validate the contributions of others. We noted that how participants gave affirmation differed based on their genders. The White men in the room tended to affirm with strong, definitive statements of support that served as decision points. In contrast, the woman in a leadership position almost always gave affirmation to others in the form of what she called “verbal head nods”, in order to acknowledge their contribution and encourage them to continue. Her supportive action was itself a form of positioning and authority, and was one of the few ways her voice was heard in meetings. Evaluating others’ contributions asserted that she was in a position of expertise, and yet she talked about giving affirmation using the gendered frames of nurturing and caregiving. Both linguistic and nonlinguistic aspects of her register were relevant: her encouraging tone and the content of her “verbal head nods” served a different social interactional purpose than the decision-making affirmations of the White men.

3.7.3 Establishing Relative Expertise

The production of hierarchical expertise, structured by race and gender, was an active process in our group. Carr (2010) notes that positioning oneself as an expert requires casting others as less knowledgeable, due to the relational nature of doing expertise. We observed several mechanisms by which White men established themselves as experts in relation to women and people of colour in the group.

White men undermined women and people of colour’s claims to holding the same expertise they did. Even when women and people of colour did have the same claim to expertise, their experience did not count without the recognition of the White men positioned as experts. The relational mechanism of undermining others’ competency went hand in hand with dismissing the legitimacy of other forms of expertise to push the participation of women and people of colour further and further into the margins.

In one example of this, we traced the planning process of an important presentation to the university administration. As the culminating activity of the year, this was considered a high-stakes event. It was taken for granted that three of the White men were qualified and prepared. Their names were suggested within seconds, but when it came to finding additional participants, group members were not sure who else was qualified based on the criteria of being “quick on their feet”. Several women, both White women and women of colour, were critiqued as hesitant; the planning team feared the women would give too many qualifying hedges on their statements. These critiques hinged on the fact that they were not doing hegemonic masculinity, and they would not be able to perform competency in a register recognizable to the administration as indicative of expertise.

This mechanism was also at work in one exchange at a meeting halfway through the academic year, where a large group of new participants attended the meeting. In an attempt to be welcoming, returning members of the group jockeyed to explain the context of the conversations. Over the course of the first ten minutes, with 16 women and 9 men in attendance, 4 White men spoke a total of 41 times, at a total duration of almost 9 minutes. Two women spoke a total of 20 times, with a total duration of just under one minute. Most revealing was a set of comments made by White men, eight minutes apart, during the beginning of the meeting.

Student 1: Ask us questions. And also, if you have a question you don't think you want to ask in public, just write it down, ask one of the people that talks a lot.

Student 2: If you would really like to come to the retreat, I guess just talk to...any of the people who you see talking a lot.

These statements, combined with a group dynamic in which White men were the people who participated most often and for the longest duration, advised new members that the White men in the room were experts. What was also implied was the women and people of colour in the room were not able to answer questions, and not in positions of authority. Participants consistently identified the members of the community of practice with the most assertive registers as the most expert in the community. Even when women and people of colour had achieved some level of skill, it was not recognized and did not receive affirmation in the same way men's contributions did.

The ongoing and interactional process of performing expertise shaped the group's dynamics into a self-reinforcing feedback loop. White men in positions of authority became gatekeepers, deciding whose claims to expertise were legitimate and valuable. By perceiving only White masculine performances of expertise as indicative of competence, they constantly re-established themselves as experts in the group, shutting out women and people of colour for whom those same practices of Whiteness and masculinity were inaccessible. Women and people of colour participated in this process of affirming White men's leadership by acquiescing with moves to dismiss other forms of expertise. They ranked their own and other women's work as less valuable. In contrast, they rarely actively dismissed the ideas of White men, and were often ignored when they did. Ultimately, White men's ideas rose uncontested to the surface and were frequently adopted without discussion as the only ones with full support.

3.8 Doing Environmentalism Differently

Our data show that hegemonic White masculinity was tied to one's ability to successfully perform expertise and be recognized as an expert. How White men did their gender and race became how we recognized expertise in general. They gained access to training and skill-building opportunities, and were increasingly likely to be selected as public representatives as their claims to expertise were recognized. Men received affirmation for their performance of expertise, and the affirmation led to them believing in their own relative expertise, continually legitimating the claims of only those other participants who projected expertise through a register of White masculinity. The more this happened, the more other participants recognized White men's positioning as experts and the more White men gained legitimacy as having more experience. There was little in our data to suggest White men in positions of mastery had claim to unique skills or differentiated competence over the other members of the group. The early projection of expertise, rooted primarily in hegemonic White masculinity, secured White men's positions as experts despite not necessarily having as much experience with activism, nor as much technical knowledge about climate change, as some of the women and people of colour in the group. Certainly White men's projection of expertise via a particular masculine register should be acknowledged as an accomplishment, and as a skill in itself. Sociocultural studies of expertise would argue that knowing when and how to enact these registers and garner recognition is what constitutes expertise. Our data do not contest that White men mastered that

expression of expertise. However, our data demonstrate that accomplishing that register and being recognized for it were highly related to participants' racialization and gender.

For White men in the group, their ways of interacting quickly and confidently were naturalized for them, understood as meritocratic and universally available to all members. When faced with decisions to include women and people of colour, White men continually invoked a dichotomy between being "diverse" and having the "best" people representing the group. For these men, doing their race and gender in hegemonic ways made them "the best" and established them as expert. Thus, we argue that doing race and gender – in particular Whiteness and masculinity – were key to the performance of expertise, and vice versa. These interactions co-constituted each other; we cannot disarticulate men's performances of Whiteness and masculinity from their enactments of expertise, nor expertise from its embeddedness in White masculinity.

Women and people of colour actively participated in the co-construction of expertise. As White men did racialized and gendered expertise, marginalized and peripheral participants within the community of practice affirmed, mimicked, and contested these practices which kept them from becoming recognized as full participants. This was a messy process, due to the standards of expertise being normalized by men in positions of mastery. Women and people of colour in our group named and pushed back against the dynamics that kept them marginal, but their bids for recognition often failed and they were relegated to doing affective and reproductive labour, the value of which was dismissed through relational positioning moves by White men. White women were occasionally successful in positioning themselves as experts, and in those instances, they tended to adopt the exclusive talk dynamics of White men, though done in a different register reflecting speaking patterns such as hedging and questioning.

For people of colour, participation in our group was complicated. Regardless of individuals' competence or claims to expertise, their contributions were rarely offered or sought out in the larger group. Frames that centred their experiences, like climate justice and Indigenous solidarity, were often dismissed by White men as unnecessary identity politics, and attempts to address the dynamics in the group through anti-oppression education were cast as a waste of time. That people of colour continued to participate was itself an accomplishment, and they carved out alternative spaces, such as a people of colour caucus and actions in support of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, that enabled conversation on the issues

they cared about. Within those spaces, their expertise was validated. However, in the larger group, their work was still tokenized and de-prioritized relative to “the real work”. Furthermore, even when their opinions were sought, people of colour came to feel that they were only second choice, or, worse, that they had only been chosen as a token of diversity rather than because of a legitimate claim to expertise. This too became a feedback loop, where people of colour said they always doubted their capacity and assumed they were being asked to represent the group for the optics, rather than the content of their contributions. Unlike White men, who were emboldened by affirmation and opportunities to represent the group publicly, people of colour in the group tended to withdraw from opportunities even when they were specifically invited.

Reproductive labour, including taking minutes and coordinating art builds that created banners and props needed for actions, was one of a few areas in which women of colour received validation for expertise. White men rarely participated in these tasks, but men of colour did regularly, pointing to the relationship between doing race and doing gender. Despite the difficulty in pointing to a single explanation for this pattern, we suggest that there is a significant difference in how men of colour position themselves compared to White men. Because White men were rarely present at the sites of reproductive labour, and because this type of work was frequently coordinated by women of colour, the dynamics of domination were very different. In fact, these spaces often facilitated consciousness-raising and critiques of the uneven participation plaguing our regular meetings.

Our data paint a rather bleak picture. Many of the attempts to combat moves to undermine women and people of colour’s leadership and expertise were unsuccessful. However, we can identify one design tool that did, temporarily, interrupt the dynamics of White masculine domination: using go-arounds to facilitate discussion. Intentionally hearing from everyone created the only spaces all year where we heard from almost all members of the group. The go-arounds were used by women and people of colour when they chaired, and illuminated a diversity of opinions on anti-oppression and Indigenous solidarity frames that was not usually apparent in meetings where White men shut down these conversations and assumed they spoke for everyone. Unfortunately, as soon as the go-around was over, the practices of exclusive talk resumed immediately in all cases, therefore we qualify that this is a strategy to mitigate, not solve, the dynamics of inequity in groups.

Given these dynamics, it is not surprising when journalists ask why White men are trying to save the planet without the rest of us. This phenomenon within the environmental movement is not just a joke and is not particularly funny for many of us trying to navigate campaigns and organizations that undermine our claims to expertise and reject our ways of knowing and being. When we see only White men in leadership positions and name mainstream environmentalism as a White man's movement, it renders invisible the contributions of the many women and people of colour who have been and continue to be involved. Interventions in meeting design could be important ways of addressing the production of gendered and racialized expertise. Unfortunately, we do not yet have much evidence of their success. We argue that the social relations of racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy are reproduced constantly through social practices and performance, making it important to look at how inequality is sustained through micro-interactions. At the same time, there is a need to work at a movement-wide level to address patriarchy, racialization, and colonialism within the institutions that coordinate environmental campaigns. The dynamics we identify in detail are not specific to our group alone, and serious interventions are required if we are to do environmentalism differently.

Chapter 4

Politicization in Practice

4.1 “What do we want? Divestment! When do we want it? Gradually over five years!”

In Spring 2014, a student group launched a campaign to get the University of Toronto to divest its endowment from direct holdings in the top 200 fossil fuel companies. The panel that presented wore business attire, and spoke about the urgent need to address climate change, focusing on the science that proves climate change exists, and the technocratic solutions available for stopping it. After submitting a thorough brief, the group of mostly White students embarked on a process that they understood as largely bureaucratic. Their goal: to convince a committee appointed by the university president that climate change represented social injury and that divestment was a remedy aligned with the university’s fiduciary responsibilities. They sought faculty, alumni, and student support, inviting them to sign a petition and attend documentary screenings. They developed a cheeky chant, riffing on a protest standard, saying, “What do we want? Divestment! When do we want it? Gradually over five years!”¹²

Two years later, after receiving the word that University of Toronto President Meric Gertler had rejected fossil fuel divestment, 200 students gathered outside of the Governing Council meeting yelling “bullshit”. Speakers who addressed the crowd, all women and people of colour, talked about the racialized and colonial impacts of climate change, as well as how those logics kept Western governments from engaging meaningfully in action to stop climate change. A few days later, the students held an “oil spill” on the front steps of the university president’s office, covering the steps in black paint, suggesting that Gertler had sold out to the oil industry, and stopping traffic using their bodies as barricades in central campus. When someone started the old cheer, there was a dramatic shift—Instead of responding with gradually over five years, they reverted to the original—“NOW”, and then changed it further, saying, “When do we want it?”

¹² The standard chant is: “what do we want? X! When do we want it? Now!”. The joke rests on the fact that, unlike many activists, they were reasonable and willing to work with the administration to implement a sensible, gradual, and non-disruptive policy.

YESTERDAY!” They were pissed off, ready to escalate their tactics, and they were highly politicized.

What enabled participants to shift their organizing so significantly? Over the course of two years, the campaign transformed from a bureaucratic intervention seeking to leverage the university’s financial holdings to address climate change, into a polarizing space where contestation over tactics, frames, and alignments became debilitating. A significant portion of the members now identified as radical activists, reframing themselves as working for “climate justice”, and substantively integrating equity critiques of racialization, settler colonialism, and patriarchy into their work. The group shifted from being almost entirely White to being a multi-racial group. They moved from wearing suits to barricading the street, and moved from aligning themselves with lawyers and business people to engaging in solidarity with Indigenous communities and low-wage workers on campus.

We understand politicization as a collective learning process involving not only the intellectual and cognitive processes of developing a political analysis that is critical of dominant social relations of power, but also involving shifts in the practices of a group, their ways of knowing, and their identities. We consider these aspects of politicization in dialectical relationship with each other—shifting practices reflect and reinforce the politicized concepts that emerge, and these are aligned with and continually reshape the ways of knowing in the collective to further develop intellectual critiques of power and dominance, which in turn create and reinforce identities where activists understand themselves as radical and continually shift their practices, ways of knowing, and political philosophies to be aligned with their identities. While this process does not have to reflect Left politics, our data stems from politicization processes that did centre anti-colonial, anti-racist, anti-capitalist, and feminist concepts, practices, ways of knowing, and identities. Our data shows that these different philosophies and logics were bound together; they were not learned as discrete sets of practices or ideas, and they worked together to develop strong identities that necessarily integrated an intersectional analysis (imperfect as it may have been, and constantly evolving) as a core piece of the identity as a radical. We see the processes of conceptual development, participation, reforming ways of knowing, and identity construction as necessarily related to each other, and impossible to tease apart completely.

We draw from this case of student environmentalists who became radical and committed to justice frameworks to argue that politicization is a comprehensive shift, one that cannot be disarticulated. In our case study we traced activists' learning about colonialism, racialization, and patriarchy simultaneously alongside their other shifts which rejected bureaucratic and reformist approaches to social change, reframed climate change as a question of imperialism, and came to question Eurowestern theories of knowledge and objectivity. While this shift was not universal, many students in the group began to identify as radical activists and be recognized by others as radical. Through the shifts of radical students, the larger group shifted, such that even though not all members identified as radical, the practices of the group increasingly reflected radical politics, generating more opportunities for politicization for new members.

In this paper, we theorize politicization as a sociocultural learning process, not merely a process of conceptual development or cognitive change, but a simultaneous process of conceptual, practical, epistemological, and identity development. We frame this conversation in the context of learning sciences research that increasingly looks to social movements as sites of learning, which share attention to dynamics of politicization without sharing a framework for theorizing the process. Using a militant ethnographic approach, we explore longitudinal video data from the student group Fossil Free UofT to describe and theorize the process of politicization. This expands on existing theories of sociopolitical development, anchoring them in the material realities of student activists whose politicization shapes social movements, fostering anti-racist, anti-colonial, and feminist praxis. We need to theorize the ways this process of becoming unfolds collectively so that we can support justice movements, and look to their work for lessons on how to better teach anti-oppression in classrooms and communities.

4.2 Conceptual Framing: Learning in Politics and the Politics of Learning

In recent years, learning scientists have shown increasing interest in social movements, arguing that social action is an important site for consequential learning and identity development. They mobilize sociocultural theories of learning to analyze the processes of movements and their learning outcomes. Many involved in this scholarship are attentive to processes of politicization, though they address it in different ways. Jurow and colleagues interrogate equity oriented scale-making processes in the food movement (Jurow & Shea, 2014), framing this type of learning as

consequential (Jurow, et al., 2016). They ask how community participants develop a sense of solidarity and *confianza* through joint participation (Teeters & Jurow, 2016). Curnow has investigated consciousness-raising and the development of political analysis of patriarchy within fair trade social movement organizations (2013), as well as the ways that shifts in practice may drive political developments toward anti-oppression politics and practice (2014a, b). Kirshner examines how youth activists learn civic engagement and develop a sense of their own political identities, while also asking how youth develop tactical and strategic skills embedded in organizing contexts (2007, 2008, 2015).

Across these studies we see a shared attention to learning in community, read through a sociocultural lens. There is a shared focus on community-engaged social action in social movement spaces, where learning is purposeful and embedded in action-oriented goals of remaking the world through widespread mobilization. Additionally, these studies gravitate around questions of how participants come to understand themselves as agentic, how they construct grievances, how they develop a political analysis, and how they mobilize their analysis collectively to change systems of oppression. What they do not share is a common language for articulating the learning phenomena being analyzed. While this results in diverse sets of findings that offer specific utility for different movement organizations, there is not yet a coherent body of work that helps activists theorize how participants are becoming part of the movement or that helps them to design spaces that facilitate political transformation.

In other educational literatures, politicization and sociopolitical development are largely neglected as learning processes in their own right. While many studies attend to social justice curriculum and ways that teachers might integrate critical pedagogy (Kumashiro, 2000; Adams & Bell, 2016; Apple, 2014; Gutstein, 2014; Ayers, et al. 2009) into their work, politicization remains a poorly defined concept in this research. Many researchers draw heavily on Freirean notions of popular education and critical pedagogy, framing sociopolitical development as the process of “reading the world” (Freire, 1970). Freirean work suggests that people start from their own experiences, which they share with their colleagues in order to make connections and identify patterns, which they then theorize and contextualize within the dominant social relations of the era (Horton & Freire, 1990; Arnold, et al., 1991). These popular education approaches necessarily mobilize the learning developed through political analysis, seeking to change the oppressive dynamics through collective action, which is iteratively reflected on and analyzed

collectively (Arnold, et al, 1991). Variations of this approach have proliferated (Giroux, 1997; McLaren, 2015; Watts, Griffith, & Abdul-Adil, 1999), each contributing nuance and detail to a range of facilitated interventions designed to collectively produce skills for analyzing one's experiences and cultivating a critical social analysis (Watts, Griffith, & Abdul-Adil, 1999; Watts & Guessous, 2006). This type of work centres ideas of praxis, the dialectical unity of thought and action, and shares its roots with other sociocultural theories of learning in the work of Vygotsky (1980). However, in much of the ways that the work is taken up, cognitivist assumptions about learning tend to bubble up, or the relationship between thought and action is treated as a linear process, rather than a co-constituting whole (Allman, 1999, 2001). The impact of this is to render much Freirean-derived work as an individual process of developing a political analysis intellectually (Allman, 2001; Choudry, 2015). To be clear, the research nearly always situates the individual in a collective learning process, it is understood as a process of community engagement, and yet the work of learning is tacitly understood as happening in the mind of individual actors, rather than distributed across people, communities, tools, and environments.

The activists we have worked with talk about politicization and radicalization as a different phenomenon from what is reflected in the literatures. In this paper, we theorize politicization so that we can better understand when and how it happens. We are interested in theorizing what activists understand as the important learning processes at the grassroots, looking at politicization as a process that is in service to social movement goals, but has not yet been theorized comprehensively. Theorizing from activist learning contexts offers a new window into political learning, where activist spaces highlight collective politicization practices that are continually mobilized and are iteratively developed to support radicalized identities in ways that we rarely see through schooling.

4.3 Methodology

Our commitment to theorizing problematics that emerge in a social movement context stems from our political engagement with activist communities and militant ethnography (Juris, 2007; Maeckelbergh, 2010; Scheper-Hughes, 1995). Scheper-Hughes (1995) argues it is inadequate for researchers to merely observe or accompany political contestation that has significant consequences for participants' lives, but that researchers must be engaged in their struggle. Thus, militant ethnography prioritizes explicit, ongoing political commitment to the activist work that

the research is bound to, as well as collective visioning, reflection, analysis, and distribution that supports the work of the partnering activists and their movements. Building on this approach, Maeckelbergh (2010, 2012) argues that through engagement in social movements, researchers can better understand the logics and practices in accountable, nuanced, embodied ways. For us, the commitment to militant ethnographic practice has meant ongoing participation in Fossil Free UofT, and we are a team of researcher-participants. Our questions about politicization, and specifically how participants become politicized through participation in movements, come out of the campaign spaces we have been part of.

To centre the voices of the movement in our research design, we use a participatory action research design (Maguire, 1987, Brown, 1978; Hall, 1981; Tandon, 1981; Kwon, 2008; Ginwright, Cammarota & Noguera, 2011; Cammarota & Fine, 2008), where Joe has partnered with Fossil Free UofT, and through the partnership, student activists have become co-researchers, refining the questions, conducting analysis, and jointly writing our results. This partnership is important because the questions and results are constantly made accountable to the movement as we ensure relational accountability (Wilson, 2008) and reliability through our experiences and our networks. We measure the validity of our findings against their utility to the movement, and work continually to check in with participants about the relevance of our work and their reliability.

We started from the broad question: how did participants in the fossil fuel divestment campaign become politicized? Fossil Free UofT has been a fruitful site for this project because of the contestation over concepts of racialization, colonialism and patriarchy and their role in the environmental movement. Participation is the foundation of our analysis, and we have all been actively involved, and between us, attended all of the large-group meetings, actions, and debriefs¹³. We have also been involved in many of the behind-the-scenes conversations and alternative spaces, and our insider perspective provides the ability to articulate the logics of the campaign and alternative spaces.

¹³ Throughout this paper we choose to use “they” pronouns, to reflect the fact that not all of us were involved in every space. For example, Joe and Lila were not active in the people of colour spaces and Amil was not involved in the women’s caucus.

We have collected over 7000 minutes of video of the large group meetings, rallies, protests, and actions. The videos from the large group meetings have four camera angles to capture the interactional exchanges of participants and were synced so that all angles could be viewed simultaneously. Video was content logged and coded thematically including broad pre-defined codes like race, gender, and colonialism. We also look to stimulated recall interviews (SRIs), which are a technique of reviewing video data with participants as a tool for allowing participants to view themselves and describe their experiences from a first-hand perspective (Lyle, 2003; Bryan, Bay, Shelden and Simon, 1990). These SRIs capture focal participant reflections, usually the day after a meeting. They also document the participation, activity, and political discourses that were developing outside of the meetings, as focal participants brought in their experiences beyond the meeting and shared their feelings and thoughts about the campaign activities at the time. We also draw on our own texts, tweets, Facebook chats, and emails as documentation of the events and conversations throughout the campaign, as well as the group's public presence, including facebook posts, tweets, email blasts, flyers, and briefs.

We began our coding process asking the question *how were participants radicalized*, and compiled a comprehensive timeline of every activity that happened over the course of the research project. We coded the timeline for important learning spaces identified by focal participants, alternative spaces, and sites of conflicts. The alternative space coding resulted in us tracing three spaces over time: the women's caucus, the POC caucus, and the Equity committee, and within each of those we identified patterned practices that enabled broader participation, including the go-arounds and distributed argumentation. As we traced these practices across the timeline, different patterns of interaction emerged as the significant practices that were enabling certain members to become politicized while others were not. This raised questions about our coding schemas and what we meant by politicization. As we iteratively coded our data, we identified shifting practices, non-dominant ways of knowing, different sets of ideas about racialization, gender, capitalism, and settler colonialism, and emergent identities as radical activists as constant patterns. As we re-analyzed our work, it became clear that these four processes were at play in each of the politicizing moments we had coded, which gave us specific examples to test our schema on.

The analysis that follows uses ethnographic moments to illustrate the politicizing processes within Fossil Free UofT. The examples were selected from the timeline based on their ability to

exemplify the shifts we saw along the four pillars of the framework. Using ethnographic detail from our perspective as participant researchers allows us to demonstrate the shifts we documented longitudinally, even when speakers did not make the shifts explicit in their talk. Using key instances allows us to highlight the shifts, providing texture and specificity, and communicating the significance of the shifts in the context of the polarization. While each of these moments relate to specific contexts, they illustrate the shifts over time. To situate these moments in the broader context, we draw on details from our field notes and Facebook chats at the time. Additionally, stimulated recall interviews from the weeks surrounding events are paraphrased to make claims about how alternative space participants reflected on the large-group meetings and the politicization that was ongoing adjacent to the official divestment work. This selection process reflects a confirmation bias, where our participation and our immersion in the data analysis over months means that we have selected instances that most strongly exemplify the patterned shifts we are arguing for. Rather than understand that as a problem, we point to theories of relationality (Wilson, 2005), and we argue that our relationship to the context and the data, as well as our continual triangulation between timeline, video, SRI data, and primary source documents accurately reflects the significant moments of politicization, and communicates their gravity within the longer campaign process.

To check the validity of our findings, we asked research collective members to talk with us about their reflections on the framework, and to help us identify disconfirming instances in the timeline or in their experiences to help refine the instances we drew on. Drafts of this paper have been shared with alternative space participants, and their feedback has been integrated.

4.4 Context

Fossil Free UofT was a student-run campaign with the goal of convincing the University of Toronto to divest its endowment from fossil fuel holdings. The University of Toronto was one of over 300 universities where students launched similar campaigns under the umbrella of 350.org, all of which used a similar tactical repertoire. From September 2014 to April 2016, Fossil Free UofT met weekly to plan events and coordinate strategy. Meetings lasted two to three hours, with facilitation responsibilities rotating between members. The group was composed of undergraduate, masters, and PhD students, with 15-35 people attending regular planning

meetings. Participation shifted weekly, but the group tended to be majority White, with roughly even numbers of men and women, and no openly-identified non-binary students.

The international fossil fuel divestment campaign markets itself as a “climate justice” campaign, though the core tactic of withdrawing money from the fossil fuel industry does little to explicitly address questions of justice. 350.org frames climate change as a problem to be solved technocratically. They argue that if university students put pressure on their universities to withdraw endowment holdings from the top 200 fossil fuel companies, then this will change public opinion, “removing their social license” from the fossil fuel industry. In this schema, the problem of climate change is traced to the business practices of the fossil fuel industry, and the remedy is to change public opinion. Other rationales suggests that by removing the social license and changing public opinion, law-makers will be more willing to regulate the industry using policies like cap and trade. The materials that 350.org circulates do not address questions of colonialism and racial justice (FossilFree USA, 2016), while the Canadian counterpart addresses Indigenous solidarity in one small section of the guidebook (Fossil Free Canada, 2016) While the conferences that student divestment campaigns organized focus on justice more centrally, engagement in questions of racialization, settler colonialism, and patriarchy vary widely across campuses.

Within Fossil Free UofT, the dominant logic of 350.org was embraced by the first generations of leadership in the organization. They developed a model brief (Toronto350.org, 2013) outlining the problem of climate change, and depended on the bureaucratic processes of the University of Toronto to accept a rational argument, which they believed would lead to principled divestment. After the brief was submitted to the university, the campaign entered a new stage, where more undergraduates were brought into the campaign, and the emphasis shifted toward building public support on campus. In this era, the participation dynamics of the group were established, and quickly racialized and gendered patterns of expertise and decision-making became normalized. Several White men in the group tended to participate the vast majority of speaking turns and duration, regardless of their relative levels of experience (Curnow & Chan, 2016). Women’s voices were often overpowered, people of colour almost never spoke (Curnow & Chan, 2016). Decisions were made by those White men who were recognized as leaders without the participation of others (Curnow & Chan, 2016). There was often contestation over how much the campaign should engage questions of race, gender, and Indigenous sovereignty. Though there

was general acceptance of the “climate justice” discourse, many of the members positioned as experts in the group argued that justice-focused frames were “alienating” and that they were a “distraction” from the “real” goal of ending fossil fuel emissions. Combined with the participation dynamics, this meant that women and people of colour’s ability to influence the substance of the conversation and the strategic direction of the campaign were limited.

The limits of the fossil fuel divestment campaign became highly visible in practice. Over time, Fossil Free UofT fractured, with some students anchoring themselves in the logic 350.org put forward, while others rejected that and became increasingly politicized through engagement in the campaign. Because of the marginalization people of colour and women experienced in the group, many sought alternative spaces to participate beyond the practices of mastery, and to give voice to their emergent critiques of the ways the community of practice functioned. Informal spaces like bars and waiting for the elevator after a meeting became significant alternative spaces, not by design, but by necessity. One of our participants quipped, “you know there’s a problem when the real meeting has to happen after the meeting”. She joked, but in reality, the dynamics during meetings were difficult, and many participants came together socially not only because they were friends, but also because they felt a need to process their emotions and have their feelings validated after a meeting. In the alternative spaces, settler colonialism, Whiteness and masculinity were not assumed to be universal, and different modes of participating, knowing, and being were given space. Politicized students centred equity critiques in their work, prioritizing attention to Indigenous solidarity as a way of addressing settler colonialism and racialization, which they argued were at the root of the climate crisis, and they sought to address them through their strategic framing as well as their internal processes.

4.5 Politicization in Process

We theorize politicization as a process of political concept development, changing practices, shifts in ways of knowing, and identity construction. We liken politicization within Fossil Free UofT to weaving a rope. Each strand of the rope exists separately, but they gain strength through being woven together, and they change into a coherent, recognizable item through their relationship with each other. In the sections that follow, we describe aspects of the politicization process that some, though certainly not all, participants in Fossil Free UofT experienced. We demonstrate the transformations that happened over time as student activists became increasingly

critical of divestment as a strategy and goal, as well as the logics that underpinned the campaign as these student activists came to understand themselves as radical. The foreclosure of space for women and people of colour's participation made them more willing to become politicized about the systemic aspects, as they located their experiences within broader systems of patriarchy and racialization. This shifted their identities and their practices, which further polarized the relationship with the White men who positioned themselves as experts who, feeling their local power diminish, lashed out against equity critiques, and argued against full participation by women and people of colour, calling them "divisive" and demanding things to "go back to normal". This further politicized women and people of colour in the group, as their identities, practices, politics, and ways of knowing developed oppositionally as they fought for different social relations in the group and the climate movement.

We use the notion of politics to describe the intellectual concept development aspects of politicization. In our data this included developing an historicized power analysis that accounted for racialization, settler colonialism, and patriarchy. It also included developing a political analysis of the ways that North American society functions to reproduce social relations of dominance interpersonally as well as institutionally and culturally. This meant a shift away from focusing on individual instances of discrimination, and toward a systemic analysis of root causes of climate change. Political concept development was tied to the frames circulated in the environmental movement, since the way a problem is articulated and the solutions that are put forward rest on the ways that the world is understood. This is where we saw the core philosophies of the politicized participants develop. They were produced through participation with others, in relation to the ways of knowing that coordinate critiques, and dependent on how participants understood themselves individually and collectively. We frame political concept development as the cognitive content that was learned and the ideologies that were adopted. Political concept development denotes how participants conceptualized the world, power relations, and their theories of change.

We use the concept of politicizing practices to signal the processes a community of practice takes up across different scales. Within this category, we look at the discursive, interactional, strategic, and tactical practices of groups. These activities are embodied forms of participation, and they reflect, reproduce, and resist political analyses, ways of knowing, and identities as part of processes of politicization. Discourse practices include what, when, and how things are said.

These vocabularies and grammars represent political choices embedded in learning to participate in specific community contexts. Interactional practices are also embedded in collective participation, and reveal different norms, whether it be turn-taking in speaking, use of space, decision making, or how one deals (or doesn't) with conflict. We also include the prefigurative practices of the group here, where choices about facilitation and group process are embedded in and reproduce a different type of politics and identity, one oppositional to dominant social relations. Strategic practices include the larger scale choices in how collective action for social change is directed, while tactical practices include the forms of activity that are used.

We use the category *ways of knowing* to signal the epistemological underpinnings of what is known and done in the group. This includes how people come to know, what is considered valid knowledge, and who is a valid knower. We recognize that ways of knowing and being are impossible to extract from each other, and our use considers them as dialectically related. In the North American context, Eurowestern epistemologies dominate, but are not the only way of knowing, and for our case, consciousness of one's own epistemological mooring was a significant shift in ways of knowing. By undermining the perceived universality of Eurowestern knowledge systems, this consciousness forced participants to grapple with awareness of Whiteness and settler coloniality. This included questioning epistemological orientations to dualism, objectivity, neutrality, "science", time, and other coordinating ideologies of Eurowestern thought. Though this experience was not shared by everyone in the group, some group members raised within a Eurowestern paradigm came to question the logic of objectivity and a move toward relational ways of knowing.

Identity, in our understanding, is an individual and collective process of becoming, refining a sense of self in relation to others. In this context, becoming politicized shifted participants' understandings of themselves: who they were, what they were willing to do, who they were accountable to, and how they envisioned their place in the world. This was a collective process of alignment, distinction, and differentiation, of coming to trust and be open to specific politics, practices, and ways of knowing that certain people put forward. This was a shift away from mainstream politics toward an identity that many members had previously considered extreme and alienating, which they now embraced based on the community, the shared practices, commitment to a set of political philosophies, and a shared sense of what is knowable and how, through contestation against the status quo.

In the next sections we tease each of these processes apart to show one aspect, and then try to explain briefly how they were woven together and how that created a stronger experience of politicization than the strands alone would have. We draw on ethnographic accounts of particular moments to illustrate the politicization processes in progress throughout the Fossil Free UofT divestment campaign. Each ethnographic “chunk” provides a description of the dynamics of the moment, focusing on one of the four areas of politicization that we theorize. While these are artificially teased apart to demonstrate the dynamics, they also illustrate the ways that the politics, practices, ways of knowing, and identities of politicization co-produced each other. These ethnographic accounts paint a picture of the political shifts that were occurring and the fissures that developed in the group, as well as how they escalated over time. They also emphasize the collective learning processes that were enabled and iteratively reinforced through changing practices and ways of knowing and being.

4.5.1 Political Concept Development: Linking local and extralocal social relations of power

Over the summer of 2016, as part of the March for Jobs, Justice, and the Climate, Fossil Free UofT participated in a sit-in coordinated by 350.org. The action was at a local politician’s office to pressure the federal government to shift their policies around fossil fuel extraction.

Participants attended trainings to prepare to risk arrest. Led by White 350.org staff, these trainings included a diverse group of people, most of whom had never risked arrest as part of a civil disobedience. The facilitators led a conversation about why it might be hard for participants to risk arrest. One facilitator acknowledged that getting arrested can be an emotional experience because the person getting arrested will feel disappointed in the police, who they had always trusted and respected. To calm the anticipated anxieties in the room, another facilitator recounted his interactions with police in other environmentalist actions. He described getting arrested as an empowering experience. He claimed that getting arrested was not a big deal; in some instances the police just drove him blocks away from the protest and released him, conveying that if the arrest is inconsequential mentally and physically, you can come out feeling emboldened to do more frequent and riskier direct actions in the future.

A few days later, the sit-in occurred. It was anti-climactic and accomplished little. The Member of Parliament refused to meet and the police declined making arrests. Effectively activists sat on the floor of the lobby chatting for the afternoon. It did not feel empowering to participants. In

fact, there was frustration with the plan that 350.org had designed. At the end of the day, as participants dejectedly let themselves out of the office having accomplished none of the goals, people of colour in the group critiqued the action and the training beforehand.

People of colour in the group were upset, and through conversations walking away from the MP's office, they realized there were commonalities in the way they experienced the sit-in. They articulated that they felt disempowered, disappointed, and worried about the sit-in. In this conversation and recurring "POC spaces" that they coordinated over the subsequent weeks, they critiqued the lack of an intersectional analysis to guide the work in 350.org. They argued that the lack of such an analysis made the organizing practice for the sit-in and the general group alienating for people of colour. In particular they revisited the sit-in training; all of them agreed, it was an alienating experience. They deconstructed the underlying White male privilege that shaped the trainers' interactions with the police and discussed the difference in how communities of colour perceive police and the different dynamics that exists when POC communities interact with police. They explained to each other that getting arrested is not empowering; it is the opposite. Amil, a Black man, described arrests as "humiliating" and as he did, others agreed, shaking their heads knowingly. He argued that police have historically arrested people of colour as a way of humiliating and disempowering them. The group of activists of colour acknowledged that arrest has been a way in which police have tried to disrupt protest and deter communities of colour from resisting. Throughout the conversation, there was a strong sense of camaraderie, a sense of shared experience, and a feeling that you didn't have to explain yourself, others intuitively knew based on similar experiences in racialized communities. This sense of difference was named explicitly by Keara, an Indigenous woman, and the discussion shifted to the Whiteness of Fossil Free UofT and the movement more broadly. Tresanne, a woman of colour, stressed how hard she had to fight to be recognized in the group, and how hard it was to integrate even tokenizing gestures to climate justice, Indigenous peoples, and impacted communities.

This example shows us the analytic processes that politicized students mobilized collectively, shifting their interpretation of events and frames in the environmental movement and bridging a highly localized experience of racialization to a extralocal critique of how racialization structured the environmental movement's priorities and strategies. The thinking and conceptual development was collective, spread across student activists who encouraged each other and co-developed a critique of the racialized dynamics of the climate movement. The political analysis

they developed centred intersectionality, talking about how race and gender enabled the facilitator's assumptions of empowerment. They challenged the default Whiteness and masculinity that often went unnamed in climate movement spaces. In this way, they rejected the dominant frames of environmentalism and developed other philosophies that enabled them to imagine a different type of environmentalism that made space for their participation and centred the experiences of impacted communities, especially in colonized contexts. This was not just an intellectual process. It was rooted in the experiences of the sit-in and formed the foundation of subsequent POC spaces where different practices were normalized. In the POC spaces, instead of reproducing the dynamics of the Fossil Free UofT meetings where people of colour almost never spoke, there was widespread participation. Everyone who attended spoke and contributions were affirmed. Non-dominant repertoires of practice were affirmed. This enabled further development of shared critiques based on lived experiences of racialization. Though the group was racially quite diverse, there was an effort to bridge the experiences as people of colour and Indigenous people to identify the patterns that emerged from their lives that cut across some of the particularities of their migration stories and experiences of racialization in Toronto.

Centring people of colour and Indigenous people's lived experiences re-shaped their relationship to knowledge. For some people of colour, the epistemological shift was not a shift away from a normative (White, settler) epistemology, but toward an acknowledgement of their own ways of knowing. For Keara, it was emboldening. As a Nêhiyaw (Cree) woman, her epistemological foundation was already consciously relational, but the process of naming and problematizing was an affirmation of her way of knowing, and she became increasingly vocal and more politically radical in a space that validated her approach. This also led to her being more vocal and critical in other spaces that did not validate her ways of being. In this way, it was a polarizing process, where she developed a specified language of critiquing the settler colonial nature of the community of practice and the environmental movement.

The process of naming their local expressions of racism and locating them within larger systems played a significant role in shaping how individuals thought of themselves as radical activists, as well as how the collectivities of politicized members conceptualized themselves as a group, drawing on the POC space participants as well as women's caucus members, and equity committee members. As they named systems of oppression, they wanted to position themselves

against them. It was a quick transition from being able to name something as racist to identifying as anti-racist, and through collaboration with the other politicized members, the identity quickly expanded to think of themselves as justice activists centring an intersectional analysis. The more the politicized members became explicitly aware of systems of oppression as the problems, the more they identified as people who are *against* those systems and *for* a comprehensive political analysis that looked at the root causes of the problems. In part, this happened through the strong sense of alignment and shared struggle in the POC spaces and other sympathetic spaces, like the equity committee meetings. Additionally, though, radical identities developed in the face of opposition. As politicized members pushed back against the White default space, they were often dismissed or harshly critiqued by those in positions of centrality. This helped politicize members further, as they developed a group identity in contra-distinction to those who wanted to uphold normative environmentalism. Politicized members were continually calling out racism in the small and large group, and this process enabled them to start to think of themselves as anti-racist. Further, it was no longer adequate to be doing generalized activist work, they felt a strong commitment to do a particular kind of activist work—work that integrated anti-racism and decolonizing approaches into the political strategy at all levels. Learning the political analysis thus re-framed how they understood activism and what it meant to be an activist.

4.5.1.1 Prefigurative Practices: Go Arounds as Disruption to Whiteness and Masculinity

One of the clearest differences in the alternative spaces of politicized members were the participation dynamics. Politicized members sought to disrupt the patterned behaviours that effectively silenced many members of the group, and intentionally tried to hear from everyone. A common strategy for encouraging full participation was the “go-around”, a facilitation process where the group simply went in a circle and gave everyone present a chance to share their thoughts on the subject at hand. The go-around was a way of removing the pressure on speakers to intervene quickly if participants had something to contribute, and assumed that everyone had something they could contribute, even if it was only the spark of an idea. Go-arounds were used as a way of building the expectation that everyone in the group had something valuable to contribute and that we all wanted to hear it, especially for those who were quiet. It controlled the speed of interaction, so those who needed more time to process could have it, and gave participants more opportunity to talk through their ideas and feelings, even when they were still

forming. The overarching goal was to hear from everyone in the room as an intentional way of creating a more welcoming space where everyone's voices were heard and valued.

This practice had consequences for the content we discussed and the types of politics we engaged. For the first time, we heard from many participants who were largely silent in the community of practice meetings. Broad participation disrupted the assumed universality of the politics of those that spoke most frequently, inviting alt space participants to hear, for the first time, the widespread disagreement to the ideas that seemingly had been decided on collaboratively in the group meetings. For example, while some of the White men in positions of mastery had continually argued against the relevance of colonialism and Indigenous solidarity to the campaign, a go around enabled us to hear that all of the other members in the large group supported the framework and many wanted it to be central to their organizing. Significantly, it allowed the group to hear from members outside of the formal centre of mastery, and in hearing from marginalized or peripheral participants, they could become legitimate knowers and masters in the alternative spaces. Through the participation of people who were often silenced in the large group, participants effectively introduced new experts alongside the new sets of practices, and those in positions of mastery were then known as capable and intelligent.

Enabling participation of more women and people of colour enabled us to hear and iterate on a different epistemological standpoint. We want to be careful here not to reproduce essentialist notions about what and how people know based on their social location, while also flagging the significant impact that racialization and gender had on what was said and known in the dominant community of practice. The fact that, in meetings, almost all of the ideas that were taken up came from White men meant that they did not reflect other repertoires of practice or non-dominant experiences. This became salient in small and large ways, like when White men argued that we needed to focus our outreach on Business students rather than Aboriginal Studies students. Hearing from people of colour disrupted some, though not all, of the expansive sense of the default Whiteness of the space, where White people, and White men in particular because of their frequent talk, assumed that their experiences of campaigning and of climate change were universally shared. Inviting voices of people of colour and women in a regular and systematic way meant that there was space for participants to draw on different funds of knowledge. Those contributions often relied on epistemologies beyond Eurowestern objectivist and masculinist perspectives. While White men's perspectives were frequently mobilized and framed (by White

men) as universal and neutral, hearing from people of colour and women created opportunities to contest the universality, neutrality, and objectivity of White men's politics because contestation over their perspectives was made visible. This exposure to other ideas, as well as the opportunity to question the universality of dominant perspectives, opened up opportunities to pursue a different politics, a different mode of participation, and different epistemologies and ontologies.

Intervening in the ubiquity of White men's speaking and decision-making had another impact on the epistemological foundations of some politicized participants, shifting their relationship to knowledge and allowing them to see themselves as legitimate knowledge producers. So often in the community of practice, women and people of colour were silent. In the alternative spaces, like the women's caucus or POC space, participants like Jade said she had internalized the belief that she had nothing to contribute, that her lack of participation was her own fault, and based on her on inability to think fast enough and well enough. Through participating in go-arounds she saw a different type of participation become possible and came to understand her own silence in the meetings as a systemic phenomenon rooted in gendered and racialized participation, not her own inadequacies. When she was able to participate generatively it unsettled her internalized ideas about her ability to lead and contribute. These practices disrupted the idea that those who spoke first, and most were the only ones with ideas, or that the assertiveness with which one spoke should be conflated with expertise.

Go-arounds helped shape the identities of politicized members in multiple ways. Through the full participation of all participants, politicized members began to see themselves as the group that stood for inclusion and representation of non-dominant standpoints. They prided themselves on having a more representative and socially just dynamic and worked to interrupt when White men dominated the space or talked over someone. Through these practices, politicized members also recognized how broader participation in the group could disrupt some of the more conservative politics by inserting other perspectives. Additionally, go-arounds gave more participants the chance to speak, and thus, to take a position in the contentious conversations that might otherwise be one-sided. This often produced a highly polarized meeting, but for politicized members it was never just about taking sides as an identity stance, it was always also a politically embedded choice that required them to advocate for the set of politics that they understood to be just and the practices that enabled full participation by people from non-dominant social locations in ways of knowing and being that affirmed them.

4.5.1.2 Ways of Knowing: Recognizing Epistemological A Prioris and Centring Relationality

Eighteen months after Fossil Free UofT delivered the brief, the president's advisory committee released their findings. The committee recommended targeted divestment from firms which derived a majority of their revenue from coal, pursued unconventional extraction methods, or knowingly disseminated misinformation. In general, FossilFree UofT saw these criteria as promising, and set out to provide guidelines for the president to interpret the committee's recommendation with the widest possible scope. However, many of the politicized participants were disappointed at the committee's silence on questions of environmental racism and colonialism, and succeeded in persuading the larger group to address this in the response. This quickly became the most contentious part of the response.

Politicized students in the group spearheaded a task force, intent on doing it in a way that reflective of the solidarity and decolonization concepts they had been exposed to and accountable to Indigenous communities. Since politicized members of Fossil Free UofT had not had the opportunity to do "real" solidarity work before because of the contestation surrounding it, they found themselves in a bind: they had no relationships with any particular Indigenous communities to whom they could be accountable. Work on the criterion progressed slowly, as there were simultaneous efforts to draft something internally which could be sufficient and to build relationships with Indigenous students' organizations on campus.

Within the group, pressure mounted on the task force to produce results. White men who positioned themselves as experts argued that the response to the committee needed to be submitted quickly. Sydney, one of the women coordinating the process, argued that it would take time to build relationships and that it would be inappropriate to demand that Indigenous people work on a project that we defined on a timeline that was set without their input. In response, Graham argued that the task force should tell Indigenous people that our work would potentially benefit them in the long run, if they did us a favour and wrote the criterion. He gave little consideration to the Equity Committee's plan to embrace a more accountable approach, where the campaign would centre the voices of the people most affected.

This conflict illustrates how different ways of knowing often led to flash points within the group. The politicized students' concerns about the other's instrumentalism reflected a familiarity with

Indigenous ways of knowing and being and a rejection of Eurowestern models of efficiency which prioritized output over collaborative processes. Politicized students rejected the idea that we could demand ideas from Indigenous people, extract that knowledge, do with it what we wanted, not be accountable to them, and feel like we were benevolently helping them. Those in opposition were task-oriented, viewing collaborations as isolated and in service to specific goals. They saw the point of the work as making sure the issue of Indigenous land rights was mentioned in the response; to them it did not matter whose perspective on the matter was centred or what the process was to develop the text.

In addition to placing them in opposition to the dominant group members, this relational epistemology helped politicized members come to different political priorities. Thinking about the interactions between land, water, and communities throughout history brought them to a more holistic understanding of the problematics of fossil fuel companies. They moved from seeing it primarily as an issue of climate and emissions to an issue of land theft, denial of sovereignty, and racially targeted pollution. This led politicized students to work to incorporate recognition of the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the right to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, as well as an understanding of Indigenous sovereignty into the divestment frame. This was the first time politicized students worked to substantively weave their anti-colonial and anti-capitalist politics into the divestment campaign, to explore if it was possible for divestment to accommodate a critical analysis of dispossession and colonialism as social harms that needed to be recognized. This stretched their knowledge of Indigenous worldviews while challenging them to contextualize their political concepts in new ways.

The contestation over the Indigenous criterion also demonstrates the shift in practices away from the brief and the bureaucracy toward deeper forms of solidarity and a struggle to include Indigenous peoples in divestment. The different factions had divergent ideas of what the goals were in the campaign, based in very different political analyses, and the lack of shared purpose led them to different strategies for engaging with communities. Politicized members wanted to take the time to develop more authentic, long-term alliances, while the other members were focused on getting short-term assistance to further their self-defined goals. The shift here was very dramatic in terms of prefiguration. Politicized members focused on the processes. They wanted the practices to be steeped in decolonial ways of knowing and reflective of their critiques of patriarchy and racialization. The discussion of go-arounds above was embedded in the same

logic, borne out through embodied practice. Within the debates, this emphasis was even stronger because politicized participants did not want to reproduce problematic settler-colonial dynamics in their interactions with Indigenous people on campus.

The fights over the Indigenous criterion helped polarize the identity differences. Politicized members who understood the Eurocentrism and settler coloniality of the efficiency approach had been learning about Indigenous struggles through friendships, ongoing workshops, and classes in Aboriginal Studies. This helped them to develop ideas of themselves as activists committed to decolonial work, and also to form communities of friends who attended the same protests. Meanwhile, several of the more liberal participants refused to attend workshops and protests, arguing that they did not need more information about Indigenous struggles and that solidarity work was a distraction from the main goal of divestment. Politicized students were appalled by this behaviour, but the reasonables did not understand their critique because they did not accept or acknowledge that a Eurowestern worldview is a stance. There was a clear contrast in the group based on ways of knowing and being, the focus on process versus outcomes, and questions of whether it was most important to win something or to fight for everything. These very different politics, practices, and ways of knowing made it increasingly difficult to work together. Arguments flared more frequently, and having to fight for the approach that was steeped in values and critique cemented a sense of identity and stakes for politicized members.

4.5.1.3 Identity Development: Radical Alliances, Collaborative Argumentation, and Enacted Solidarities

As the deadline for the University President's decision on fossil fuel divestment loomed, the group had become increasingly polarized. Questions of alliances, solidarities, politics, framing, goals, and tactics came to a head. In a meeting described as "riding a fuckin' bronco", we argued about one sentence proposed for the press release that we would send out after the university's decision. Confident that we would win the divestment campaign, the radical faction of the group argued that we needed to leverage our momentum and include a sentence of explicit support for the other divestment campaigns on campus: the Boycott Divestment Sanctions (BDS) campaign against Israeli Apartheid, and the Black Liberation Collective's (BLC) emergent campaign to divest from private prisons in the US. In the overheated room where we met, tempers boiled over. One side argued that one sentence of support represented was the bare minimum we could do for campaigns we claimed to stand in solidarity with. The other side argued the sentence

would alienate the Canadian public, destroying years of work. Both sides became increasingly polarized and entrenched in their identities as “radical” or “reasonable” through the contestation.

As the fight escalated, “radical” members argued that if we, as a group, claimed to be invested in climate justice and identified colonialism as one of the underlying causes on climate change, this was a clear case where we could contest settler colonialism in the Occupied Territories and link it to environmental degradation. Politicized students felt a strong sense of accountability and responsibility to the other campaigns and the larger political project. As a matter of ethics and identity, they fought to support their allies on campus. Because the debate was contentious, it gave members a sense of opposition they could mobilize against and identify the problematic assumptions within their logics. The process of argumentation entrenched the identities of politicized members further because they had a sense of who they were aligned with. Thus even when they were not yet clear on why the arguments their radical peers made were valid, they were inclined to side with them and support their arguments. The more they argued, the further entrenched participants’ views and identities became.

While the opposition argued that naming BDS would be toxic politically, politicized members argued that it was an obligation, an opportunity to show reciprocity, and a chance to have some skin in the game when it came to more contentious anti-colonial politics. As the argument continued, politicized members developed a line of argumentation that made visible some of the sense of identity and responsibility. Sinead argued, “It kinda scares me—we’re in university now and this is the chance we have to be most radical in our pursuit of justice that a lot of us will ever get. We have time, we have the space carved out where we can be really explicit about the kind of justice we are looking for.” The principle of standing up for what you believe in was made clear. As a matter of identity, the politicized members believed that they had an obligation and an opportunity to be principled and to fight for what was right. They contrasted this with their opposition, who did not want to stand up publicly, even as they acknowledged that there was shared support for the campaign internally. This was one of the clearest lines of distinction: through the argument, politicized members came to see themselves as bold and willing to back up their politics with action, and they saw their peers as cowardly and complicit in reproducing racist and colonial dynamics. After contestation over women being interrupted and intense frustration about why we even needed to debate this, two progressive members stormed out. A

vote was called, and in a split decision (7 to 6), the group decided against including one sentence of support in a press release if they won fossil fuel divestment.

While identities were salient in this fight, the debate was also deeply steeped in the divergent politics of the factions. For politicized members, lending support to BDS and the BLC was anchored in a critique of settler colonialism and racialization. For them, the political analysis was not about climate change in terms of the parts per million of carbon in the atmosphere, but a critique of colonialism and capitalism. Every time more conservative members tried to frame the logic of the campaign as merely about climate, the politicized members pushed back. Amil bristled at the suggestion that action on climate change, narrowly framed, was the only thing that brought the group together. In response he said, “That is *not* the goal of the campaign. That’s not the reason I get involved in any climate change or environmental struggle... my focus is on justice. And this is a way of getting to that. I see all of our struggles as being linked”. He put forward a different political analysis that tied diverse movements and de-centred White environmentalist framing that the opposition persistently argued was universally shared.

Politicized identities changed the normalized participation dynamics in the group. As the argument unfolded, the racialized and gendered dynamics in the group were clear, with the majority of people of colour and all of the politicized participants arguing for public alignment with the other divestment campaigns. Three White men attended the meeting, and all vigorously argued against, speaking far more frequently and for longer than any other speakers. Politicized students fought to prefigure these politics internally, aggressively pushing back against the racialized and gendered dynamics in the group. This created conflict, where several women called out the dynamics where men who had spoken frequently were allowed to talk over others or prevent women from responding to criticisms. These dynamics were normalized in the group, but calling them out was not, and the change in practice was very visible, though ineffective. The interactional practices were bound up in politicized members’ critiques, and the ability for others to hear radical critiques of the mainstream frames was contingent on disrupting White men’s over-participation. Politicized members developed a practice of distributed argumentation, where arguments were distributed across the politicized group, in an unplanned way, to respond to the persistent attacks. Since the White men spoke every other turn, this distribution allowed them to rebut the points while affirming their colleagues. As a learning process, this distributed argumentation meant that often times participants were developing arguments that they had not

begun. In that process, they extended their own learning by building on arguments that were still embryonic, based on their sense of allegiance and identity.

This struggle to prefigure solidarity substantively was not just a question of practice, but also a question of theory and of ways of knowing. Throughout the debate, “reasonable” members argued that, “we all think Israeli apartheid is super fucked up, but saying so publicly is unnecessary.” They feared blowback from the Toronto press, but more significantly here, they thought it was unnecessary. They argued that politicized members were too invested in “moral purity” and suggested that implicit, internal support for the other campaigns was adequate. In response, Sinéad argued that if we could not garner even this tokenistic gesture, our solidarity was meaningless. The divide, epistemologically, was between conceptualizations of thought and action. Politicized students argued for a view of solidarity where praxis had to be united, where their opponents argued that we could, and should separate our support, prioritizing what was strategic in the moment. The earlier debates about process and relationships were wrapped up in these contestations. While the mainstream environmentalists argued for a discrete approach to a narrowly framed issue, politicized members wanted to frame climate change in its relational ecosystem, using the anticipated win to build momentum for anti-racist and decolonial struggles.

4.6 Weaving the Strands Together

Fossil Free UofT allows us to trace the politicizing processes of youth involved in a fossil fuel divestment campaign. This case shows that politicization was not just about knowing the concepts or having skills to analyze the local and extralocal; it demonstrates an expansive type of learning that involved epistemological, activity, and identity shifts. Politicized participants became able to articulate their political critiques through dynamic participation in community. Their process was simultaneously one of developing practices that met their goals of enabling fuller participation and undermining the dynamics of dominance that they problematized. The practices enabled rich contexts for political development, which were embedded in, and co-produced the epistemological shifts members experienced. The practices also opened up new ways for politicized members to understand themselves as radical, developing practice-based identities that further entrenched their commitment to the sets of ideas, practices, and people in the radical spaces. In this way we have demonstrated that politicization was not only cognitive,

based on a particular political analysis, but a comprehensive, practice-based identity shift that simultaneously shaped the epistemologies, identities, and political philosophies of participants.

These seemingly separate aspects of politicization—concept development, practices, ways of knowing, and identities—were not separate. They were a continually evolving joint production, which created reinforcing loops of accountability to the ideas, to the people, to the ways of knowing, and to the identity of radical activists. Creating alternative spaces enabled this interstitial process to happen in the absence of the dynamics which continually reinforced, colonialism, and racialization and only allowed liberal political frames to circulate. In the alternative spaces, their identities as radical were jointly created, given meaning, and celebrated. Their practices were refined as the politics developed, prefiguring learning opportunities that supported radical politics. Their ways of knowing validated and shaped their repertoires of practice, funds of knowledge, and standpoints.

Being in relationship with others who identified as and were identified by others as radical made it possible for those identities to become specific, salient, and desirable, rather than an abstract label. That shift in desire to become, and the process of re-making practices, frames, and epistemologies in order to become recognized as a radical activist was significant in shifting individual members' relations to the dominant practices and the members in positions of mastery within Fossil Free UofT. This was not mindless mimicry or indoctrination, but intentional engagement with the ideas, practices, and epistemologies associated with what other radicals did. The identity gave participants a sense of possibilities they might orient toward, which practices they might try on and play with, and which ideas they might try to explore and develop. Not all aspects of the identity stuck, and not everyone adopted the same practices and politics; there were varied levels of commitment to the identity, and identities and political expression varied based on the spaces they were in. On the whole, though, we saw the group shift in its shared identity, politics, and epistemologies, such that when we look at the last rally, the practices, the talking points, and even the people representing the group look markedly different than they had eighteen months prior.

4.7 Conclusion

For those of us committed to supporting youth in their political development for justice, this case offers us opportunities and a challenge. First, the challenge: We cannot conceptualize

politicization as only an intellectual task of learning the histories of racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy, or only focus on building youth activists' ability to develop a critical social analysis. While our data clearly indicates that this is important, it is just one piece of a larger shift. We need to make spaces available for activists to experiment with practices that allow them to practice non-dominant social relations, prefiguring different ways of interacting in order to subvert the dominant practices of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism that structure many of our day to day interactions. We also need to support the participation of lots of different people, and design for equitable participation.

The opportunity, of course, is to find new ways to foster politicization as an embodied practice rooted in ways of knowing, and deeply tied to questions of identity. This case points to the ways that even in politically and tactically constrained campaigns, student activists seek out and make for themselves opportunities to become radical. As educational theorists, we should look to the alternative spaces that activists carve out for themselves, and examine more closely the ways that they support sociocultural politicization in context. The work happening in student campaigns is exciting, fast paced, and highly responsive to the social relations they are embedded in. Youth activists are primed to be critical and engaged, and the coming years promise many opportunities for their fight for a more just world.

As theorists, we need to understand politicization as a broad collective process of identity development, and think about ways to support youth in innovating practices that challenge everyday dominance, bring other epistemologies into play, and make possible the significant identity shifts that drive students to engage more deeply in the practices, epistemologies, and politics that are made available to them. As supporters of youth claiming their place in history as agentic and powerful, we must not only attend to these aspects, but seek opportunities to foster more opportunities for politicization.

Chapter 5

Resituating Situated Learning within Racialized, Gendered, and Colonial Social Relations

5.1 Learning, Power, and Social Relations

“Learning only partly—and often incidentally—implies becoming able to be involved in new activities, to perform new tasks and functions, to master new understandings. Activities, tasks, functions, and understandings do not exist in isolation; they are part of broader systems of relations in which they have meaning. These systems of relations arise out of and are reproduced and developed within social communities, which are in part systems of relations among persons.”

— Lave and Wenger 1991 p. 53

Twenty-five years ago, Lave and Wenger dramatically transformed the intellectual landscape when they offered the concepts of situated learning, communities of practice, and legitimate peripheral participation. Today these concepts are widely accepted, used extensively across disciplines, and are foundational to many approaches to theorizing learning, organizations, and the social construction of meaning. Throughout *Situated Learning*, Lave and Wenger continually flag the need to acknowledge and address power dynamics that impact communities’ practices and members’ abilities to access and perform the full practices of a community. They note the need to account for and theorize power dynamics in their historical, cultural, and institutional contexts. Decades later, this has yet to be fulfilled. Though thousands have taken up the concepts of situated learning and communities of practice, they have largely done so in the absence of a sustained treatment of power dynamics (Contu & Willmott, 2003) and, in particular, social relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism.

While situated learning brings tremendous value to studies of learning, power dynamics rooted in social relations of racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy are largely overlooked. This leaves a significant gap in our understandings of how communities of practice operate, how these social relations impact the practices of a community, and how opportunities to learn may be enabled or constrained because of colonialism, racialization, and patriarchy woven into the practices, epistemologies, and ontologies of the community. In this paper, I explore the ramifications of

this absence in situated learning frameworks, and offer analysis of how social relations shape and are shaped by communities of practice and learning practices.

Bringing an analysis of social relations of power rooted in patriarchy, colonialism, and racialization is required to understand learning within communities of practice. In this paper, vignettes from an environmental activist community of practice expose some of the gaps that emerge when situated learning theory does not attend to racialization, colonialism, and gender. I show that the practices of a given community are not neutral; they exist within and reproduce repertoires of practice and social relations of power, which may privilege some members of a community while rendering others unable to participate fully. The vignettes illustrate that communities of practice are immersed in and reproduce repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies that are embedded in social locations and histories. I argue that combining situated learning analysis with critiques of the historical, institutional, and interactional dimensions of racialization, gender, and colonialism allows us to more fully account for the ways participants learn and participate in communities.

The political analysis I bring forward here is not new. Indigenous scholars (Anderson 2000; Deloria, 1995; Little Bear, 2000), critical race scholars (Collins, 1986; hooks, 1984, 1989; Sandoval, 1991; Leonardo, 2009; Omi & Winant, 2014), critical whiteness theorists (Frankenberg, 1993; Roediger, 1999) and standpoint feminists (Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1992; Hartsock, 1983; Smith, 1987) have been fighting these battles for decades, and there is a well-established body of theory that attends to the ways that social relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism shape daily interactions and institutions. Within other areas of sociocultural learning theory, work has been done that explores how racialization, gender, and colonialism impact learning (Nasir & Hand, 2006; Nasir, 2011; González, Moll & Amanti, 2006; Gutiérrez, 2008; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López & Tejada, 2000; Lee, 2001, McDermott, Rale & Seyer-Ochi, 2009, Bang & Medin, 2010, Rogoff, 2011, Rogoff, Najafi, & Mejía-Arauz, 2014). However, this work is not reflected in the body of educational and organizational scholarship that builds primarily from situated learning and communities of practice frameworks. Anti-racist, feminist, and anti-colonial scholarship need to be brought into conversation with situated learning as a way of enriching the theories and accounting for how racialized, gendered, and colonial social relations are enacted within and shape communities of practice.

In the sections that follow, I briefly review situated learning and community of practice theory, touching on the ways that social relations of power have been alluded to, yet not fully realized analytically. I then introduce the environmentalist social movement organization that is the context for the vignettes that follow. In three sets of vignettes, I trace the ways that gender, racialization, and colonialism were made salient within the community of practice, raising questions about how a normative situated learning analysis might interpret the marginalization of participants from non-dominant social locations. The vignettes are framed around the ways that practices, epistemologies, and ontologies, respectively, were embedded in social relations of power and reproduced them in ways that constrained opportunities for some members to participate and become recognized. In analyzing these vignettes, I show that the practices, epistemologies, and ontologies of the community of practice were not neutral, but embedded within historical relations of power, and that they were not shared across the community of practice. I then argue that we must contextualize the learning and participation of members within the histories and continuities of patriarchy, racialization, and colonialism in order to more precisely theorize learning in communities of practice.

5.2 Revisiting Situated Learning and Communities of Practice

As highly influential theories of learning, situated learning, legitimate peripheral participation, and communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) together represent an important stronghold of theorization that offer an alternative to acquisition models of learning. Situated learning theory conceptualizes learning as a social process rooted in participation in a community, rather than as an individual's uptake of content. This view holds that learning is co-constructed among groups of people, continually negotiated, and contextually bound (Lave & Wenger, 1991). These theories offer significant analytic value to researchers interested in learning both in and out of schools and institutions. Because of this value, these concepts have become mainstream in studies of education, workplace learning, and organizational management.

Lave and Wenger's (1991) theories of situated learning and legitimate peripheral participation explain learning as becoming, where through participation, members learn the skills and social performances of the community. Communities of practice are understood as groups of people engaged in collective work in a joint enterprise using shared repertoires (Wenger, 1998). The

theory articulates learning as legitimate peripheral participation, where new members move from the periphery into full participation gradually, through deeper immersion in the community. Situated learning argues people learn through absorption and integration into the community, where all members participate in generative, ongoing negotiation of the community itself, though in differentiated ways. Lave and Wenger stress the active, communal negotiation of meaning, rather than individual cognition, and in doing so, they have changed the face of learning scholarship.

Taken together, these concepts offer an understanding of how learning and practice are intertwined. They show how individual and collective knowledge is co-produced through joint participation. This approach allows us to better describe and theorize the ways that people come to understand and (re)create their social world, giving meaning to it in specific, and sometimes divergent, ways. Lave and Wenger's work is highly influential and forms the foundation of much of the learning sciences. Given the extensive uptake of their ideas, it is important to improve and expand its ability to theorize learning in the context of racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy which greatly impact people's experiences of learning and participation.

Throughout *Situated Learning*, Lave and Wenger call for attention to power. Such references are sprinkled throughout the text (Contu & Willmott, 2003). Again and again (for example, pages 36, 37, 42, 51, 64, 95), Lave and Wenger make reference to the importance of power in the form of social relations. They acknowledge the importance of the "social organization of and control over resources" (Lave & Wenger 1991, p. 37) as well as how "hegemony over resources for learning and alienation from full participation are inherent in the shaping of the legitimacy and peripherality of participation in its historical realizations" (p. 42). They also argue "any given attempt to analyze a form of learning through legitimate peripheral participation must involve analysis of the political and social organization of that form, its historical development, and the effects of both of these on sustained possibilities for learning" (Lave & Wenger 1991, p. 64). Throughout the text, they stress the idea that local communities of practice are embedded within dominant social relations.

Lave and Wenger clearly believe that attention to power relations is necessary for studies of learning and communities in order to theorize collective work in robust and historicized ways. But while Lave and Wenger repeatedly call for attention to social relations of power, saying

“unequal relations of power must be included more systematically in our analysis” (1991, p. 42), the call is not borne out in their preliminary analysis of midwives, tailors, quartermasters, butchers, and non-drinking alcoholics. In their discussions of participants within a community of practice, practices, legitimate peripheral participation, and the larger contexts, they do not engage with questions of gender, colonialism, or racialization. Within each of the cases, a critique of the ways gender, colonialism, and racialization shape and are shaped by the community of practice and the modes of participation would improve the analysis. The communities of practice they explore are discussed as largely homogenous groups: the tailors, butchers, and quartermasters are all men, the midwives are women; we know that the midwives are Indigenous Yucatec women, that the tailors are Vai and Gola, but we otherwise do not know their racial and ethnic identities. These details are important for contextualizing the learning process. For example, in their discussion of Yucatec midwives’ interactions with the medical industry (Lave & Wenger 1991, p. 107), Lave and Wenger could have contextualized the midwives’ resistance within a conversation about the medicalization of traditional healing and the replacement of Indigenous spirituality, epistemologies, and ontologies through processes like the biomedical credentialing they refer to. Alternately, Lave and Wenger could discuss the racism of skilled trades as they discussed the peripheralization of butchers (1991, p. 77), complicating their narrative by questioning if Black and Brown workers had access to the apprenticeship process, and asking how race and ethnicity played a role in sequestering some workers. Or, Lave and Wenger could examine the ways that gendered participation and sexism play out in environments like Alcoholics Anonymous, as Hodges (1998) does, to trace the difficulty women experienced in becoming full members of the community due to the gendered repertoire of practice of testimony and the sexism of other members. Examining social relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism as central aspects of how communities function, who is made a full participant, how practices are reproduced and valorized, and how learning is sustained would deepen our understanding of the learning dynamics, showing us how practices and communities are reproduced, and how they can be resisted and transformed through other learning trajectories.

Within Wenger’s follow up book, *Communities of Practice*, the gestures to social relations are even more pervasive. He states “communities of practice are not self-contained entities. They develop in larger contexts—historical, social, cultural, institutional—with specific resources and constraints” (Wenger, 1998, p. 79). Focus on these relations is clearly a priority, yet requires

further development and more focused attention on historical and institutional relations of power. The “larger contexts” that Wenger describes in the book are particular industries, rather than social relations of power. Wenger does not engage with the histories and contemporary manifestations of institutional racism, sexism, and colonialism. When Wenger does name racism and sexism explicitly, he says communities of practice, “can reproduce counter productive patterns, injustices, prejudices, racism, sexism, and abuses of all kinds. In fact, [he] would argue that they are the very locus of such reproduction” (1998, p. 132). Though he says this, it is not fully woven into his analysis or much of the work that follows suit.

In his work, Wenger celebrates diversity, saying that “what makes engagement in practice possible and productive is as much a matter of diversity as it is a matter of homogeneity” (1998, p. 75). However, he describes diversity in terms of individual characteristics. When Wenger highlights different salient traits that might influence someone’s experience of a workplace or other community of practice, he focuses on introverted-ness or extroverted-ness, being plain or attractive, and being left- or right-handed (1998, p. 75, 162).¹⁴ While being introverted, for example, might make it difficult to perform certain types of work that require animated engagement with people, the characteristic of being introverted is an individual trait and it does not systemically and institutionally empower or disempower certain classes of people, and is not based in historical relations of dispossession. Wenger focuses on individual power, or power related to particular roles (i.e. a manager), rather than institutional power or systems of oppression. Wenger does note, “even when specific members have more power than others, the practice evolves into a communal response to that situation” (1998, p. 80). However, not everyone has an equal or equitable say in how engagement and participation are negotiated, and so while it is true that it is a communal response, historical and institutional power dynamics play a significant role in how practices evolve, which ways of knowing are valued, what ontologies prevail, and what the communal response is in ways that may continually reaffirm and

¹⁴ We should understand expectations around beauty and outgoing-ness as racialized, gendered, and classed expressions. Rather than ask if someone is attractive, though, an analysis of the social relations that produce gendered and racialized beauty norms might be more fruitful than a conversation about if being plain is a historically, systemically oppressed social identity. If right-handed-ness is a key component of a community of practice’s joint work, then the tools ought to be understood as disabling, and disability studies has much to offer these discussions (Titchkosky 2011).

re-entrench certain people's power while continually marginalizing others. Attention to these dynamics would strengthen the communities of practice approach.

Across Lave and Wenger's work, there is a clear call for attention to social relations. They repeatedly acknowledge the significance of power, and demand that further work be taken up to build on their initial theorizations bolstering it and further contextualizing it in the realities of our historical moment and attending to the particularities of how capitalism, racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy shape communities and their practices. We need to answer their call and analyze situated learning alongside transhistorical relations of power as they manifest within and beyond communities of practice, as well as how practices reproduce and reinscribe social relations of dominance. To theorize learning in context, we must analyze the contexts of power.

5.3 Social Relations in Situated Learning and Communities of Practice

Social relations of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism are active processes enacted by people across the local and translocal, and necessarily in relationship within, and specific to, the historical mode of life under capitalism. In other words, gender is not a fixed thing, nor is race, nor is colonialism: we *do* gender, racialization, and colonialism (Smith, 1987; Ng, Staton, & Scane, 1995). These ongoing historical processes assign power and privilege to people in dominant groups via institutions and practices, enacted by people in daily life. These relations are enacted across different scales, from the micro-interactional to repertoires of practice to the epistemological and ontological, co-producing each other across scales. They may be performed differently in particular spaces, and there is flexibility in the ways they are enacted, yet they are also coordinated transhistorically. These relations are co-constituting. Racialization, gender, and colonialism exist in dialectical relation with each other (Bannerji, 2001).

The move to centre relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism analytically within communities of practice is decidedly not a move to essentialize gendered, racialized, and/or colonial performances as natural, immutable, or inherent to particular bodies or cultures. Rather, I am accounting for how social relations in the practices of socializations, cultures, and contexts create ways of being that are not available to all people evenly. Gutiérrez and Rogoff (2003) offer the concept of "repertoires of practice" to talk about the ways that practices can be linked to cultural and historical experience, rather than traits of individuals. Their work is useful, laying

out the contours of cultural practices in community while repeatedly stressing the importance of understanding these practices as dynamic and contextually relevant. They propose:

A shift from the assumption that regularities in groups are carried by the traits of a collection of individuals to a focus on people's history of engagement in practices of cultural communities. In cultural-historical approaches, cultural differences are attributed to variations in people's involvement in common practices of particular cultural communities (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 21).

Their work gives us a language within sociocultural studies to talk about the ways that practices can be tied up with cultural and historical practices, and how their travel within communities of practice is understandable, and even expected, but not pathologized or tied to the biology or cognition of individual members. What is necessary to add to their theorization is intensive historicization around how groups have been constructed historically, institutionally across time. When I talk about social relations, it is a way of capturing both the cultural practices of the group and the institutional, historical relations that dialectically produce them and are reproduced through them. Gutiérrez and Rogoff's definition focuses on culture, rather than social relations, and I extend their usage to accommodate the political contexts that constrain and shape cultural practices through both material and symbolic means.

While theorizing repertoires of practice highlights the activity of people effectively, it does not attend to the epistemological and ontological aspects of communities. As with repertoires of practice, epistemologies and ontologies are never universal within a social grouping and should not be essentialized. Yet epistemologies and ontologies are important to recognize as coordinating processes linked to different social groups that result in different ways of knowing, being, and participating. These are rooted in history, in place, and in power relations. Together, the practices, epistemologies, and ontologies of communities of practice must be interrogated to investigate if and how social relations of power are made salient in communities of practice, and offer nuanced ways of articulating learning within the context of racialization, gender, and colonialism.

5.4 Racialization, Gender, and Colonialism in the Situated Learning Literature

In the situated learning and communities of practice literatures, little work has been done to attend to social relations of difference analytically. Contu and Willmott (2003) argue that in this literature, power relations are often ignored as an analytic category¹⁵. They critique the field of situated learning and communities of practice, pointing out the dearth of analysis and arguing that participants in a community cannot be expected to learn practices they do not have access to. They argue that power dynamics within a community of practice are critical to analyses of who is able to learn which practices, and why they have access and others may not. Stressing the importance of power relations in learning theory, Contu and Willmott claim that attention to power dynamics must be re-embedded in analyses of situated learning. Others have made similar critiques, noting the inattention to power, the embedded assumption of heterogeneity in communities of practice, and the inherently reproductive aspects of the theories (Fuller, Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2005; Hughes, Jewson & Unwin, 2007).

There have been some critiques of the ways modes of participation may be gendered and require certain gendered performances in order to be successful (Hodges, 1998; Paechter, 2003a, 2006; Salminen-Karlsson, 2006; Curnow, 2013). The articles on women in communities of practice show not all practices are attainable or desirable for women (Hodges, 1998; Salminen-Karlsson, 2006; Callahan & Tomaszewski, 2007). They argue that the full practices of the communities they study are gendered as masculine and in service to the ways men tend to navigate the world. Notably, many pieces that have engaged women's experiences in a community of practice centre unspecified and undifferentiated women's experiences, a move that universalizes and flattens women's experiences into a unified whole that feminists of colour have argued against (Spelman,

¹⁵ Class is interrogated in the situated learning and communities of practice literatures. A core piece of the communities of practice genre is workplace learning analysis that centres the employment relationship (Billett, 1994; Fuller & Unwin, 2003; Fuller, Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2005).

1988; Collins, 1986). These articles are nonetheless useful for raising the significance of social relations in terms of how individual members navigate communities of practice, and acknowledging the ways that practices and modes of participation may be linked to sex and gender.

Unfortunately, no such analogues exist which engage racialization and colonialism. Discussions of how race and colonialism enable and constrain access to communities of practice and modes of participation are non-existent, as is work that attends to racialization, gender, and colonialism as co-constituting relations that must be analyzed as a dialectical whole, rather than discrete categories. This is a significant gap in the situated learning literature.

Understanding how processes of racialization, gender, and colonialism actively construct communities of practice through their repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies is a critical area for theorization. Without accounting for the ways power relations based in social relations of racialization, colonialism, and gender shape and are shaped by the practices, epistemologies, and ontologies of communities, learning cannot be understood and theorized adequately. In the sections that follow, I demonstrate the significance of this gap in the hopes that situated learning and communities of practice theorists will begin to take seriously and substantively integrate social relations into learning analysis.

5.5 Situated learning in a multiracial, multigender, settler-colonial community of practice

In this section, vignettes from an environmentalist organization demonstrate how the repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies of the community of practice were racialized, colonial, and gendered in ways that privileged people from social locations of dominance. This rendered participants with less privilege because of their social locations marginalized and peripheral. Each set of vignettes demonstrates the ways repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies of the community of practice were shaped by social relations, and explores the ways that this impacted participants' abilities to participate and become recognized.

The vignettes draw on a case study approach, where I have selected instances from a larger body of research. Case studies allow us to elaborate on theory based on the specificities of single instances, and to generalize from the patterns that emerge across instances (Yin, 2009). Each

vignette has been selected for its ability to speak to a gap in the way that situated learning theory can be taken up. The cases are generalizable to theoretical propositions, yet make no claims to speak for all communities of practice or all research that employs situated learning frameworks. The vignettes do not fully analyze this community of practice, but demonstrate some of the ontological and epistemological gaps in situated learning itself. The discussion offers interpretations of the experiences of non-dominant members of the community of practice in ways that reflect their learning, repertoires of practice, and resistance more fully.

The vignettes are drawn from a multi-year, video-based research project conducted with a university-campus-based, climate-change activist community of practice. The project traced the learning trajectories of a diverse group of participants as they worked on a campaign to shift the investment policies of a large university away from the fossil fuel industry. The group met weekly to plan strategy, and held events to raise awareness and build support. The meetings included from 12 to 37 students, and were multiracial and multigender spaces. The group was majority White, with a significant number of people of colour. Men and women attended meetings in roughly even numbers and no students openly identified as non-binary. Vignettes were drawn from video of meetings and rallies, focal participant interviews, audio recordings, emails, and field notes.

Initially, the vignettes were developed through a process of interpreting the data through the lens of situated learning theory to address questions of gendered participation. However, through this analysis, I found aspects where situated learning theory could be sharpened to accommodate the power dynamics that were pervasive in the dataset. This analysis led me to look for other places where situated learning tools did not enable a robust analysis of racialized, gendered, and colonial dynamics. General patterns across data were described to show salience of the new additions to the theory. Of the coded instances, these vignettes were selected based on their ability to illustrate the recurrent phenomenon and the gaps in the theory most effectively.

These vignettes illustrate some of the areas that situated learning and communities of practice theory would be strengthened through a broader analysis of social relations of power. Focusing on the repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies allows a detailed analysis of different ways that racialization, gender, and colonialism were reproduced in the group. For the purposes of analysis, practices, epistemologies, and ontologies were teased apart, though they are

co-constituting, with the practices shaping and being shaped by the epistemological and ontological foundations, and vice versa. Exploring how situated learning theory and communities of practice theory often miss these dynamics allows us to shed light on different types of learning beyond the reproduction of the dominant practices and oppressive social relations and complicates how we theorize learning, participation, and mastery.

5.5.1 On Gendered Practices and Repertoires of Practice

Vignette 1

Graham is a White man who was in his first year of law school. Graham had not been involved in activism before, and joined the group during his second month of law school. In meetings, Graham frequently spoke, expressed confidence through his talk and his tone, responded authoritatively to questions, and weighed in often on the decisions of the group. After only two months of involvement, he became one of the spokespeople vested with responsibility for negotiating directly with the administration. Other members of the group often deferred to him, named him explicitly as an “expert”, and cited his experience as important and helpful, despite the fact that he had less activist experience and formal expertise than other members.

Ariel, a White woman in fourth year, had been involved in the group longer than all but two participants. Ariel was well versed in the politics of climate change and was relatively experienced in activism on campus. She spoke frequently. Participating in whole-group conversations and exclusive talk between only a few members during the meetings for the purposes of quick decision-making were core practices in the group, and Ariel actively engaged in both. She was a co-president of the group, yet men in the group regularly talked over her, made decisions without her, and attributed her verbal contributions and her campaign work to other men.

Ariel’s repertoire of practice was qualitatively different than men in positions of mastery. Her talk was often framed as a question, offering an idea and then ending her sentence in a higher key, or inviting collaboration at the end of a contributions, asking, “but what do other people think?”. The majority of her talk turns were encouraging others through affirmative statements which she called “verbal head nods” to create a welcoming environment for others’ participation. Though Ariel had more experience and was in a formal leadership position, her mode of

participation was often unrecognized by the group. She sought the opportunity to present at a high stakes meeting that had the potential to shape the outcome of the campaign, but several men in the group suggested she was not capable, because she was not assertive enough or “quick on her feet”, which they viewed as necessary performances for representing the campaign. At an end-of-year focus group among women, multiple participants said they had not known Ariel was a co-president based on how others in the group reacted to her participation.

Normative Situated Learning Analysis

Graham’s case follows an ideal, though perhaps expedited, trajectory from a position as a newcomer to one of mastery through legitimate peripheral participation. He entered the community of practice with little experience and was given opportunities to participate in the tasks of the community. He quickly mastered the central practices of public speaking and brokering, and as he did so, he gained more access to the leadership practices of the group and was trusted with higher stakes activities. He became recognized as an expert and was in a position to judge the contributions of others in the group, and he used his position to shape the frames and goals of the group.

A situated learning analysis might suggest that Ariel was in the process of legitimate peripheral participation; she was not a novice, but had not become recognized as a full participant in the community. While she did many of the practices and understood the community philosophies deeply, she was not recognized by members in positions of mastery or by new members. Her performance would likely be assessed as doing some of the right practices, like participating actively in the group meetings, but not doing them in the proper register. Her engagement was not read by the group as an expert performance. Her position might be identified as legitimately peripheral, in the process of becoming a full participant, yet until she learned to reproduce registers of confidence, as Graham had, she was unlikely to earn recognition as a full participant in the community of practice.

Complicating our analysis

Many analyses of situated learning might look at these cases and ascribe learning and mastery to Graham, but not to Ariel. However, situating communities of practice within the broader context of patriarchal social relations complicates that analysis. If we look to research in how gender is

constructed and performed, we understand gender as a collaborative process, and much of what is assessed in the environmentalist community of practice above is the ability to do gender in particular ways. Theorizations of “doing gender” (West & Zimmerman, 1987; 2009) argue that gender is a process that individuals and communities enact through their interaction. Gender is not natural or inherent to bodies or necessarily sex-linked, but is a social production that is contextually-bound and continually performed (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Paechter (2003b) argues that communities of practice theory provides a way of thinking about the formation and perpetuation of localized masculinities and femininities, where gendered performances are learned and reproduced in the context of a community. Bridging situated learning theory with an interactional critique of the production of gender helps us to see how communities construct gendered repertoires of practice which may reproduce patriarchal gender relations.

In the vignette, Graham is successful at projecting confidence and authority, which studies of masculinity (Connell, 1990; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) would locate within a performance of hegemonic masculinity. Graham’s performance is embedded within gendered power relations and reproduces them through his interactional practice. Hegemonic masculinity is described by Connell and Messerschmidt as “the pattern of practice (i.e. things done, not just a set of role expectations or an identity) that allow men’s dominance over women to continue” (2005). Hegemonic masculinities reflect the social practices that produce dominance in their relevant contexts; linking them to rugged frontiersman ideologies, performances of transnational business, and other modes of masculinity that produce mainstream ideas about what it is “to be a man”. Studies also link Whiteness and masculinity, arguing that masculinities are racialized in their specificity, and that White men, for example, do masculinity in ways that are distinct from men of colour (Epstein, 1998; Hughey, 2011). These studies fit with studies of gendered behavior and socialization to demonstrate the ways that assertive, highly vocal participation and decision-making produce performances of masculinity.

Graham’s practices of assertive and frequent participation fit within a North American pattern of hegemonic masculinity that reflect the social production of masculine behaviours and their disproportionate valuation relative to feminine and non-binary gender performances. For example, research has shown that White boys and men receive more encouragement to participate frequently, to respond quickly, and to project authority in their speech acts (Benwell, 2014; Speer, 2005). Brokering and leadership are often seen as masculine traits, and masculine

performances may be conflated with leadership (Sinclair, 2005). Graham's repertoire of practice in the community of practice reflects the dominant performances of masculinity. His participation thus reflects his gendered repertoire of practice, which is read as mastery within the community of practice, by both those in positions of mastery and those positioned as newcomers.

In contrast, Ariel's participation reflects dominant gendered repertoires of practice for those gendered as women and girls. Her speech acts employed uptalk, ending her sentences at a higher pitch, as one would when asking a question (McLemore, 1991). Sociolinguistic studies have shown that this is a pervasive phenomenon, particularly among young women, and serves the social function of hedging contributions in order to appear not overly confident (Wolk, Abdelli-Beruh & Slavin, 2012). Ariel commonly used other forms of hedging in her speech, including explicit hedges, like "I think...", "I dunno..." and bids for affirmation, "y'know?" or "do you think??" . These patterns are also common among young women and serve to soften the assertions they make and to gain legitimacy from others (McLemore, 1991, Kitzinger, 2009; Speer, 2005; Stokoe & Smithson, 2001). Both strategies are considered linguistically innovative, but are persistently viewed negatively by men. Ariel's performance of a common feminine repertoire of practice did not gain her recognition as a competent participant in the community. Instead, her register was often labeled in the group as "weak" or as lacking confidence, and therefore inappropriate by those in positions of mastery and unacknowledged by the broader membership.

This is significant for situated learning in that it demonstrates how particular practices within a community are embedded in and reproduce social relations of power in an ongoing way. What has largely gone unrecognized in situated learning is that the practices of a community may be located within particular social relations such that they reinforce power relations. Graham's ability to participate and become recognized was largely related to his ability to do hegemonic masculinity in the community of practice. What was expected of him and what was measured as a learning accomplishment was participation in a repertoire of practice that he was already fluent in. Within this community of practice, privilege within social relations advantaged Graham significantly, and some of his recognition may have resulted from his privileged repertoire of practice. Thus for Graham, developing an identity of mastery in the community reflected his hegemonic White masculine repertoires of practice.

In contrast, Ariel's participation remained peripheral regardless of what she learned based on her inability to do hegemonic masculinity convincingly. The practices expected of her stemmed from a masculine mode of participation that she had less experience projecting. Further, if Ariel had enacted hegemonic masculinity, she may have faced negative consequences by being labeled as "pushy" or "bitchy", as happened with another woman in the group who performed the same assertive register that Graham did. The practices and the community of practice's evaluation of them disadvantaged Ariel's repertoire, which was embedded in and reproduced social relations of patriarchy. In this case, Ariel's success in the community of practice would require her to "overcome" her gendered repertoire of practice, reinforcing dominant repertoires of practice that reproduce relations of dominance and disproportionately recognize those in positions of privilege.

Implications for Situated Learning Theory

These cases show how the practices of this community clearly advantaged White men and indicate that learning analysts must situate the practices that are being learned within a broader context of power. This holds for racialized and colonial repertoires of practice as well, where particular practices are embedded within the histories and practices of particular groups and situated within historical and institutional relations of power. If we do not situate the practices within their sociohistorical contexts, we may misread the power dynamics that are reproduced in communities of practice as indicators of learning.

Situated learning theorists should keep these relations in mind when describing and analyzing learning trajectories, so that learning is not uncritically conflated with reproducing dominance. While learning may certainly be a component, we need to understand dominant practices within their historical and interactional contexts. Ways of participating may be rooted in cultural repertoires of practice; they are not evenly available to all participants in a community of practice. The full practices of a community may re-inscribe inequitable power relations, not based on learning, but based on the social relations of inequity.

5.5.2 On Whiteness as an Epistemological A Priori in a Community of Practice

Vignette 2

Halfway through the year, a member of the leadership put forward a proposal that the group adopt an “Intersectionality Clause”. The clause was a statement of values recognizing that “climate change is the by-product of settler colonialism in addition to structural racism, sexism, ableism, queerphobia, and classism.” The proposal was controversial, and in the discussion, three White men in positions of mastery challenged the logic of the statement in quick succession, arguing that there were “unproven claims” that needed “evidence”. They disagreed with the claim that climate change is a by-product of settler colonialism, arguing that that there was no provable causal relationship, and that climate change stems from many causes. After a short discussion between few participants, the proposal was pulled.

Later that week, Amil, a Black man who grew up in Guyana who was in his fourth year, expressed frustration with the dismissal of the clause. Amil attended almost every meeting, was deeply engaged in the work behind the scenes, and had a long a history of organizing on campus. Amil rarely spoke during group meetings. Since the way of garnering recognition in the group was participation in the meetings and brokering with the administration, he was not recognized by those in positions of mastery as a full participant, as evidenced by his lack of inclusion in important events and decision-making. He said:

It's really tough. How can you be involved in a campaign when your entire reason for being involved with a campaign is not welcome? There's no pulling the colonial framing, the racist framing apart from the campaign. This is how I frame it, this is how people I can speak for that are not in Western countries frame it. This is how Indigenous people frame it. You're saying that the people who identify with this framing aren't important. I think, and this is my opinion, that the White men – based on how they talk about the issue of intersectionality – think that a lot of people think like straight White males.

Amil disagreed with the contention that there was not evidence of the connection between colonialism and climate change, so I asked why he had not spoken up. He responded that:

It's just being in White spaces, in general, that have that effect, personally, on me. It's something I've been dealing with since I've been at this university, in terms of putting out your opinions and having them scrutinized, because in instances it's been very vicious. White people say, “you see things this way because it affects you,” and it's like you can't

make an objective argument because you are somehow self-interested in this. It just shuts me down right away.

Normative Situated Learning Analysis

A possible interpretation is that to become a recognized, full member of the community of practice, a member needs to be able to effectively participate in the community, both doing the core practices and doing them in ways that are legitimized by the community. The theory argues that through doing so, members learn the logic of the community and it becomes woven into their practice and their identity. The fact that Amil did not participate might be read as legitimate peripherality, where he was participating through observation, and was not yet ready or able to participate fully in the community. In this vignette, a normative analysis might argue that if Amil hopes to gain recognition, by those in mastery as well as the larger community, he needs to take up the practices that have been negotiated as central to the community, as well as their philosophical underpinnings.

Complicating our analysis

Often in situated learning analysis, ways of knowing are not considered, and the tacit assumption is that they are either shared across a community of practice, or that there is only one way of knowing; dominant epistemologies are treated as a given. This has been labeled the a priori assumption of Whiteness (Moreton-Robinson, 2004), denoting the ways that people from dominant epistemological standpoints do not have to acknowledge their own standpoint, while continually devaluing the epistemological standpoints of others. White, Eurowestern knowledge systems are often assumed as universal, indeed the assumptions of universality and neutrality and the erasure of other epistemologies are among the most defining characteristics of epistemologies of Whiteness (Frankenberg, 1993; Keating, 1995; Roediger, 1999). Due to the presumption of universality, within communities, and, I would argue, among situated learning analysts, epistemologies have not been interrogated in communities of practice literatures. The inattention to the epistemological underpinnings of practices, learning, and communities renders it difficult for us to problematize Amil's marginalization.

In order to effectively analyze this vignette, we need to be able to identify the dominant epistemology at work in the community of practice, which is made visible through contestation

over what claims are true, what kinds of evidence is necessary to prove the claims, and who is in a position to evaluate the claims. The interventions by White men in positions of mastery make some of the epistemological underpinnings of the group clear, through their requests for proof via Eurowestern evidentiary standards (Dixon & Jones, 1998). Of course, the epistemology of a community of practice is not constructed by only three men. Situated learning argues that the practices and philosophies of a community of practice are co-negotiated by its members (Lave and Wenger, 1991), and here we see that negotiation. However, it is not a consensual process, as is often assumed by communities of practice theorists (Hughes, 2007). So while a community of practice's epistemologies are collectively constructed, it is often constructed without explicit consideration, given, again, that epistemologies tend to be universalized to those embedded within them. In this community of practice, other epistemologies were present, yet White men in positions of mastery consistently pushed back against any knowledge forms that were not "objective" enough for them. In this way, they regulated collective knowledge processes, preventing ideas that they disagreed with from taking off, and consistently delegitimizing other ways of knowing through their overt challenges in meetings. While other people in the group had a role in this process and ultimately allowed those in positions of mastery to shape this, it was not an equitable process, and those who articulated other epistemological stances to me outside of meetings said they often kept silent as a way of avoiding public dismissals of their ideas and ways of knowing.

In Amil's pushback, we can see another epistemological stance. He argues for positional knowledge, based on lived experience within a racialized, colonized, and gendered context. His position reflects his experiences in coastal regions of the Global South, where the impacts of climate change and colonialism are continually felt, to disastrous effects. His epistemological move to count experience as a legitimate way of knowing stands in contrast to what those in mastery advocated. Amil's stance was not rooted in inexperience with Eurowestern scientific standards – indeed, he studied environmental sciences in North America – and it is not because he did not understand or could not participate in the construction of Eurowestern knowledge alongside those in mastery in the community of practice. Instead, his move must be analyzed as a clash of ways of knowing and a deliberate, strategic, and axiological choice to advocate for relational and experiential epistemologies.

Interestingly, in the vignette, Amil identified the White epistemological stance inherent to the position of those in mastery, naming it as a racialized and gendered stance that they attempted to universalize. His ability to identify the standpoint of White men reflects his own subjugated knowledge of how epistemologies reproduce systems of power (Sandoval, 1991; Collins, 1986). If Amil was required to take up the epistemologies that dominated the community of practice in order to become recognized, he would have to assume several self-devaluing premises: that dichotomous, oppositional thinking is natural, and that epistemologies of Whiteness are more valuable and objective (Collins, 1986). He would have to reject ways of knowing which centred the experiences of non-dominant people as a way of theorizing power relations, and refrain from drawing on the subjugated knowledges of non-western and Indigenous peoples, and the lived experiences of impacted people (Leonardo, 2002; Collins, 1986; Sandoval, 1991).

Situated learning theorists could conclude that Amil did not learn because he did not take up the dominant epistemology and did not participate vocally in meetings, or that whatever learning he did do was immaterial to the community and its core practices. But he did learn, reading the racialized context in nuanced ways that led him to participate strategically. His refusal to speak in anticipation of claims that he was biased and self-interested may be seen as a way of mitigating the negative assessment of his epistemological stance by White men in positions of mastery. In not speaking, his contributions could not be named as non-objective, and so he could retain his position of peripherality. Though he could not become a full participant, his silence may have kept him from being further marginalized. Strategic moves like this have been demonstrated across education research of race, where students of colour have been shown to resist their marginalization through withdrawing participation to insulate themselves as well as to contest the racialization processes at play in educational contexts (Nasir, 2011, Noguera, 2009). We need to understand Amil's silence within the broader context of his ways of knowing being devalued and his nonparticipation as a strategic form of resistance and learning. Instead of marking Amil's position as legitimately peripheral, we need different tools for theorizing his learning, which involved reading the racial dynamics of the community of practice and developing contingencies, as well as his ability to name the epistemological barriers to his full participation and recognition in the group. This learning allowed him to find a space within the community while subject to the constraints of his marginalized position without sacrificing his epistemological commitments. To argue that this type of learning is less relevant to the

community than the learning done by those who are not so constrained, privileges the participation of the latter. If we, as situated learning theorists, assessed Amil's participation and learning without accounting for the epistemological contestation that sits at the heart of this case, we run the risk of reproducing racialized, gendered, and colonial assumptions about the superiority and universality of epistemologies of Whiteness.

Implications for Situated Learning Theory

Across studies of situated learning, there is an implicit assumption that how knowledge is generated and evaluated in a given community of practice is shared across all members and the collective. However, in communities of practice where epistemologies are not shared, this creates a yet untheorized problem for situated learning. Asking that members of a community of practice take up different understandings of how things are known can be a significantly different task than taking up the practices and registers of a community of practice. If communities of practice require adopting a dominant epistemology, then learning in a community of practice significantly disadvantages those with other epistemological positions, whose ways of knowing are degraded and replaced. This process reinscribes the universality of epistemologies of Whiteness which are predicated on objectivity, neutrality, and the ability to know the world through decontextualized analysis (Roediger, 1999; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2000; Dixon & Jones, 1998).

Revealing the epistemologies of a community of practice allows us to contextualize learning, including what is known, how it is known, and who is able to become a knower. It allows us to situate theories of knowledge within their historical relations of power and to interrogate the knowledge claims of those in mastery and their criteria for recognizing full participants. If we do not explicitly attend to the ways that racialized, gendered, and colonial epistemologies produce philosophies and modes of participation that are reproduced through the community of practice, we likely miss a significant analytic for understanding who becomes recognized, who does not, how ideas and practices develop and become part of the full practices.

5.5.3 On Diverse Ontologies in Communities of Practice

Vignette 3

Keara, a Nêhiyaw (Cree) woman in her first year, was tasked with recruiting Indigenous Elders and other community members to speak at and participate in an event that was rapidly approaching. Outreach to different groups was a common practice in the group, and was often a starting point for new participants to demonstrate their competence in recruiting and discussing the issues of the campaign. In conversation, Keara told me how she felt she could not go to Elders and ask them to sign on to an event that they had no hand in creating for an organization that they did not have a relationship with. She believed it would be a dramatic breach of the local Indigenous protocol, which centres relationship and reciprocity—neither of which she felt were adequately present. She did not have time, given the timeline imposed, to build a relationship between the environmental organization and local Indigenous organizations or to approach the request in a good way. However, she believed that those in positions of mastery read her resistance to recruiting as incompetence, laziness, and unprofessionalism, leaning on racialized tropes about Indigenous people.

Those in positions of mastery thought the task they assigned her was simple and that she merely needed to send a few emails and possibly follow up with phone calls. They likely did not understand the gravity of what they were asking her from an Indigenous worldview. When Keara refused to leverage her personal reputation on what she understood as an unethical, exploitative, and tokenizing process, her behaviour was pathologized by settlers in positions of power. The assessment that her participation was inadequate was likely compounded by her gendered participation, given the assumption that assertiveness and expressions of hegemonic masculinity demonstrated competence. Her mode of participation was not considered legitimate, and men in positions of mastery suggested to her that she had not learned how to do her job.

Normative Situated Learning Analysis

Situated learning analysis might suggest that Keara's refusal to participate in the practices of the community meant that she was either unable or unwilling to become a full member, that she did not understand the logic of the community, or that she had not learned the relevant skills and ways of participating that would allow her to become a full, recognized member of the community of practice. Keara's peripheralization might be interpreted as a result of her own choice not to integrate, ultimately assigning responsibility for her peripherality to her individually.

Complicating our analysis

Situated learning analysts might struggle to theorize the learning dynamics at play in this community of practice, given Keara's refusal to participate in the practices that were expected in ways that would be legible to those in positions of mastery. If situated learning theory does not take diverse ontologies into account, it becomes difficult to parse these dynamics. If we accept that diverse ontologies may exist and that they are significant within a community of practice, then we gain the ability to theorize Keara's learning and resistance from her own ontological position and historicize the ways that others in the community expected her compliance within their own ways of knowing and being. Situated learning theorists should look to other ontologies to understand the dynamics when, as Blackfoot scholar Leroy Little Bear has referred to this, "jagged world views collide" (2000).

In this community of practice, the practices that were expected of new members may not seem unreasonable, and they accurately reflected the skills that full members built and relied on regularly as part of their work. However, the assumptions embedded in the practice revealed a Eurowestern settler approach to building relationships. When Keara was asked to do boundary-crossing work, it surfaced her discomfort with the way the community of practice operated, stemming from the epistemological, ontological, and axiological moorings of the seemingly simple practice. Indigenous stories and scholarship have long documented the different ways of knowing and being that Indigenous life centres around, as compared to settler-colonial ways of knowing and being (Little Bear, 2000; Simpson, 2001, 2011; Deloria, 1995). Indigenous scholars argue that relational ontologies are central to Indigenous ways of knowing (Wilson, 2008; Absolon, 2011; Smith, 1999) and require deep relationships of reciprocity, respect, responsibility, and relevance in order to be considered balanced relationships. There are many other foundational ontological differences between Eurowestern settler-colonial ways of being and ontologies of Indigenous peoples, whether that be on a specific nation by nation basis or a pan-Indigenous ontological frame, including differences in the relationship between individuals and communities, ecological systems, and the more than human (Bang, 2015), the relationship between mind, body, and spirit (Little Bear, 2000), the significance of land (Simpson, 2004), citizenship (TallBear, 2013), and time (Smith, 1999), as well as many other premises. These are not universal or essential characteristics, nor are they static and fixed in time (Little Bear, 2000).

As with other ontologies, they are collectively produced and constantly negotiated by people, yet coordinate the ways that people view the world and their place within it.

When Keara eventually chose not to engage the Indigenous individuals and communities she was asked to in the ways that were expected of her, members of the community of practice did not identify a problem with their practice, but instead assumed that she was not capable. Situated learning theorists must be careful not to fall into the same judgment, because doing so reproduces several highly problematic colonial processes. It ignores the Eurowestern settler ontologies that underpinned the practices being demanded of Keara, normalizing and invisibilizing them. As with our earlier discussion of non-dominant epistemologies, failure to attend to ontologies within communities of practice tends to reinforce the sense of universality of dominant ways of being while erasing non-dominant ways of being. For Indigenous peoples, this has been an ongoing process of contestation, where for generations Eurowestern settlers have sought to erase and replace Indigenous ontologies (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013; Simpson, 2004, 2011). This happens through explicit measures of cultural suppression like banning cultural practices, through residential schooling designed to “take the Indian out of the child”, and through the everyday erasure of Indigenous ways (Simpson, 2004, 2011). The everyday erasure tends to be most difficult for settlers to see, as it is a process of replacing Indigenous ways with dominant, Eurowestern ways that are understood by settlers as normal (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). The process of imposing settler ways of being, though, is a process of cultural genocide, which denigrates and replaces Indigenous ontologies. Given this context, we must be highly attentive to the ways that communities of practice implicitly impose settler ways of being through their practices and ways of knowing. What is being asked of Keara in this vignette was not merely a routine exercise in outreach, but a radically different mode of interacting. Thus, situated learning theorists must assess the practices and modes of participation in a community of practice with an eye toward the larger coordinating theories of knowledge and being, and with great attention to the historical power relations that have informed them.

The ontologies of those in positions of mastery in the community are highly relevant to situated learning analysis. Based on my observations of this campaign, I suspect that had the men in positions of mastery here been directly told that what they were asking of Keara would not only be ineffective, but would reproduce colonial relations that would harm rather than support

Indigenous peoples' engagement, they may have shifted their expectations. The fact that they were not told likely further reinforced their sense that it was a reasonable ask and that Keara was just not doing her job. I raise this not to excuse their behaviour, but to identify the ontological perspective that they brought to bear; without considering their ontologies analytically, situated learning theorists cannot situate the practices within the settler-colonial and racialized relations that allowed them to privilege their own perspectives. For these men, who were firmly entrenched in the group and in positions of leadership and privilege beyond it, intervening on tasks they disagreed with was a common practice that held little risk. However, this was not the case for Keara. Her position in the group was more precarious, and as a young, Native woman, she was aware that her actions were scrutinized differently, though men in mastery likely did not consciously realize that. More significantly, though, Indigenous ontologies tend to work from an ethic of non-intervention (Rogoff, 2011). Within Keara's ontologically grounded repertoire of practice, withdrawal would be an appropriate form of non-intervention; not doing what was asked should clearly demonstrate that she disagrees. However, the settler colonial logic of the community of practice did not read her withdrawal as strategic or as an active form of alternate participation. Instead, they read it as lazy, drawing on particularly racialized ideas of Indigenous people.

For situated learning theorists, it is important that we not reinscribe the same racialized tropes through our analyses. An analysis that dismisses strategic withdrawal in the context of Indigenous ontologies ignores the ways that Keara's practices were appropriate for her cultural context and responsive to the historical relations of settler colonialism that have shaped Indigenous-settler relationships. This othering, by members of the community of practice, and potentially reproduced through situated learning analysis, reflects the ontological priorities of settlers and an inattention to the context of Indigeneity, which fails to acknowledge the strategic reasons an Indigenous person might withdraw. For Keara, her withdrawal from the outreach assignment was a way of not reproducing settler dominance in Indigenous communities and of protecting Native organizers from potentially predatory relationships.

For Keara, acting in culturally appropriate ways was marked as an illegitimate way of participating within the community of practice, drawing on ongoing colonial relations that marked Indigenous ways of being as invalid. Her practices were appropriate to the task, making possible the potential for boundary-crossing, but racialized and colonial assumptions by people

in the community of practice labeled those as inappropriate. Keara's non-participation in the dominant practices should not be read as a failure to learn or as legitimate peripherality. She was learning, but she did not reproduce the dominant settler practices of the community. This was a process of learning resistance for Keara. She was beginning to name the practices she was being asked to reproduce as settler and cultivating a critique of settler-colonial ontologies. As part of her process, she became committed to embodying Indigenous ontologies, focusing on cultural resurgence via Indigenous ways of knowing and being as a prefigurative political act to combat the erasure of Indigenous peoples (Simpson, 2011). The learning and transformation she experienced is not easily analyzed through the lens of communities of practice, indicating the need for more robust tools for understanding learning within the context of settler-colonial power relations.

Implications for Situated Learning Theory

As with our epistemological interventions, we need to anticipate that there may be diverse ontologies within communities of practice, and attend to the ways that the different ways of knowing are made salient through participation. In some communities of practice, certain tasks may require fluency in cultural practices and ontologies that are not shared by all members. In instances where the community of practice is embedded in and reproduces dominant ways of being, this may require participants from non-dominant positions to make a political choice to comply with the ontological and epistemological assumptions that underpin the task. This means that many of the practices that proliferate in a settler community of practice, while technically being available to an Indigenous person to reproduce, reflect a view of the world that is colonized; in taking up that practice, damage can be done to Indigenous ideologies and practices. While many Indigenous people engage in processes of code-switching, moving between settler and Indigenous ways of being, there is a cost spiritually and politically to not being able to act in ones' own ways (Simpson, 2011). This process of forced bilingualism is part of the colonial project of erasure. It should not be conflated as just another form of learning, as Indigenous members of the community of practice learn to do Whiteness or take up settler ways by adopting ways of talking and interacting that are at odds with their culturally relevant ways of being. Given this potentiality, situated learning theorists must contextualize the practices and philosophies of a community of practice, so that we are clear when participants are expected to reproduce relations of dominance, either explicitly or implicitly.

Furthermore, situated learning analysis should not be implicated in furthering this colonial project. By attending to the racialized and colonial ontological underpinnings of communities of practice and their activities, we can disrupt the tendency to view practices as universally available to all members. By not assuming that settler ways of acting, knowing, and being are universally held, we can more accurately identify the learning processes at play and more fully describe the negotiation of meaning across ontological assumptions.

5.6 Conclusions

Theorizing learning outside the context of social relations of power is like a physics instructor's infinite frictionless plane or a microeconomics lecturer's perfectly rational consumer – abstractions that, while useful in reducing the many variables at work in complex systems in order to focus on specific aspects of a problem, are ultimately missing key forces at play. To understand how physics or economics work in real life, we need to complicate the analysis. The same is true for situated learning. We live in meaningfully racialized, gendered, and colonial contexts that shape our practices, ways of knowing, and ways of being. To understand how learning happens in the historicized context of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism, we need to attend to those relations as they shape and are shaped by dominant and non-dominant repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies. Bringing social relations in is like bringing friction into the equation for situated learning theorists. Social relations of power are a significant lurking variable in any analysis that does not substantively engage them.

The vignettes discussed in this paper demonstrate some of the ways that gender, racialization, and colonialism were made salient through the practices, epistemologies, and ontologies of the community of practice. The first examined how gendered repertoires of practice might be conflated with expertise in a community of practice, reproducing patriarchal relations of power that disproportionately value hegemonic masculine repertoires of power. This vignette shows us how repertoires of practice can be gendered and racialized, and how non-dominant repertoires of practice may be read as less valuable and illegitimate, and suggests that situated learning theorists must attend to the ways practices, registers, and repertoires of practice may be entrenched in particular social locations which unevenly advantage privileged people within dominant social relations.

The second vignette looked at the ways epistemologies are mobilized in communities of practice and how that shapes what is known, how it is known, and who is recognized as a knower. The vignette showed how a non-dominant epistemology rendered many participants as marked members who those in positions of dominance argued were not capable of objectivity, while their own objectivity, through an epistemology of Whiteness, was assumed. This has implications for who can become a recognized knowledge producer in the community, and suggest that theorists must attend to the diverse epistemologies that may be present in a community of practice, and attend to how different ways of knowing can shape the participation and cognition of members from diverse social locations.

Finally, the third vignette assessed the ways that ontologies shape the practices and ways of knowing within communities of practice. I argued that shared ontologies among members cannot be assumed. The vignette showed how settler-colonial ways of being shaped particular practices, and how that rendered an Indigenous participant unable and unwilling to participate in legitimate ways. This demonstrates for situated learning theorists the need to attend to multiple ontologies and to critically inspect what is being asked of participants, given that the reproduction of dominant power relations can serve as a dehumanizing, patriarchal, racializing, and colonial process. Taken together, these vignettes offer an alternative approach to mobilizing situated learning in the context of social relations, one that centres relations of power by analyzing how gender, racialization, and colonialism shape and are shaped by the practice, epistemologies, and ontologies of a community of practice.

Communities of practice are not politically neutral, practices are not equally and universally available, and ways of knowing and being within communities of practice are embedded within social relations of power. These truths mean that learning is never a simple process of reproduction of the full practices of a community of practice; it is always a complicated negotiation of power dynamics that navigates the dominant practices of a particular community in relation to the dominant social relations of racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy. Without attending to these social relations in learning analysis, we may theorize in ways that are inaccurate and reproductive of dominant power relations. This is especially critical given that situated learning theory does not operate in the abstract—it is used to design, shaping learning environments and organizational structures. Learning theorists have an important responsibility

to the world to get this right, otherwise we continually reinscribe the dominant relations of White supremacy, patriarchy and colonialism.

Our theorizations matter; it is important that we situate them fully. For Ariel, naming her marginalization as gendered emboldened her to demand more recognition, even when she was not enacting hegemonic masculinity, and inspired her to intentionally support other women, whose leadership was also overlooked because of their feminine register. For Amil, working through the logic of Whiteness in the group helped him to recognize and value his own subjugated knowledge and create alternative communities of practice where non-dominant ways of knowing would be welcomed, which gradually shifted the practices in the larger community. For Keara, articulating her assignment through the lens of settler-colonial relations enabled her to reject the task and embark on a different process of relationship building, one that was rooted in Indigenous ontologies and that began by sitting with Elders and listening. Learning in these instances was much richer than the reproduction of dominant practices, epistemologies, and ontologies, but required an analysis that accounts for historic relations of power.

The same is true beyond this case study, where our theorization of power relations and learning matter deeply. If we consider just a few potential contexts, it is clear that this type of analysis is necessary. Take, for instance, the tech sector, where women's low level of participation has consistently been documented. Rather than looking to the ways that women might change their practices and "lean in" in isolation, we would be well served to theorize the community of practice within its historical context, looking at the ways that White, Eurowestern, and masculine repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies shape the context and are constantly reproduced in the community. Alternately, we might look at Indigenous education, especially in light of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's call to action in Canada. Without theorizing learning and education in the context of settler colonialism and the ways that White, patriarchal, and Eurowestern practices, epistemologies, and ontologies have been fundamental to educational initiatives, we cannot truly understand the context of learning or what is being asked of Indigenous students in the settler school system. These are but two areas where resituating situated learning could bring immense value to our conversations about learning, and there are undoubtedly countless more. We cannot afford to continue to theorize on a frictionless plane, we must centre relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism in our theorizations of learning if they are to bring value to our communities.

Chapter 6 Conclusion

The mainstream environmental movement has long been characterized as a White man's movement that reproduces racialized, patriarchal, and colonial relations. Despite this legacy, some young people involved in the climate movement are working to shift the politics of the wider environmental movement. This dissertation has investigated the process of becoming politicized around social relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism through the lens of situated learning and communities of practice. Investigating the University of Toronto's fossil fuel divestment campaign as part of a two-year participatory action research project has allowed us to explore how the campaign is constructed to reinforce racialized, gendered, and colonial repertoires of practice, ways of knowing, and ways of being. Additionally, the study shows how the normative default space of Whiteness, masculinity, and colonialism was resisted as participants in this environmentalist campaign developed political critiques, alternative practices, relational ways of knowing, and radical identities. Several different analyses have emerged, all of which draw on different constellations of feminist, anti-racist, and Indigenous thought and sociocultural views of learning to inform multi-scalar analyses in service to reconciliation processes within social movements.

In this concluding chapter, I tie the disparate chapters of the dissertation together. First, I briefly review the arguments and findings of each chapter. I then explicitly draw out the four themes that bind the chapters together, focusing on relationality, political vision, participation, and identity as coordinating concepts. After tracing these across the chapters, I identify the contributions the dissertation makes to the learning sciences and to studies of social movement learning, and identify the limitations of this research project. I close by revisiting the commitments of relational accountability I introduced in Chapter Two, highlighting the impacts of this project on focal participants in the research, Fossil Free UofT, the fossil fuel divestment campaign, and the environmental movement.

6.1 Chapters in Review

Chapter One provided an introduction to the environmental movement, arguing that attention to learning about racialization, settler colonialism, and patriarchy is urgent and necessary to unsettle

the normalized dynamics of the movement. It argued that the environmentalist movement has long been steeped in patriarchal, racializing, and settler-colonial logics, ways of knowing, and practices that shape the tactics, strategies, and frames of the movement. The chapter also introduced the popular fossil fuel divestment campaign and Fossil Free UofT, the University of Toronto divestment group. Additionally, the chapter briefly reviewed social movement learning literatures (Hall & Turay, 2006) and emergent work in the learning sciences that focuses on social movements as sites of learning (Kirshner, 2008, 2015; Jurow & Shea, 2015; Curnow, 2013). To lay the groundwork for the subsequent chapters, this chapter also provided an overview of sociocultural theories of learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1996; Wenger, 1998). The chapter also introduced the questions of the study and their significance. Overall, it introduced the political and theoretical context for the research project, framing the research questions within the climate movement and situating the approach within the learning sciences.

Chapter Two outlined the relational ontology and political vision that prefigures my work. It provided an overview of the Indigenous (Wilson, 2008; Smith, 1999), feminist (Maguire, 1987), and militant (Maeckelbergh, 2011; Scheper-Hughes, 1995) methodologies that form the foundation of my approach to knowledge and research. This section included a reflection on my self-location within the research process and the methods of data collection and analysis. It also provided an overview of the collaborative data analysis process, demonstrated the ethic of relationality and accountability throughout the analysis and described the division of labour in the writing and analysis process.

Chapter Three analyzed gendered and racialized participation dynamics within the fossil fuel divestment campaign at UofT. It argues that expertise was conflated with White, masculine modes of practice that undermined women and people of colour's participation and leadership. Through a mixed methods approach, we traced the ways that White men were disproportionately recognized through affirmations and assertions of expertise, while White women's contributions were affirmed less frequently, and people of colour's contributions went unrecognized. We also examined exclusive talk dynamics, which showed that White men participated most often, while White women were significantly outnumbered and people of colour did not participate in exclusive talk.

Chapter Three makes contributions in three major areas. The first is gender studies. This paper contributes to theorizations of “doing gender” (West & Zimmerman, 1987, 2009; West and Fenstermaker, 1995) by analyzing performances of racialized masculinity, arguing that White men’s recognition as leaders and experts was an ongoing interactional accomplishment by people of all genders. This builds upon studies of masculinity (Connell, 1990; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), exploring racialized and gendered expertise as a product of and performance of masculinity. The second area this chapter contributes to is studies of the environmental movement and gender (MacGregor, 2011). This sheds light for environmentalists on how the mainstream environmental movement is continually reinforcing itself as a White man’s movement through an interactional analysis of masculinity and racialization, demonstrating how hegemonic masculinity and Whiteness were constructed. Our work brings detailed analysis to studies of the environmental movement, rather than leaning on essentializing gendered and racialized concepts of “ethics of care” (Arp & Howell, 1995; Bell & Braun, 2010), and instead shows how an environmentalist group can collectively produce a space, though of course through uneven participation and power relations, that is experienced as a default White, masculine space. The third area Chapter Three contributes to is that of expertise (Carr, 2010) and situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991). By explicitly identifying registers of confidence and expertise as racialized and gendered, we complicate notions that learning and becoming an expert are necessarily linked to competent practice. Instead, we argue that it may be linked to racialized and gendered repertoires of practice. This offers an analysis of situated learning that centres power relations, while examining how they are produced interactionally.

Chapter Four argued that politicization must be understood as a learning process embedded in communities and dependent on jointly developing practices, philosophies/concepts, identities, and epistemologies that challenge dominant social relations locally and extralocally (Smith, 1987). Building on the analysis in Chapter Three, this paper shows how participants in an activist community of practice became politicized. We argued that politicization in these spaces was a sociocultural learning process. We defined politicization as a simultaneous process of conceptual, practical, epistemological, and identity development, generating a rich ecology for experimentation with new communities of practice that dramatically and iteratively shaped the politics of the alternative space participants.

Chapter Four contributes to social movement learning studies, as well as youth activism and organizing studies, in that it offers a sociocultural theorization of politicization that encompasses both the individual shifts, cognitive and emotional, as well as the shifts in collective practice, identity, and epistemologies that were distributed across the alternative space members. This theorization of politicization advances sociocultural views of learning that are attentive to the ways racialization, gender, and settler colonialism shape learning opportunities, as well as how the practices, epistemologies, and ontologies of communities of practice may shift through politicization processes. This contributes to learning sciences by developing a more specific language for theorizing politicization, one which is situated within sociocultural conceptions of learning and attentive to social relations of power. For studies of social movement learning, this chapter contributes to the ongoing documentation of social movement practices and the everyday learning in these spaces. It brings a more specified focus on the learning – rather than teaching – dynamics in movements, examining how participants become politicized, support each other’s conceptual development, shift their practices, and reorient their ways of knowing and being.

Chapter Five offered theoretical interventions to situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) theories based on the previous two chapters. This chapter argued situated learning theory must account for power dynamics and social relations of racialization, colonialism, and gender in communities of practice. The paper traces a series of vignettes that come from the dissertation project, with each vignette illustrating a potential gap in the ways that situated learning and communities of practice tend to be operationalized. The first vignette explores how the full practices of a community may be entrenched in particular social locations, granting uneven access to members who do not share a cultural repertoire of practice. The second examines the ways that communities of practice and their activities are embedded in and reproductive of epistemologies that may not be shared by all members. This vignette demonstrates that learning across epistemological divides must be accounted for in the theorization of situated learning, rather than taken for granted or assumed to be shared. Finally, the third vignette explores how ontological differences may be salient within a community of practice, arguing that theorizations that do not account for this are implicated in the erasure of Indigenous peoples and the ongoing settler-colonial project. Overall, this chapter argues that to understand how learning happens in the historicized context of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism, we need to attend to those relations as they shape and are shaped by dominant and

non-dominant repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies, and that mainstream situated learning theorizations must begin to actively account for social relations of power in our analysis of what and how people learn and become in communities of practice.

Chapter Five contributes to the learning sciences by bringing an equity critique to situated learning and communities of practice theorizations, arguing that racialization, gender, and colonialism must be part of the analysis of learning, identity development, and participation. It builds on the strength and utility of situated learning, and models ways that other bodies of research might contribute to more expansive analyses of learning that account for the historical and ongoing continuities of racialization, colonialism, and patriarchy within and beyond communities of practice. This offers a significant challenge to the a priori assumption of Eurowestern ways of knowing and being (Moreton-Robinson, 2004) in communities of practice, while also raising questions about the implicit settler assumptions situated learning is embedded in and tends to reproduce analytically.

6.2 Central Themes

While each chapter stands independently, a few themes cut across the entire manuscript, effectively weaving the chapters together thematically. I trace relationality, a political vision of reconciliation, decolonization, and anti-racism, participation, and identity across each of the chapters. These leitmotifs form the foundation of the dissertation conceptually, tying together the chapters from the design of the research to the politicization of Fossil Free UofT members, to the analysis and findings of the project.

6.2.1 Relationality

The ethic of relationality (Hampton, 1995; Wilson, 2008) runs through this dissertation and is perhaps the strongest force binding the pieces together and governing the research process. This ethic is described explicitly in Chapter Two, as I provided an overview of my relationship to the research questions and the broader political project of reconciliation and antiracism. In Chapter Two, I also recounted my commitment to relational accountability with participants and the environmental movement, explaining how I mobilized participatory action research steeped in Indigenous research methodologies with a commitment to social movement activism through militant ethnography.

Beyond the design and methods, though, relationality provides the backbone for the subsequent analyses. It is embedded in the axiological, epistemological, and ontological foundations of this study. Chapter Three's findings emerged through relationships with women and people of colour who were often marginalized in the Fossil Free UofT community of practice, whose experiences I witnessed, shared, and interpreted alongside other members throughout the research process. My sense of accountability to those members and their trust in sharing stories with me made it possible to develop the coding schema that led to our results. Developing that analytic schema was also a process steeped in relational ways of knowing, as it was a collective process of naming the normalized dynamics in the group. This process challenged collaborative data analysis participants to reflect on and trust their experiences and their relationships to ideas and each other. This process reframed some of their understandings of objectivity and reliability such that they came to value their own lives as sources of knowledge, particularly in relationship to questions of racialized, gendered, and settler colonial power relations. Chapter Four documents this transformation further, noting the ways that relational ways of knowing became a key marker of the alternative space members' politicization. For them, expanding their notions of how one comes to know to include relationality and context was an important part of becoming politicized and moving toward decolonial critiques of Eurowestern ways of knowing and being, which discount relationship, process, context, and experience.

The collective learning process that unfolded through the research also fostered dialectical understandings of the relationships between processes of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism. The assumption that these processes are co-constituting, historicized relations produced and reproduced by people interactionally, locally, and extra-locally runs across all of the chapters. This attention to intersectionality and scale-making (Juwon & Shea, 2015) is very important to the types of analysis that we have conducted and stresses the relationality of scale. Across the chapters of this dissertation, we have looked at different scales and conducted analyses of different grain sizes. We moved from the turn-taking and interactional analysis, to the longitudinal shifts in practices, epistemologies, identities, and politics within the group. We also conducted a brief review of the frames and strategies of the climate and environmental movement. We examined how environmentalist practices continually reproduced and reinforced through the interactional dynamics of mainstream environmental campaigns as well as the institutional choices and constraints of the movement.

While Chapter Three focuses largely on the interactional dynamics of racialization and patriarchy, Chapter Four explores the ways that participants moved from interactional critiques of social relations to abstracted understandings of systemic power relations. Chapter Five further engaged these questions, arguing for a deep integration of relational epistemologies and ontologies as a way of accounting for the significance of power relations in communities of practice by acknowledging how they shape people's access to full participation and power. In the introduction and in this conclusion, I jump scale, linking the interactional and campaign-specific practices and dynamics of the UofT fossil fuel divestment campaign to the broader practices of the mainstream environmental movement and North American society more broadly. These moves to account for the co-constituting relationships between micro, group, movement, and institutions is rooted in a theory of relationality which theorizes social relations of power ecologically.

Furthermore, when asked in a closing reflection, the research collective participants remarked that their most significant learning had been a shift away from accepting the notion of “objectivity” and toward thinking about knowledge and practice as situated, contextual, and above all else, relational. Thus, the process of our research has shifted our thinking, practice, and identities toward a more relational understanding of the world. This shift permeates the analytic chapters and our findings, and is also borne out in our embodied, interactional practices as a research collective and in the activism that has emerged post-campaign.

6.2.2 Politics of Decolonial Reconciliation, Anti-Racism, and Feminist Praxis

The second pillar of this research project is a commitment to decolonial reconciliation, anti-racism, solidarity, and feminist praxis. Broadly, this work seeks to radically shift power relations through shifted identities, modes of participation, and relational epistemologies. The work of politicization in social movements, to my mind, is a process of shifting power dynamics such that participants are able to actively theorize and construct different social relations, social relations that enable participation in multiple ways of knowing and being, that centre rematriation of land to Indigenous peoples (Tuck & Yang, 2012), that address patriarchy in both its interactional and institutional processes, and that intervene in racialization, disrupting racialized hierarchies. The goal of this research is to analyze processes of learning which disrupt

the dominant relations of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism, and give participants tools, concepts, and a community within which to work on dismantling and building alternatives.

This political vision underpins the research design, the practices of the research collective, the relationships of accountability detailed in the section above, the ways of knowing and being that are centred, and the analyses that we are circulating. Accountability to justice movements is the orienting political commitment of this project. It is grounded in an axiology, epistemology, and ontology of relational accountability and militancy. My commitment to broader political goals of disrupting racialized, patriarchal, colonial dominance in local and extralocal expressions animates the design of the research. Our collective research practices prefigure anti-racist, feminist, and decolonial relations. The results serve to help social movement activists refine their practice as they engage in reconciliation processes and redefine environmentalism. Our results have influenced the practices of the group, giving them tools and concrete data for understanding racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism in local and translocal expressions. Throughout the research process, our work has aimed to be accountable to women, Indigenous people, and people of colour in the campaign, and has been driven by the relationship of accountability and political vision of radical reconciliation.

This political commitment is borne out in each chapter in different ways. Chapter One introduced the political context of the colonialism and racialization of the environmental movement and laid out the rationale for the questions we interrogate. We analyze relations of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism, as well as how participants learned and contested them. In this way, the research takes a political stance to support activist practice for reconciliation and decolonization. Chapter Two explained the politics that underpin our practices as a research group and the types of questions we ask. The prefigurative politics (Maeckelbergh, 2011) of our practices are made explicit in this chapter, and can be traced through the analytic chapters. Chapter Three analyzed the racialized, colonial, and gendered relations of Fossil Free UofT, and the analysis provided tools for participants to discuss and problematize the practices of the community of practice. Chapter Four traces and theorizes the politicization process wherein some members of the group became politicized and shifted their practices, identities, and ways of knowing and being to reflect the justice-based analysis they were developing. Chapter Five brings this political critique to learning theory itself, challenging the normative mobilizations of learning theory that erase racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism as

significant relations which enable and constrain learning, participation, and identity development. Each chapter thus takes a political stance, implicitly arguing that historicized power relations must be accounted for across scales, whether it be interactional or systemic, and anti-racist, feminist, decolonial practices must be centred in our work intellectually and politically.

6.2.3 Participation

Participation is another major theme that cuts across all of the chapters of this document, from the design to the theoretical framework to the empirical analyses. Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1996) is a central tool for understanding learning and becoming, and across the chapters I assume that active, sensuous engagement is the bedrock of collective learning. In the different sections of this manuscript, I conceptualize participation slightly differently, but all gravitate around active social engagement.

In Chapter One, I laid out the theoretical framework that guides the subsequent chapters, centring learning as becoming and participation in communities of practice. Participation is thus what I documented and analyzed in order to make claims about learning and politicization. Chapter Two documents my participation in Fossil Free UofT, arguing that engagement in the movement better enabled relationships to participants, ideas, and politics to develop accountably and reliably. My participation in the fossil fuel divestment campaign was fundamental to being able to understand, analyze, and theorize what happened over the course of the campaign; my relational accountability was enabled through joint participation. Chapter Two also explained the research collective's participation and how joint participation in the analysis and writing enabled new forms of relational accountability. Participation in the research process fostered different ways of knowing and being, and made different identities accessible to research collective members, which has further politicized us, and driven us to deeper forms of solidarity practices.

The analytic chapters also orient to questions of participation. In Chapter Three we showed how participation within Fossil Free UofT's meetings and actions was enabled and constrained by social relations of gender, racialization, and colonialism, and how the participation dynamics reinforce privileged participants' access to centrality and opportunities to learn. Constrained participation, in this chapter, is a significant way that racialization and patriarchy were made salient and power relations were re-embedded, rationalized through the discourse of expertise

and learning. In Chapter Four, we showed how participation in other sets of practices, beyond those which were dominant in the Fossil Free UofT community of practice, innovated new sets of philosophies, identities, and epistemologies. Participation, here, becomes a central way of producing and giving meaning to radicalized politics, and shifted participation was one of the clearest markers for identifying who understood themselves as radical. Further, we show how participation is in relationship with the political concepts, identities, and ways of knowing, such that participation is not considered as an isolated set of practices, but a situated, collective phenomenon. In Chapter Five, I theorized how participation and practices can be rooted in cultural repertoires of practice, ways of knowing, and ways of being, and that these must be accounted for within situated learning. Participation in social movement activity is the steady thread across all of these papers, and as the participation dynamics shifted, we can see how that changed the politics, but also how the changed politics, identities, and epistemologies simultaneously required shifted practices. This requires us to think about praxis dialectically, again leaning on dialectical understandings of relationality noted above, to think about and theorize the ways that what we do shapes and is shaped by who we work with and how, and how we collectively think about, name, and frame the social relations we are immersed in, within communities of practice, but also beyond them.

6.2.4 Identity

The final strand woven through this manuscript is the significance of identity and becoming (Lave, 1996). For me, this is a crucial question for the environmental movement: who identifies with the mainstream movement, whose participation is marked as valid, who is made to belong, and who is not. Alternately, we can ask how the mainstream environmental movement might become more embedded in decolonial reconciliation processes, how it might centre anti-racism, and build feminist futurities that enable space for everyone's full, equitable participation and guarantee a livable planet.

Within the context of this research, we examine questions of identity at a smaller scale. Chapter Two includes a substantive discussion of my own identity and how both my social location as a White settler woman and my identity as an activist and anti-racist educator shape my approach to the research questions and design. I also trace how the shared identity and politics of the research collective have shaped the research, and gesture to the ways that this process has been iterative,

with our identities, politics, ways of knowing, and practices continually emerging in conversation with one another in response to our participation in the campaign and our findings in the research. This is an ongoing process of becoming, not arriving, and our praxis and identities have been co-producing, prefiguring a politicized space of inquiry and action.

In the analytic chapters, identity is a persistent variable, playing a key role in what is learned and performed. Within the research project, participants' identities and social locations in the group, as well as beyond it, played a significant role in shaping our standpoints. This, in turn, shaped participants' willingness to engage and participate in questions of politicization, solidarity, and the grievance construction. In Chapter Three, we see only White men who do Whiteness and masculinity in hegemonic ways becoming recognized as experts, while those who do not do that become withdrawn, question their own abilities, and do not become recognized, regardless of their contributions. We can see the collective group identity becoming legible as a White, masculine space—the ideas that are put forward reflect Whiteness and masculinity, and are not reflective of the other participants' ideas or identities. It becomes a space that is identified as White and continually reinforces the kinds of identities that are recognized and supported, through the full practices and philosophies that are affirmed, in the shared space.

In Chapter Four, identity development is a central concept, as we traced the process of becoming politicized. Here we can see how individual participants shifted their own sense of identity through their participation in the collective practice of the alternative space. This, in turn, dramatically shifted the identity of the group, by contesting the practices, identities, and epistemologies that dominated the larger community of practice, and introducing competing sets of practices that enabled broader participation and called on other ways of knowing and being. This clarifies that identity is a shared, social production, not an isolated or individualized phenomenon. Finally, in Chapter Five, identity is still highly relevant, though it is considered at a different grain size. Here we think about identity in terms of social relations and social locations, and the ways that cultural repertoires of practice, epistemologies, and ontologies shape the learning and participation. This further stresses a situated view of identity, one that is rooted in historicized social relations of power. Social location, based on relations of racialization, gender, and colonialism, is held in dialectical tension with identity, and both social location and identity are in relation with learning and participation, as well as ways of knowing and being and political commitments.

Each of these themes – relationality, political vision, participation, and identity – run through the dissertation, but none stands independently. Each of these leitmotifs is intertwined with each other. They rely on and reproduce each other. Their dense weave provides the strong rope that scaffolds the individual analyses and lends coherence to the overall research project and this dissertation.

6.3 Theoretical Significance

6.3.1 Contributions to the Learning Sciences

First, this dissertation brings the process of politicization into focus as a learning accomplishment. It extends the range of analysis that learning sciences works in, bringing sustained attention to non-curricular learning. This work focuses on social relations of equity and how participants learn to name and resist racialization, gender, and settler colonialism through their shared practices. Chapter Three points to specific ways that dominant performances of Whiteness and masculinity may be conflated with learning and expertise, and how expressions of power and privilege can skew analysis of the practices of a community and who is able to accomplish them. For the learning sciences, this makes social relations of power explicit within the analysis of communities of practice and calls for careful attention as we assess who has learned and how we delineate centrality, recognition, and full participation. Chapter 5 extends this work by explicitly challenging some of the epistemological assumptions embedded within situated learning. It also suggests interventions that build upon the strengths of situated learning, sociocultural theories, and the learning sciences more broadly, and looks for ways to weave analysis of historical and contemporary power relations through our analysis of learning. This is firmly based in the argument that communities of practice are not neutral, that their practices and their ways of assessing mastery are rooted in ways of knowing and being that may privilege certain participants based on historical relations. This work builds on other learning scientists who have attended to racialization, gender, and colonialism, and contributes by focusing on situated learning and advocating for a more historicized, critical analysis of different modes of participation and becoming in communities.

Epistemologies within the learning sciences tend toward the positivist, based in colonial logics that decontextualize, gutting the relationships between the knower and what is known, as well as the larger histories in which relations have been constructed. Even the materialist and post-

structuralist work in the learning sciences tends to be rooted in and reproductive of Eurowestern theories of knowledge and ways of knowing, and shifting the assumed universality of these approaches will be a longer project within the learning sciences. This dissertation brings in and acknowledges other ways of knowing, providing alternatives to “objectivity” and “reliability” that persist in the learning sciences. My methods demonstrate some of the richness in data analysis that emerge from including participants, and reject the idea that the work would be stronger and more objective if participants had not been involved.

Finally, this work is part of an emerging body of work in the learning sciences that considers movements as sites of learning. Our work clearly demonstrates that the fossil fuel divestment campaign was a site of tremendous learning, and enriches sociocultural learning theorizations by showing reproductive practices as well as transformative practices in a community of practice. It also opens questions about if and how social movements enable different forms of learning, particularly in their ability to bridge local and global social relations and connect histories to current practices.

6.3.2 Contributions to Social Movement Learning Studies

Within social movement learning studies, this dissertation contributes by documenting the learning process within the fossil fuel divestment campaign at the University of Toronto. Fossil fuel divestment is a new site for analysis, and it offers richness for theorizing learning about social relations and their connections to the environmental movement. This also brings student and youth organizing into focus, adding texture to existing social movement learning studies by showcasing some of the unique aspects of this type of politicization, including the context, pacing, and intensity of learning in student-led social movements.

More significantly, though, this dissertation contributes by bringing an interactional analysis of learning. Building on sociocultural learning theory, this study examined the ways that the Fossil Free UofT group learned collectively, and offers more specific analysis into the dynamics that enabled learning. While adult education studies of learning in social movements have a long history of examining and considering politicization, they have often lacked a depth of analysis that illuminates the specific learning mechanisms and how they were made possible. This study attends closely to the micro-interactions in the group in order to analyze how practices shifted and why. It also explores how collective practice enabled shifts in politics, identities, and

epistemologies by creating communities of practice where learners' individual development was enabled by participation alongside their peers as they collectively negotiated the practices of an alternative space that supported their political exploration and experimentation.

6.3.3 Methodological Contributions

The design of this research contributes to learning sciences and social movement learning studies in several ways through the innovative use of multi-camera video data and the deep engagement of participants in analyzing that data.

First, this research contributes to social movement research by integrating multi-camera video data. As noted in the introduction, most social movement learning research is ethnographic work that recounts what people who participate in social movements learn. My research design and analysis are unique in that we have collected a comprehensive record of a social movement campaign's meetings and actions across a two-year span. This record allows us to conduct detailed analysis of interaction and learning over time in ways that are unprecedented, and this dissertation only scratches the surface in terms of the types of analyses that are made possible through this data corpus. We have documented the learning trajectories of a group of students over two-years and are able to trace the shifts in discursive practices and participation dynamics, enabling a detailed analysis of the identity and epistemological shifts of participants in ways that ethnographic accounts of social movements do not afford. Further, we have a rich record of the ebbs and flows of participation and consciousness-raising and can engage in nuanced conversations about the ways that politicization was context specific, contested, and inconsistent, rather than presenting a flattened perspective of learning as linear, unified, and consistent. Our data collection methods model a different approach to social movement learning studies that allow for more detailed analysis at a finer grain size.

Second, this research process contributes methodologically through the design of collaborative video analysis. Bringing participants into video-based interaction analysis represents a significant departure in the ways most Participatory Action Research is conducted, where participants are often involved in design and data collection, but not analysis. This distinction is even more significant for learning sciences research, where participants are rarely deeply engaged in the analysis of data, with the occasional inclusion of those in positions of leadership and/or authority as is sometimes the case within Design Based Research schemas. The

collaborative data analysis by members has the potential to shift studies of social movement learning and the learning sciences in that it demonstrates the value of participant engagement—both in terms of the richness of the findings and analysis, as well as the ways that the process developed the research skills of activists, informing their praxis and enabling them to develop evidence-based anti-oppressive practices designed to disrupt the power dynamics they identified through the data analysis. In this way, the research design has prefigured new identities, practices, and epistemological commitments within the research collective and the University of Toronto fossil fuel divestment campaign. This type of process holds promise for other researchers investigating learning, politicization, and social movements.

Finally, the research project's use of Stimulated Recall interviews (SRIs) and collaborative data analysis as politicizing, relational research is a significant outcome that contributes to research in the learning sciences, curriculum studies, and studies of social movement learning. In this way, our research not only reflected our commitments to relational accountability via anti-racist, anti-colonial, and feminist approaches, but also produced conditions that enabled politicization, reinforcing the political analysis through prefigurative research design. As focal participants reviewed the video data in SRIs, and later in the collaborative analysis processes, they developed a political critique of the participation dynamics and the discourses of the group. These SRIs then became data for us to analyze further, and in this way, we have a rich record of some member's politicization in real time. Our research was part of an iterative process of analyzing the day-to-day practices of the group, which in turn shaped the group's practices and informed our analysis. For the activists involved, this was a very important process, where we iteratively experimented with processes of naming the dynamics, intervening, and regrouping as a process of research, but also as a political process that formed the foundation of much of the equity-based work during Fossil Free UofT. For other researchers, and in particular, those engaging in activist-specific contexts or embodying militant ethnographic principles, SRIs and collaborative data analysis provide a model for a type of research praxis that enriches movements, builds analytic skills, and can produce rich analysis of movement dynamics which necessarily inform and shape the practices, frames, strategies, and identities of our work as activists.

6.4 Limitations

While I believe decolonial, anti-racist, and feminist vision is a central theme across the papers, there are places where analysis of decoloniality and anti-racism, in particular, fall short. In Chapter Three, while we attend to racialization and gender analytically, we do not address settler-colonial dynamics. This is for two reasons: one, only one Indigenous woman participated in Fossil Free UofT regularly, and so we have more limited data to talk about the interactions between Indigenous and settler people. The second, and I think more significant, reason is that our analysis in this chapter addresses more the racialized aspects of Indigeneity, not questions of sovereignty or dispossession. We are looking at repertoires of practice, rather than the historical processes, and so even though we recognize (and argue in later chapters) that settler colonialism is enacted interactionally and that Eurowestern ways of knowing are made the default through these processes, we have not woven that into a transhistorical and extralocal analysis.

I also want to acknowledge that even the students who identified as radical are not deeply engaged in decolonial political action. While they are sympathetic, and invested in pursuing decolonial activism, they have not yet found ways of practicing and becoming part of decolonial activist spaces. In some ways, we might argue that the engagement in anti-colonial work is a move to innocence (Tuck & Yang, 2013) that has done little to shift the material relations of land dispossession, while securing identities of “good” settlers. It might also be read through Dion’s lens of the “perfect stranger”, where settlers avoid significant engagement with Indigenous histories and political struggles because they do not know enough about the history or are not in relationship with Indigenous people (2009), thus “cloaking” and protecting themselves from further implication and responsibility toward decolonial action (Pitt & Britzman 2003). Both of these suppositions are likely appropriate assessments. However, I also think that the limited uptake is related to the timeline. The young people whose learning we document are still learning and becoming, and their participation in decolonial work is still emerging. For that reason, some of our analysis of decoloniality is limited; it has not been borne out in our data beyond the aspirational commitments based in emergent identities, recognition of ways of knowing, increasing familiarity with the politics of resurgence, and an interest in participating in solidarity praxis.

Alternately, I would argue that settler colonialism is taken up much more centrally in Chapters Four and Five, and questions of racialization recede from focus. In Chapter Four, while we do document the experiences of participants of colour and their recognition of their ongoing marginalization through racializing processes, the learning among Fossil Free UofT was most explicitly about questions of settler colonialism and Indigenous solidarity relationships. Because the group only rarely addressed racism explicitly, we have much less data to draw on in that way. Chapter Five does attend to questions of racialization in the second vignette, but does so in a way that centres the cultural aspects of racialization, rather than the historical and institutional. This is the same challenge we face with addressing settler colonialism interactionally in Chapter Three, and I believe the work for our research collective moving forward will be to try to more explicitly link the interactional dynamics in our analysis to institutional systems of power, and find ways to bring the institutional and structural aspects of social relations into focus.

Learning is a long-term process of becoming, and what we document here is really a small moment across the span of student learning. A year ago, several of us were very frustrated about the lack of engagement with ideas of colonialism, but six months later the group of students were having a totally different conversation. This study captures their process during the two-year window in detail, but I want to stress that this is not a complete or linear story of becoming. Two academic years is really not that long for people to be introduced to, come to understand, and learn to contest relations of racialization, patriarchy, and settler colonialism within their own practices and the environmental movement. Many of the students' identities have shifted substantially, and yet the nuance within those identities is constantly shifting to accommodate what they learn and do together. Longer-term engagement with these students would be helpful for understanding the trajectories of politicization beyond initial identity shifts to trace the ways that the practices, identities, ways of knowing and being, and concepts are appropriated and travel across different contexts. Their continued development would give us more data on the way these learning processes unfold and how they shape and are shaped by other political contexts.

Where students have perhaps not learned or shifted their practices, that is not a final, definitive statement. Their learning processes, though different than other students in the group, is also in progress. They have not failed to learn; they have learned differently and time will tell how that learning will manifest through their practice. We do not focus on their learning within our

analysis, and so we are limited in our ability to make claims about how and why some participants resisted and rejected moves to integrate anti-racism, anti-colonialism, and feminism into the group's practice.

From our data, it is clear that learning and becoming are not linear processes. Several of the students involved in the fossil fuel divestment campaign moved from identifying as climate justice activists to rejecting that frame. While our analysis in Chapter Four gestures to this briefly when we discuss the polarization, it is not the politicization process we focus on analytically. However, readers should not think that all participants in Fossil Free UofT enthusiastically developed radical politics, practices, and identities rooted in non-dominant ways of knowing or that people who were open to some aspects adopted all, or that all participants who adopted the identities of radical climate activists embraced that identity consistently across the two-year window. From our data, we would not necessarily expect that climate justice will remain a consistent focus for all participants, reflecting another mode of learning and sense making. This is outside the scope of our work here, and requires further research to understand when and how participants' identities and practices as activists shift away from the radical politics they may have previously embraced. Additionally, the polarization phenomenon we noted could provide valuable data in terms of understanding the process of becoming more conservative and what the identity development process is as participants in positions of privilege react against justice politics and more openly embrace racist and/or sexist logics to justify their claims to space and expertise. These are important processes to study to help understand the barriers and supports for becoming radicalized and to understand the dynamics of social movements that are internally contentious.

6.5 Further Research

Several questions have emerged from our analysis that are outside the scope of our research, but which merit further examination. For example, our data demonstrates significant polarization within the community of practice, where a significant portion of the community became highly politicized, while some members became more conservative in their political views. Further research might explore the learning and identity development processes of group members who reject justice frameworks. What are the cognitive, emotional, and practice-based shifts that enable and constrain the shifts in participation, epistemologies, and identities? How are positions

of power within broader social relations, as well as local communities of practice, made salient in this process of non-participation in the politicization of a community? In particular, further research might help us to theorize the reactionary shifts in identity and conceptual development that occurred in the group as those who rejected politicized identities and practices perceived a loss of influence, but also challenges to their ways of knowing. This may help us to develop more nuanced theorizations about how foundational worldviews and ways of knowing are to political development, and give us tools for thinking about conservative politicization processes. In Chapter Four, we have focused on understanding how people in the community of practice successfully became politicized, and sought to describe the learning trajectory. An alternate analysis of those who withdrew from the politicization, rejecting the alternative spaces, practices, and identities might shed different light on ways that educators can design spaces to accommodate these participants, and might offer strategies to activists seeking to avoid some of the emotional and political fallout that our community of practice experienced.

A second area for further research is a methodological and epistemological question. We believe it would be productive for learning scientists to ask: what modes of analysis enrich situated learning and sociocultural studies? How do participants weave in analyses of racialization, patriarchy, and colonialism in the assessment of learning? How might non-western epistemologies be welcomed into learning sciences analysis? Thus far, these types of questions have remained marginal across the learning sciences, but this dissertation has demonstrated the significance of accounting for social relations in our theorizations of learning. Further work is needed to demonstrate the ways that different epistemologies and practices are made salient in the learning processes of diverse communities, and from this work, our field would benefit from meta analyses of how we can begin to see and interpret learning from a more relational-ontological space.

One of the questions raised through our process is the extent to which this Participatory Action Research process itself enabled particular forms of politicization. Many of the focal students reflected that their learning largely stemmed from the SRIs and Collaborative Data Analysis, where we examined the dynamics and revisited video. Through an analysis of the video of SRIs, especially in relationship to the subsequent weekly videos, we might examine how the SRI and collaborative analysis processes informed the ongoing processes of politicization. How did the methodology of this project shape the political and learning opportunities for students? How

might future studies be designed to support student reflection and analysis more intentionally? How might social movements integrate these reflective methodologies for their own purposes of politicizing members? These questions centre relationality, and epistemological shifts as a critical move for learning scientists to consider, while potentially bringing value to social movements and community organizations.

6.6 Revisiting Relational Accountability

In Chapter Two, I wrote about the methodological underpinnings of this study, including the axiological commitment to relationality as a governing epistemological and ontological guideline. Where Indigenous research methods (Hampton, 1995; Wilson, 2008) require relational accountability, militant ethnography (Scheper-Hughes, 1995; Maeckelbergh, 2011; Juris, 2007) strives for utility to the movements we are embedded in. Thus, to close I want to revisit the contexts and communities I introduced in Chapter One as a way of closing the circle, and explicitly arguing for the contributions this research makes to Fossil Free UofT, the research collective, the fossil fuel divestment campaign, and the mainstream environmental movement. If this work is successful, it will be not only in that the ideas are coherently argued and grounded in the relationships forged in the University of Toronto divestment campaign, but it will also be useful to these campaigns. That does not mean they have to be pleasant; indeed, much of the learning and transformation within our campaign was hard-won and difficult, yet it has been important in shaping how we collectively conceptualize racialization, patriarchy, and settler colonialism in the context of the climate movement, and it has the potential to reshape our participation in subsequent climate activism.

Within the Fossil Free UofT community of practice, the research has played a vital role in shaping the conversation around racialization, gender, and colonialism. Our work has provided data, and the analysis of that data has served a political project within the campaign. The findings of Chapter Three, which documented the racialized and gendered participation patterns, emboldened women, Indigenous people, and people of colour to push back against the normalized dynamics and problematic frames and discourses of the group. This process changed the context of the community, and also gave participants lived experience in naming and challenging social relations of power in their communities. The research helped create spaces where participants could do the naming and analytic processes documented in Chapter Four, and

in this way, the research was a piece of the larger politicization process that many members of the group were embroiled in.

Overall, the campaign has ended, at least for now, in defeat. What I think the research's lasting impact will be is a new attention to questions of racialization, gender, settler colonialism in the environmental work that is taken up next—and I think more specifically (and honestly more limited) an attention to the interactional dynamics of race, gender, and class. For the students that were politicized that we documented in Chapter Four, their learning trajectories have been dramatically shaped by the research process and the alternative spaces that developed in relation to the SRIs, drafts, and collaborative analysis that emerged from the research. For other members, the research contributed an increased awareness of race, gender, and colonialism in the environmental movement, and produced discursive shifts that reflected their familiarity.

The research and the politicization that happened in Fossil Free UofT has reshaped the activism of environmentalist students on campus—not just because of the research, but as a component of the shifted identity, ways of knowing, emergent concept development, etc. More work is being done with First Nations groups, including fundraising to support pipeline-related legal battles that rest on the premise of Indigenous sovereignty and treaty-based land claims. There are ongoing discussions of environmental justice and climate change's relation to colonialism. While I won't make any grand claims of a transformed local environmental movement, I would argue that there is now sustained attention to the interactional dynamics of race and gender and an ongoing conversation about the importance of Indigenous solidarity alongside substantive relationship building with Indigenous organizers around a broad array of issues, not narrowly constrained to pipeline and climate alliances. More women and people of colour have stepped into leadership and are intentionally seeking out spaces that support multiracial leadership—and they are using that space to reframe some of the campaign goals to integrate anti-racism, reconciliation, and feminism into the articulation of the problem of climate change and their proposals for solutions.

For the student fossil fuel divestment movement, our research offers critique as well as affirmation. Throughout Chapters Three and Four, we can see that the fossil fuel divestment campaign does not require attention to racialization, to gender, or to settler colonialism, and for the first year of our research participating in the fossil fuel divestment campaign at UofT, that

type of political commitment was marginalized and dismissed. Attention to social relations of power is not required for the divestment campaign to function as it is designed, and so in this way, we might argue that the campaign is falling short of their claims to centre climate justice, instead reproducing the same old dynamics of the mainstream environmental movement.

However, our work also affirms, to an extent, the claim that divestment is a politicizing tool that pulls students in and makes them more ready and willing to engage in direct action for climate justice. While there is more to be said about this than our detailed analysis of one site will allow, our research points to the possibility of emergent politicization in spite of the fossil fuel divestment campaign's frame, rather than because of it. In our study, we see student activists becoming politicized, shifting their politics, practices, identities, and ways of knowing and being because of their participation in divestment. This makes us cautiously believe in the potential for the campaign to create communities of practice where transformation is possible.

For the broader environmental movement, this research project points to the interactional and institutional processes that constitute the movement as a White, settler, masculine space, but also signals several areas of potential for reconciliation work. This research points to strategies for politicizing participants in ways that help them to recognize and unsettle the default space through new practices, frames, and identities. It also shows that there will be conflict and contestation, but that conflict can also be productive in generating new opportunities to learn, and make new identities more legible and desirable, as identities are forged and fortified through the argumentation processes. Further, this project has demonstrated that for mainstream environmentalist, taking climate justice seriously as a strategy to contribute to reconciliation will be difficult and contentious. It will require learning and politicization, and there are opportunities and spaces in which this work can be worthwhile, despite its challenges.

Since Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau approved the Kinder Morgan and Line 3 pipelines, we're seeing a ramp-up of pushback by Indigenous peoples and environmentalists and many promises to block the construction legally and extra-legally. Many have said the Kinder Morgan fight will be "Canada's Standing Rock", and already the mobilizations and coalitions are coalescing. Kinder-Morgan is one of many pipeline projects setting the stage for collaboration and substantive reconciliation work, should people choose to engage in it. This research project offers some specific interventions in terms of the type of participation and learning that might foster relations of politicized solidarity in the multi-racial, multi-gender coalitions between

settler environmentalists and Indigenous peoples. For many mainstream environmentalists, substantive, decolonized solidarity will require a tremendous shift in their ways of knowing and being, their political concepts, their practices, and their identities. It will require deep engagement with questions of racialization, patriarchy, and settler colonialism across multiple scales, and will require a shift away from the ubiquity of settler, and particularly White settler, repertoires of practice and ways of knowing and being. While our work shows that this learning and transformation is possible, it also demonstrates the challenges that are present in reconciliation and justice work in the environmental movement. As more coalitions between mainstream environmentalists, environmental justice activists, and Indigenous people emerge, we will have the opportunity to see other expressions of this learning process, and further document the strategies for building deeper solidarities based on politicization that centres decolonial practices, ways of knowing and being, politics, and identities. For these coalitions to work and sustain themselves, they will have to substantially shift what it means to be an environmentalist, such that the label centres identities of relational accountability anchored in anti-racist, anti-colonial, and feminist praxis.

From the discussion of the pipeline battles growing across Turtle Island, the urgent need for solidarity that is steeped in anti-colonial, anti-racist, and feminist praxis should be clear. Environmentalist battles against the fossil fuel industry must necessarily be fights against colonialism, racialization, and patriarchy. This is one of many places that reconciliation must be made tangible: on the land, in fights for sovereignty, water, and a livable future. Yet these lessons are still being learned by mainstream environmentalists. Reconciliation and decolonial work must become central pillars of the environmental movement. This will require learning, collectively, and understood through the lenses of participation, identity development, and relational epistemologies to radically reconfigure power dynamics within the environmental movement, but also far more broadly. This learning process is fundamental to reconciliation and decolonization; it is a necessary step in the path toward a process of returning land and recognizing sovereignty, unsettling patriarchy, and eliminating racism.

References

- Absolon (Minogiizhigokwe), K. E. (2011). *Kaandossiwin: How we come to know*. Black Point: Fernwood Publishing.
- Absolon, K., & Willett, C. (2005). Putting ourselves forward: Location in Aboriginal research. *Research as resistance: Critical, Indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*, 97-126.
- Adams, M., & Bell, L. A. (Eds.). (2016). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. Routledge.
- Adger, W. N., Paavola, J., Huq, S., & Mace, M. J. (2006). Toward justice in adaptation to climate change. *Fairness in adaptation to climate change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Aguiar, L. L. M., & Marten, T. I. L. (2011). Shimmering white Kelowna and the examination of painless white privilege in British Columbia. In A. Baldwin, L. Cameron, & A. Kobayashi (Eds.), *Rethinking the great white north: Race, nature and the historical geographies of whiteness in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Allman, P. (2001). *Critical education against global capitalism: Karl Marx and revolutionary critical education*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Allman, P. (1999). *Revolutionary social transformation: Democratic hopes, political possibilities and critical education*. Praeger Pub Text.
- Alvarez, R & Gutierrez, L. (2001) Choosing to do participatory research: An example and issues of fit to consider. *Journal of Community Practice*, 9(1): 1-20.
- Anderson, K. (2000). *A recognition of being: Reconstructing Native womanhood*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2014). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. Routledge.
- Arnold, R., Burke, B., James, C. Martin, D., & Thomas, B. (1991). *Educating for a Change*. Toronto: Between the Lines Press.
- Arnaquq-Baril, A. (2016). *Angry Inuk*. National Film Board of Canada.
- Arp, W., & Howell, C. (1995). Black environmentalism and gender differences: An ethics of care?. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 19(4), 300.
- Ayers, W., Quinn, T. M., & Stovall, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of social justice in education*. Routledge.
- Azocar, M. J., & Ferree, M. M. (2015). Gendered expertise. *Gender & Society*, 0891243215602104.
- Bang, M. (2015). Culture, learning, and development and the natural world: The influences of situative perspectives. *Educational Psychologist*, 50(3), 220-233.
- Bang, M., & Medin, D. (2010). Cultural processes in science education: Supporting the navigation of multiple epistemologies. *Science Education*, 94(6), 1008-1026.
- Bannerji, H. (2005). Building from Marx: Reflections on class and race. *Social Justice*, 32(4), 4.
- Bannerji, H. (2001). *Inventing subjects: Studies in hegemony, patriarchy and colonialism*. Anthem Press.

- Barab S., Hay S. and Yamagata-Lynch L. (2001), Constructing Networks of Action-Relevant Episodes: An In-Situ Research Methodology. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 10(1&2), pp. 63-112.
- Barker, C. (2007). Cultural-historical activity theory and social movements: An initial exploration. In Barker, C., & Tyldesley, M. (Eds.), Twelfth International Conference on Alternative Futures and Popular Protest. Manchester: Manchester Metropolitan University.
- Barker, C., Cox, L., Krinsky, J., & Nilsen, A. G. (2013). Marxism and social movements: an introduction. *Marxism and Social Movements*, 1-37.
- Barron, B. (2006). Interest and self-sustained learning as catalysts of development: A learning ecology perspective. *Human development*, 49(4), 193-224.
- Beach, W.A. (2000) 'Inviting Collaborations in Stories About a Woman', *Language in Society* 29: 379-407.
- Bell, S. E., & Braun, Y. A. (2010). Coal, identity, and the gendering of environmental justice activism in central Appalachia. *Gender & Society*, 24(6), 794-813.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual review of sociology*, 26(1), 611-639.
- Benwell, B. (2014). Language and masculinity. In *Handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*, Ehrlich, S, Meyerhoff, M., and Holmes, J. (Eds). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell: 240-259.
- Bevington, D., & Dixon, C. (2005). Movement-relevant theory: Rethinking social movement scholarship and activism. *Social movement studies*, 4(3), 185-208.
- Billett, S. (1994). Situated learning—A workplace experience. *Australian Journal of Adult and Community Education*, 34(2), 112-30.
- Billig, M. (1999) 'Whose Terms? Whose Ordinarity? Rhetoric and Ideology in Conversation Analysis', *Discourse & Society* 10: 543-58.
- Blain, L. (2005). Ain't I an environmentalist. *Social Policy*, 35(3), 31-34.
- Bloom, L. R. (1998). *Under the sign of hope: Feminist methodology and narrative interpretation*. SUNY Press.
- Blyth, W. F., Clarke, D., & Labovic, A. (2006). Video analysis to understand e-learning of vector calculus. *ANZIAM Journal*.
- Bolland, J. & McCallum, D. (2002). "Neighboring and community mobilization in high-poverty inner-city neighborhoods" *Urban Affairs Review*, 38(1), pp. 42-69.
- Breines, W. (1989). *Community and Organization in the New Left: The Great Refusal*. New Brunswick: Rutgers Press.
- Brown, P., & Ferguson, F. I. (1995). "Making a big stink." Women's work, women's relationships, and toxic waste activism. *Gender & Society*, 9(2), 145-172.
- Bryan, T., Bay, M., Shelden, C., & Simon, J. (1990). Teachers' and At-Risk Students' Stimulated Recall of Instruction. *Exceptionality: A Special Education Journal*, 1(3), 167-179.

- Bullard, R. D. (1993). *Confronting environmental racism: Voices from the grassroots*. South End Press.
- Bullard, R. D. (2000). *Dumping in Dixie: Race, class, and environmental quality* (Vol. 3). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bullard, R., & Wright, B. H. (1987). Environmentalism and the politics of equity: emergent trends in the black community. *Mid-American Review of Sociology*, 21-37.
- Burns, P., Coulter, G., Green, A., Hoffmann, M.; Hosios, A., Karney, B., . . . O'Brien, R. (2016, April 4). Op-ed: An open letter to the University of Toronto on fossil fuel divestment. In defense of the Toronto principle. Retrieved from <http://thevarsity.ca/2016/04/04/op-ed-an-open-letter-to-the-university-of-toronto-on-fossil-fuel-divestment/>
- Cabello, J., & Gilbertson, T. (2012). A colonial mechanism to enclose lands: A critical review of two REDD+-focused special issues. *ephemera*, 12(1/2), 162.
- Cable, S. (1992). Women's social movement involvement. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 33(1), 35-50.
- Callahan, J. L., & Tomaszewski, L. (2007). Navigating the good ol'boys club: Women, marginality, and communities of practice in a military non-profit organization. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 29(3), 259-276.
- Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (2008). Youth participatory action research. *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion*, 1-12.
- Cammarota, J., & Romero, A. (2011). Participatory action research for high school students: Transforming policy, practice, and the personal with social justice education. *Educational Policy*, 25(3), 488-506.
- Campbell, M, Copeland, B and Tate, B. (1998) Taking the standpoint of people with disabilities in research: Experiences with participation. *Canadian Journal of Rehabilitation*, 12(2): 94-104.
- Canadians for Emergency Action on Climate Change. (2012, December 18). The most important COP briefing that no one ever heard. Retrieved from <http://climatescanada.org/blog/2012/12/18/the-most-important-cop-briefing-that-no-one-ever-heard-truth-lies-racism-omnicide/>
- Carpenter, S. (2012). Centering Marxist-feminist theory in adult learning. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 62(1), 19-35.
- Carpenter, S., Ritchie, G., & Mojab, S. (2013). The dialectics of praxis. *Socialist Studies/Études Socialistes*, 9(1).
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Carr, E. S. (2010). Enactments of expertise. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 17-32.
- Carroll, K. (2009). Outsider, insider, alongsider: Examining reflexivity in hospital-based video research. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(3), 246-263.
- CBC. (2014, April 22). Keystone XL pipeline protesters gather in Washington. Canadian Broadcast Corporation. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/keystone-xl-pipeline-protesters-gather-in-washington-1.2618367>

- CBC. (2016, April 1). Student says U of T president 'cowardly' for refusal to divest. Canadian Broadcast Corporation. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/radio/asithappens/as-it-happens-friday-edition-1.3516655/student-says-u-of-t-president-cowardly-for-refusal-to-divest-1.3516659>
- CBC. (2016, December 4). Standing Rock protesters celebrate 'big victory' as pipeline construction halted. Canadian Broadcast Corporation. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/dakota-access-pipeline-1.3881042>
- Chaiklin, S., & Lave, J. (1993). *Understanding practice: Perspectives on activity and context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chatterton, P., Hodkinson, S., & Pickerill, J. (2010). Beyond scholar activism: Making strategic interventions inside and outside the neoliberal university. *ACME: An international e-journal for critical geographies*, 9(2).
- Choudry, A. (2015). *Learning activism: The intellectual life of contemporary social movements*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Choudry, A., & Kapoor, D. (2010). Learning from the ground up: Global perspectives on social movements and knowledge production. In *Learning from the Ground Up* (1-13). Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Clover, D. (2002). Traversing the gap: Concientización, educative-activism in environmental adult education. *Environmental Education Research*, 8(3), 315-323.
- Cole, L. W., & Foster, S. R. (2001). *From the ground up: Environmental racism and the rise of the environmental justice movement*. NYU Press.
- Cole, M., & Engeström, Y. (1993). A cultural-historical approach to distributed cognition. *Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational considerations*, 1-46.
- Colectivo Situaciones. (2007). Something more on research militancy: Footnotes on procedures and (in) decisions. In Shukaitis, S., Graeber, D., & Biddle, E. (Eds.) *Constituent imagination: militant investigations//collective theorization*. AK Press, 73-93.
- Colley, H. (2012). Celebrating the work of Paula Allman: thinking through Marx in adult education. The impact of austerity policies on learning in human service work. Presented at *Inaugural Conference of the ESREA Network on Policy Studies in Adult Education*, 10-12th February 2012, University of Nottingham.
- Collier, P. (2015). Preserving the race: Gendered violence in the early conservation movement. Paper presented at *Symposium of university research and creative expression*.
- Collins, P. H. (1995). Review of *Doing difference* by Candace West; Sarah Fenstermaker. *Gender and Society*, 9(4), 491-506.
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social problems*, 33(6), s14-s32.
- Connell, R. W. (1990). A whole new world: Remaking masculinity in the context of the environmental movement. *Gender & Society*, 4(4), 452-478.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & society*, 19(6), 829-859.

- Contu, A., & Willmott, H. (2003). Re-embedding situatedness: The importance of power relations in learning theory. *Organization Science*, 14(3), 283-296.
- Cox, P. A., & Elmqvist, T. (1993). Ecocolonialism and Indigenous knowledge systems: village controlled rainforest preserves in Samoa. *Pacific Conservation Biology*, 1(1), 6-13.
- Cram, S. (2016, November 20). Reporter's notebook: Standing Rock is not the new Woodstock. Canadian Broadcast Corporation. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/reporter-standing-rock-is-not-woodstock-1.3856910>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford law review*, 1241-1299.
- Crossley, N. (2003). From reproduction to transformation: Social movement fields and the radical habitus. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(6), 43-68.
- Crowther, J. (2006). Social movements, praxis and the profane side of lifelong learning. *Lifelong learning: Concepts and contexts*, 171-181.
- Cunningham, P., & Curry, R. (1997). Learning within a social movement: The Chicago African-American experience. In *AERC proceedings*. Stillwater: OK. Adult Education Research Conference.
- Curnow, J. (2013). Fight the power: situated learning and conscientisation in a gendered community of practice. *Gender and Education*, 25(7), 834-850.
- Curnow, J. (2014a). Climbing the leadership ladder: legitimate peripheral participation in student movements. *Interface: A Journal on Social Movements*, 6(1), 130-155.
- Curnow, J. (2014b). Becoming an activist: Learning the politics and performances of youth activism through legitimate peripheral participation. In Polman, J. L., Kyza, E. A., O'Neill, D. K., Tabak, I., Penuel, W. R., Jurow, A. S., O'Connor, K., Lee, T., & D'Amico, L. (Eds.). *Learning and Becoming in Practice: The International Conference of the Learning Sciences 2014, Volume 1* (pp. 206-213). Boulder, CO: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Curnow, J., & Chan, J.R. (2016). Becoming an "expert": Gendered positioning, praise, and participation in an activist community. In Looi, C. K., Polman, J. L., Cress, U., and Reimann, P. (Eds.). (2016). *Transforming Learning, Empowering Learners: The International Conference of the Learning Sciences 2016, Volume 1* (pp. 146-153). Singapore: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Curnow, J, Davis, A., & Lightning, K. (2016). Challenging the default whiteness of the climate movement. Poster presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Curnow, J., & Gross, A. (2016). Injustice is not an investment: Student activism, climate justice, and the fossil fuel divestment campaign. *Contemporary Youth Activism: Advancing Social Justice in the United States: Advancing Social Justice in the United States*, 367.
- Daniel, J. (2016). Knowledge from trauma: Black Lives Matter and community-based participatory research. Poster presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

- De Fina, A. (2007). Code-switching and the construction of ethnic identity in a community of practice. *Language in society*, 36(3), 371-392.
- De Smet, B. (2012). Egyptian workers and “their” intellectuals: The dialectical pedagogy of the Mahalla strike movement. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 19(2), 139-155.
- Deloria, V. (1995). *Red earth, white lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact*. Fulcrum Publishing.
- Democracy Now. (December 18, 2009). Chief G-77 negotiator Lumumba Stanislaus Di-Aping: US-backed proposals mean death for millions of Africans. Democracy Now. Retrieved from https://www.democracynow.org/2009/12/18/chief_g77_negotiator_lumumba_stanislaus_di
- Derry, S. J., Pea, R. D., Barron, B., Engle, R. A., Erickson, F., Goldman, R., et al. (2010). Conducting video research in the Learning Sciences: Guidance on selection, analysis, technology, and ethics. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(1), 3–53. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10508400903452884>
- Diani, M., & McAdam, D. (2003). *Social movements and networks: Relational approaches to collective action*. Oxford University Press.
- Dion, S. D. (2009). *Braiding histories: Learning from aboriginal peoples' experiences and perspectives*. UBC Press.
- Dixon, D. P., and Jones, J. P. (1998). My dinner with Derrida, or spatial analysis and poststructuralism do lunch. *Environment and Planning A*, 30(2), 247-260.
- Dowie, M. (2011). *Conservation refugees: The hundred-year conflict between global conservation and native peoples*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Dookie, L. (2015). *Examining marginalizing acts of social positioning in mathematical group work: Towards a better understanding of how microaggressions and stereotype threat unfold in intergroup interactions* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto).
- Dwyer, O. J., & Jones, J. P. (2000). White socio-spatial epistemology. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 1(2), 209-222.
- Endresen, K., & Von Kotze, A. (2005). Living while being alive: Education and learning in the Treatment Action Campaign. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 24(5), 431-441.
- Engeström, Y., Miettinen, R., & Punamäki, R. L. (1999). *Perspectives on activity theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Engeström, Y. (2014). *Learning by expanding*. Cambridge University Press.
- Engle, R. A., Conant, F. R., & Greeno, J. G. (2007). Progressive refinement of hypotheses in video-supported research. In Goldman, R., Pea, R., Barron, B., & Derry, S. J. (Eds). *Video research in the learning sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 239-254.
- Epstein, D. (1998). Marked men: Whiteness and masculinity. *Agenda*, 14(37), 49-59.
- Erickson, F. (2006). Definition and analysis of data from videotape: Some research procedures and their rationales. *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*, 3, 177-192.

- Erickson, F. (1992). Ethnographic microanalysis of interaction. *The handbook of qualitative research in education*, 201-225.
- Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life*. Polity.
- Escueta, M., & Butterwick, S. (2012). The power of popular education and visual arts for trauma survivors' critical consciousness and collective action. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 31(3), 325-340.
- Esmonde, I, Curnow, J., & Riviere, D. (2014). Becoming an activist mathematician in an age of austerity. In Polman, J. L., Kyza, E. A., O'Neill, D. K., Tabak, I., Penuel, W. R., Jurow, A. S., O'Connor, K., Lee, T., & D'Amico, L. (Eds.). *Learning and becoming in practice: The International Conference of the Learning Sciences 2014, Volume 1* (pp. 134-141). Boulder, CO: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Eyal, G. (2013). For a sociology of expertise: the social origins of the autism Epidemic1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(4), 863-907.
- Eyerman, R., & Jamison, A. (1991). *Social movements: A cognitive approach*. Penn State Press.
- Fals Borda, O. (1979). Investigating reality in order to transform it: The Colombian experience. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 4(1), 33-55.
- Fernández, J.S. (2016). Moving beyond the local campaign? Unraveling the complexities of critical social analysis in youth activism. Poster presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC
- Flacks, R. (2004). Knowledge for what? Thoughts on the state of social movement studies. *Rethinking social movements: Structure, meaning, and emotion*, 135-154.
- Flynn, B., Ray D. & Rider M. (1994). Empowering communities: Action research through healthy cities. *Health Education Quarterly*, 21(3), 395-405.
- Foley, G. (1999). *Learning in social action: A contribution to understanding informal education. Global Perspectives on Adult Education and Training*. St. Martin's Press, Inc: New York, NY.
- Foster, V. (2009). Authentic representation? Using video as counter-hegemony in participatory research with poor working-class women. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(3), 233-245.
- Fossil Free (n.d.). Fossil free: A campus guide to fossil fuel divestment. Retrieved from www.gofossilfree.org
- Fossil Free Canada. (2016). About. *Fossil Free*. Retrieved from www.gofossilfree.ca.
- Fossil Free USA. (2016). About. *Fossil Free*. Retrieved from www.gofossilfree.org.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Franta, B. (2016, February 8). On divestment, adopt the Toronto principle. Harvard Crimson. Retrieved from <http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2016/2/8/franta-divestment-toronto-principle/>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

- Fuller, A., Hodkinson, H., Hodkinson, P., & Unwin, L. (2005). Learning as peripheral participation in communities of practice: A reassessment of key concepts in workplace learning. *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(1), 49-68.
- Fuller, A., & Unwin, L. (2003). Learning as apprentices in the contemporary UK workplace: Creating and managing expansive and restrictive participation. *Journal of Education and Work*, 16(4), 407-426.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Garrison, W. A. (1992). The social psychology of collective action. *Frontiers in social movement theory*, 53-76.
- Gellis, Z.D. (2001). Using a participatory research approach to mobilize immigrant minority family caregivers. *Journal of Social Work Research and Evaluation*, 2(2), 267-282.
- Gertler, M. (2016). *Beyond divestment: Taking decisive action on climate change*. Administrative response to the report of the president's advisory committee on divestment from fossil-fuels. Accessed at <http://www.president.utoronto.ca/secure-content/uploads/2016/03/Beyond-Divestment-Taking-Decisive-Action-on-Climate-Change.pdf>
- Gibbs, L. M. (2011). *Love Canal and the birth of the environmental health movement*. Island Press.
- Ginwright, S. A., Noguera, P., & Cammarota, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Beyond resistance!: Youth activism and community change: New democratic possibilities for practice and policy for America's youth*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Goldenberg, S. (2014, May 8). Why are so many white men trying to save the planet without the rest of us? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/may/08/white-men-environmental-movement-leadership>.
- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Routledge.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1992). Context, activity and participation. *The contextualization of language*, 77-99.
- Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. M. (2004). *Rethinking social movements: Structure, culture, and emotion*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Goodwin, J., Jasper, J. M., & Polletta, F. (Eds.). (2009). *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gouin, R, Cocq, K, & McGavin, S. (2011) Feminist participatory research in a social justice organization. *Action Research*, 9(3): 261-281.
- Gleason, B. (2013). #Occupy Wall Street: Exploring informal learning about a social movement on Twitter. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(7), 966-982.
doi:10.1177/0002764213479372

- Grady-Benson, J. (2014). *Fossil fuel divestment: The power and promise of a student movement for climate justice* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). Pitzer College: California.
- Grady-Benson, J., & Sarathy, B. (2016). Fossil fuel divestment in US higher education: student-led organising for climate justice. *Local Environment*, 21(6), 661-681.
- Grant, J., & Luxford, Y. (2014). Video: A decolonising strategy for intercultural communication in child and family health within ethnographic research. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(3), 218–232. <http://doi.org/10.5172/mra.3.3.218>
- Grove, R. H. (1996). *Green imperialism: colonial expansion, tropical island Edens and the origins of environmentalism, 1600-1860*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148-164.
- Gutierrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 19–25. doi:10.3102/0013189X032005019
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Bien, A. C., Selland, M. K., & Pierce, D. M. (2011). Polylingual and polycultural learning ecologies: Mediating emergent academic literacies for dual language learners. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 11(2), 232-261.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, culture, and activity*, 6(4), 286-303.
- Gutstein, E. R. (2012). Mathematics as a weapon in the struggle. In *Opening the cage* (pp. 23-48). SensePublishers.
- Hall, B. L. (1981). Participatory research, popular knowledge and power: A personal reflection. *Convergence*, 14(3), 6.
- Hall, B., & Turay, T. (2006). State of the field report: Social movement learning. *Victoria, BC: University of Victoria*.
- Hall, B. L., Clover, D. E., Crowther, J., & Scandrett, E. (2011). Social movement learning: a contemporary re-examination. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 43(2), 113-116.
- Hall, R., & Jurow, A. S. (2015). Changing concepts in activity: Descriptive and design studies of consequential learning in conceptual practices. *Educational Psychologist*, 50(3), 173-189.
- Hall, R., & Leander, K. (2010). *Scaling practices of spatial analysis and modeling*. Symposium presented at the 9th International Conference of the Learning Sciences, Chicago, IL.
- Hampton, E. (1995). Memory comes before knowledge: Research may improve if researchers remember their motives. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 21, 46-54.
- Hand, V., Penuel, W. R., & Gutiérrez, K. D. (2013). (Re) framing educational possibility: Attending to power and equity in shaping access to and within learning opportunities. *Human Development*, 55(5-6), 250-268.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist studies*, 575-599.
- Harding, S. G. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?: Thinking from women's lives*. Cornell University Press.

- Harding, S. (1992). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is "strong objectivity"? *Centennial Review*, 437-470.
- Hardt, M. (1999). Affective labor. *boundary 2*, 26(2), 89-100.
- Harrison, S. (2016, November 29). Cynical betrayal on Kinder Morgan galvanizes B.C. voters. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from <https://dogwoodinitiative.org/cynical-betrayal-kinder-morgan-galvanizes-b-c-voters/>.
- Harley, A. (2014). The pedagogy of road blockades. *Interface*.
- Hartsock, N. C. (1983). *The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism*. 283-310. Springer.
- Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research*. Sage Publications.
- Henderson, G. (1998). Nature and fictitious capital: the historical geography of an agrarian question. *Antipode*, 30(2), 73-118.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1971). *Primitive rebels: Studies in archaic forms of social movement in the 19th and 20th centuries*. Manchester University Press.
- Hodges, D.C. (1998). Participation as dis-identification with/in a community of practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 5(4), 272-290.
- Hoffer, E. (1951). *The true believer: Thoughts on the nature of movements*. New York NY: HarperCollins.
- Hoffmann, M., Burns, P., Coulter, G., Green, A., Hosios, A., Karney, B., . . . O'Brien, R. (2016, April 5). A Committee Replies. The Globe and Mail. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/letters/april-5-cash-access-politics-plus-other-letters-to-the-editor/article29517019/>
- Holford, J. (1995). Why social movements matter: Adult education theory, cognitive praxis, and the creation of knowledge. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 45(2), 95-111.
doi:10.1177/0741713695045002003
- Holst, J. D. (2011). Frameworks for understanding the politics of social movements. *Studies in the Education of Adults*.
- Holland, D., W. Lachicotte, D. Skinner & C. Cain. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Holland, D., Fox, G., & Daro, V. (2008). Social movements and collective identity. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 81(1), 95-126.
- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Cambridge: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1989). Choosing the margin as space of radical openness. *Framework*, (36), 15.
- Horton, M. & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Temple University Press.
- Hudema, M. (2016, December 2). Let's make 2017 a year Justin Trudeau will never forget. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from <http://www.greenpeace.org/canada/en/blog/Blogentry/lets-make-2017-a-year-justin-trudeau-will-nev/blog/58157/>

- Hughes, J., Jewson, N., & Unwin, L. (Eds.). (2007). *Communities of practice: Critical perspectives*. Routledge.
- Hughey, M. W. (2011). Backstage discourse and the reproduction of white masculinities. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52(1), 132-153.
- Indigenous Environmental Network. (n.d.). <http://www.ienearth.org/about/>
- Isaki, B. (2013). State conservation as settler colonial governance at Ka'Ena Point, Hawai'i. *Environment and Earth Law Journal*, 3, 57
- Johnston, H. (1995). A methodology for frame analysis: From discourse to cognitive schemata. *Social movements and culture*, Routledge. 217-246.
- Jones, V. (2007, May 17). Vanity fair: The unbearable whiteness of green. Huffington Post. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/van-jones/vanity-fair-the-unbearabl_b_48766.html
- Jordan, B., & Henderson, A. (1995). Interaction analysis: Foundations and practice. *The journal of the learning sciences*, 4(1), 39-103.
- Juhasz, A. (2003). No woman is an object: Realizing the feminist collaborative video. *Camera Obscura*.
- Juris, J. S. (2007). Practicing militant ethnography with the movement for global resistance in Barcelona. In S. Shukaitis, D. Graeber, & E. Biddle (Eds.) *Constituent imagination: militant investigations//collective theorization*. AK Press 73-93, 164-176.
- Juris, J. S. (2008). *Networking futures: The movements against corporate globalization*. Duke University Press.
- Jurow, A. S., & Shea, M. (2015). Learning in equity-oriented scale-making projects. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 24(2), 286–307. doi:10.1080/10508406.2015.1004677
- Jurow, A. S., Teeters, L., Shea, M., & Van Steenis, E. (2016). Extending the Consequentiality of “Invisible Work” in the Food Justice Movement. *Cognition and Instruction*, 34(3), 210–221. doi:10.1080/07370008.2016.1172833
- Kane, L. (2000). Popular education and the Landless People's Movement in Brazil (MST). *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 32(1), 36-50.
- Karney, B., Burns, P., Coulter, G., Green, A., Hoffmann, M.; Hosios, A., . . . Sherwood Lollar, B. (2015). Report of the president’s *advisory committee on divestment from fossil fuels*. Accessed at <http://www.president.utoronto.ca/secure-content/uploads/2015/12/Report-of-the-Advisory-Committee-on-Divestment-from-Fossil-Fuels-December-2015.pdf>
- Keating, A. (1995). Interrogating" whiteness,"(de) constructing" race". *College English*, 57(8), 901-918.
- Kilgore, D. W. (1999). Understanding learning in social movements: A theory of collective learning. *International journal of lifelong education*, 18(3), 191-202.
- Kim, J. (2012). Empowering community leadership and learning for immigrant rights: A Cultural-Historical Activity Theory investigation of an urban Korean American community organization. . *31st International Conference of the Canadian Association for Studies in Adult Education*. Waterloo, ON.

- Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1998). Addressing the crisis of whiteness. *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America*, 3-29.
- Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg, S. R., Rodriguez, N. M., & Chennault, R. E. (Eds.). (2000). *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kindon, S. (2003). Participatory video in geographic research: a feminist practice of looking? *Area*, 35(2), 142–153.
- King, B. G., & Pearce, N. A. (2010). The contentiousness of markets: Politics, social movements, and institutional change in markets. *Annual review of sociology*, 36, 249-267.
- King, B. G., & Soule, S. A. (2007). Social movements as extra-institutional entrepreneurs: The effect of protests on stock price returns. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(3), 413-442.
- Kirshner, B. (2007). Introduction: Youth activism as a context for learning and development. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(3), 367–379. doi:10.1177/0002764207306065
- Kirshner, B. (2008). Guided participation in three youth activism organizations: Facilitation, apprenticeship, and joint work. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 17(1), 60–101. doi:10.1080/10508400701793190
- Kirshner, B. & Tivaringe, T. (2016) Every generation has its struggle: Learning in the context of a social movement for education equality in South Africa. Poster presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Kitossa, T. (2000). Same difference: Biocentric imperialism and the assault on indigenous culture and hunting. *Environments*, 28(2), 23.
- Kitzinger, C. (2000) 'Doing Feminist Conversation Analysis', *Feminism & Psychology* 10(2): 163–93.
- Kitzinger, C. (2009). Doing gender: a conversation analytic perspective. *Gender and Society*, 23(1), 94-98.
- Klandermans, B., & Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, networks, motivations, and barriers: Steps towards participation in social movements. *American sociological review*, 519-531.
- Klein, N. (2014). *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Kohler, R. E. (2013). *All creatures: Naturalists, collectors, and biodiversity, 1850-1950*. Princeton University Press.
- Koschmann, T., Stahl, G., & Zemel, A. (2004). The video analyst's manifesto: (Or the implications of Garfinkel's policies for the development of a program of video analytic research within the learning sciences), 278–285
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Krech, S. (2000). *The ecological Indian: Myth and history*. WW Norton & Company.
- Krinsky, J. (2007). *Free labor: Workfare and the contested language of neoliberalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Krinsky, J. (2008). Changing minds: Cognitive systems and strategic change in contention over workfare in New York City. *Social Movement Studies*, 7(1), 1-29.
- Krinsky, J., & Barker, C. (2009). Movement strategizing as developmental learning: Perspectives from cultural-historical activity theory. In Johnston, H. (Ed). *Culture, protest, and social movements*. London: Ashgate Publishers, 209-22.
- Krinsky, J., & Crossley, N. (2014). Social movements and social networks: Introduction. *Social Movement Studies*, 13(1), 1-21.
- Krinsky, J., & Mische, A. (2013). Formations and formalisms: Charles Tilly and the paradox of the actor. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, 1-26.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational research*, 70(1), 25-53.
- McLaren, P. (2015). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. Routledge.
- Kwon, S. A. (2008). Moving from complaints to action: Oppositional consciousness and collective action in a political community. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 39(1), 59-76.
- LaDuke, W. (1999). *All our relations: Native struggles for land and life*. South End Press.
- Langemeyer, I., & Roth, W. M. (2006). Is cultural-historical activity theory threatened to fall short of its own principles and possibilities as a dialectical social science?. *Outlines. Critical Practice Studies*, 8(2), 20-42.
- Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 3:3, 149-164.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge Press.
- Lee, C. D. (2001). Is October Brown Chinese? A cultural modeling activity system for underachieving students. *American educational research journal*, 38(1), 97-141.
- Lee, C. D. (2003). Why we need to re-think race and ethnicity in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 3-5.
- Lee, C. D., & Smagorinsky, P. (2000). *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race, ethnicity and education*, 5(1), 29-50.
- Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. Routledge.
- Leontiev, A. N. (1981). *Problems of the development of the mind*. Moscow: Progress.
- Leontiev, A.N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness, and personality*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Lewis, A. G. (2012). Ethics, activism and the anti-colonial: Social movement research as resistance. *Social Movement Studies*, 11(2), 227-240.
- Little Bear, L. (2000). Jagged worldviews colliding. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 77-85). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Lizarralde, M. (2003). Green imperialism: Indigenous people and conservation of natural environments. *Our backyard: A quest for environmental justice*, 39-57.

- Lyle, J. (2003). Stimulated recall: A report on its use in naturalistic research. *British educational research journal*, 29(6), 861-878.
- MacGregor, S. (2011). *Beyond mothering earth: Ecological citizenship and the politics of care*. UBC Press
- Maeckelbergh, M. (2010). *The will of the many: How the alterglobalisation movement is changing the face of democracy*. Pluto Press.
- Maeckelbergh, M. (2011). Doing is believing: Prefiguration as strategic practice in the alterglobalization movement. *Social Movement Studies*, 10(01), 1-20.
- Magendzo, S. (1990). Popular education in nongovernmental organizations: Education for social mobilization?. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(1), 49-62.
- Maguire, Patricia. (1987). *Doing participatory research: A feminist approach*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
- Mansbridge, J. J., & Morris, A. (2001). *Oppositional consciousness: The subjective roots of social protest*. University of Chicago Press.
- Matoesian, G. (2008). Role conflict as an interactional resource in the multimodal emergence of expert identity. *Semiotica*, 2008(171), 15-49.
- Mattingly, D. J., & Falconer-Al-Hindi, K. (1995). Should women count? A context for the debate. *The Professional Geographer*, 47(4), 427-435.
- McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2003). Dynamics of contention. *Social Movement Studies*, 2(1), 99-102.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1212-1241.
- McDermott, R., Raley, J. D., & Seyer-Ochi, I. (2009). Race and class in a culture of risk. *Review of research in education*, 33(1), 101-116.
- McDonnell, M. H., King, B. G., & Soule, S. A. (2015). A dynamic process model of private politics activist targeting and corporate receptivity to social challenges. *American Sociological Review*, 80(3), 654-678.
- McGregor, D. (2004). Coming full circle: Indigenous knowledge, environment, and our future. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 28(3), 385-410.
- McCoy, K. (2014). Manifesting Destiny: a land education analysis of settler colonialism in Jamestown, Virginia, USA. *Environmental Education Research*, 20(1), 82-97.
- McKibben, B. (2012). Global warming's terrifying new math. *Rolling Stone*, 19(7).
- McKibben, B. (2013). The case for fossil-fuel divestment. *Rolling Stone*, 22.
- McLaren, P. (2015). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. Routledge.
- McLemore, C. A. (1991). *The pragmatic interpretation of English intonation: Sorority speech*. University of Texas at Austin Ph. D (Doctoral dissertation, PhD thesis, dissertation).

- McWilliams, J. (2016). Against the progress narrative: Addressing the "ambivalent gift" of LGBT legitimization. Poster presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Meek, D. (2011). Propaganda, collective participation and the "war of position" in the Brazilian Landless Workers' Movement. *Studies in the Education of Adults*.
- Merchant, C. (2003). Shades of darkness: Race and environmental history. *Environmental History*, 8(3), 380-394.
- Michael Y., Farquhar S., Wiggins, N. & Green, M. (2007). "Findings from a community-based participatory prevention research intervention designed to increase social capital in Latino and African American communities" *Immigrant Minority Health*, 10, pp. 281-289.
- Minkler, M. (2000). Using participatory action research to build healthy communities. *Public Health Reports*. pp. 191-197
- Mitman, G. (1992). *The state of nature: ecology, community, and American social thought, 1900-1950*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mohanty, C.T. (1988). Under western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist review*, 61-88.
- Mojab, S., & Carpenter, S. (2011). *Educating from Marx: Race, gender, and learning*. Springer.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Mondada, L. (2006). Video recording as the reflexive preservation and configuration of phenomenal features for analysis. *Knoblauch, B. Schnettler, J. Raab and HG Soeffner (Red.), Video Analysis. Methodology and Methods. Qualitative Audiovisual Data Analysis in Sociology*, 51-67.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2004). Whiteness, epistemology and Indigenous representation. *Whitening race: Essays in social and cultural criticism*, (1), 75-88.
- Morris, A. D. (1986). *The origins of the civil rights movement*. Simon and Schuster
- Nadasdy, P. (2005). Transcending the debate over the ecologically noble Indian : Indigenous peoples and environmentalism. *Ethnohistory*, 52(2), 291-331.
- Nasir, N.S., Rosebery, A.S., Warren, B., & Lee, C.D. (2006). Learning as a cultural process: Achieving equity through diversity. *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences*, 489-504.
- Nasir, N. I. (2011). *Racialized identities: Race and achievement among African American youth*. Stanford University Press.
- Nasir, N.S. & Hand, V. M. (2006). Exploring sociocultural perspectives on race, culture, and learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 449-475.
- Newman, R. (2001). Making environmental politics: women and love canal activism. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 29(1/2), 65-84.
- Ng, R., Staton, P. A., & Scane, J. (1995). *Anti-racism, feminism, and critical approaches to education*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

- Nyks, K. (Director), & Scott, J. P. (Producer). (2013). *Do the math* [Motion picture]. United States: PF Pictures.
- O'Connor, R. (2016, November 28). Standing Rock: North Dakota access pipeline demonstrators say white people are 'treating protest like Burning Man'. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/music/news/standing-rock-north-dakota-access-pipeline-burning-man-festival-a7443266.html>
- Oliver, P., & Johnston, H. (2000). What a good idea! Ideologies and frames in social movement research. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, 5(1), 37-54.
- Ollis, T. (2011). Learning in social action: The informal and social learning dimensions of circumstantial and lifelong activists. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*.
- Ollman, B. (2003). *Dance of the dialectic: Steps in Marx's method*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Ollman, B. (1993). *Dialectical investigations*. New York: Routledge,
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States*. Routledge.
- O'Neill, K., & VanDeveer, S. D. (2005). Transnational environmental activism after Seattle: Between emancipation and arrogance. In Leatherman, J., & Webber, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Charting transnational democracy: Beyond global arrogance*. Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Osa, M. (2003). *Solidarity and contention: networks of Polish oppositions* (Vol. 18). University of Minnesota Press.
- Our Power Campaign (n.d). <http://www.ourpowercampaign.org>. Retrieved from [ourpowercampaign.org](http://www.ourpowercampaign.org).
- Paechter, C. (2006). Power, knowledge, and embodiment in communities of sex/gender practice. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 29(1), 13-26.
- Paechter, C. (2003a). Learning masculinities and femininities: Power/knowledge and legitimate peripheral participation. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26, 541-552.
- Paechter, C. (2003b). Masculinities and femininities as communities of practice. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26, 69-77
- Park, P. (1993). What is participatory research? A theoretical and methodological perspective. In Park, P, Brydon-Miller, M, Hall, B, and Jackson, T. (Eds.) *Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Pink, S. (2013). *Doing visual ethnography*. Sage.
- Pirie, S. (1996). Classroom video-recording: When, why and how does it offer a valuable data source for qualitative research? Proceedings from the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education. Panama City, FL.
- Pitt, A., & D. P. Britzman. (2003). Speculations on Qualities of Difficult Knowledge in Teaching and Learning: An Experiment in Psychoanalytic Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 16, 755-776.

- Polletta, F. (2012). *Freedom is an endless meeting: Democracy in American social movements*. University of Chicago Press.
- Polletta, F. (2009). *It was like a fever: Storytelling in protest and politics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Prudhomme, J. J., DiGiacomo, D. & Van Steenis, E. (2016). Learning to resist: Foregrounding the political funds of knowledge rooted in organizing among communities of color. Poster presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Pulido, L. (2000). Rethinking environmental racism: White privilege and urban development in Southern California. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90(1), 12-40.
- Ramazanoglu, C. (2002). *Feminist methodology*. London: Sage.
- Roediger, D. R. (1999). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. Verso.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (2016). Paradigm shifts in repertoires of practice. Presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Rogoff, B., Pérez González, C., Chavajay Quiacaín, C., & Chavajay Quiacaín, J. (2011). *Developing destinies: A Mayan midwife and town*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B., Najafi, B., & Mejía-Arauz, R. (2014). Constellations of cultural practices across generations: Indigenous American heritage and learning by observing and pitching in. *Human Development*, 57(2-3), 82-95.
- Rogoff, B. E., & Lave, J. E. (1984). *Everyday cognition: Its development in social context*. Harvard University Press.
- Roschelle, J. (2000). Choosing and using video equipment for data collection. *Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education*, 709-729.
- Rose, M. (2005). *The mind at work: Valuing the intelligence of the American worker*. Penguin.
- Salminen-Karlsson, M. (2006). Situating gender in situated learning, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 22, 31-48.
- Sandoval, C. (1991). US third world feminism: The theory and method of oppositional consciousness in the postmodern world. *Genders*, (10), 1-24.
- Sannino, A., Daniels, H., & Gutiérrez, K. (Eds.) (2009). *Learning and expanding with activity theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sawan, J. E. (2011). Recovering Marx's theory of alienation: Theoretical considerations from a case study with community activists in Scarborough, Ontario. *Just Labour*, 17.
- Sawchuk, P. H. (2011). Anti-poverty activism from a CHAT perspective: A comparison of learning across three organizations. In Brigham, S., & Plumb, D. (Eds). *29th International Conference of the Canadian Association for Studies in Adult Education*. Montreal, QC.

- Sawchuk, P. H. (2014). Understanding a Dialectical Materialist CHAT Perspective on Social Movement Learning. In Plumb, D. (Ed). *33rd International Conference of the Canadian Association for Studies in Adult Education*. St. Catherines, ON.
- Sawchuk, P.H. (2006). Activity and power: Everyday life and development of working-class groups. In Sawchuk, P.H., Duarte, N., & Elhammoumi, M. (Eds). *Critical perspectives on activity: Explorations across education, work and the everyday*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 238-267.
- Sawchuk, P.H. (2010). Socio-cognition and social movement theory: A Marxist activity theory perspective on community/union mobilization and change. In Barker, C., & Tyldesley, M. (Eds.), *Alternative Futures and Popular Protest Conference*, Manchester: Manchester Metropolitan University.
- Saxe, G. B. (1991). *Culture and cognitive development: Studies in mathematical understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Scandrett, E., Crowther, J., Hemmi, A., Mukherjee, S., Shah, D., & Sen, T. (2010). Theorising education and learning in social movements: environmental justice campaigns in Scotland and India. *Studies in the Education of Adults*.
- Shabecoff, P. (2012). *A fierce green fire: The American environmental movement*. Island Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1992) 'Introduction', in H. Sacks, *Lectures on Conversation* (Vols I and II, G. Jefferson, ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on language and social interaction*, 26(1), 99-128.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1997) 'Whose Text? Whose Context?', *Discourse & Society* 8: 165–87.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 413-416.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999). Schegloff's texts' asBillig's data': A critical reply. *Discourse & Society*, 10(4), 558-572.
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (1995). The primacy of the ethical: propositions for a militant anthropology. *Current anthropology*, 36(3), 409-440.
- Scully-Russ, E. (2006). Learning to organize: US unions, work, and learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 18(7/8), 522-534.
- Shriver, T. E., Miller, A. C., & Cable, S. (2003). Women's work. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 44(4), 639-658.
- Simpson, L. (2004). Anticolonial strategies for the recovery and maintenance of Indigenous knowledge. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 28(3), 373-384.
- Simpson, L. (2011). *Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence and a new emergence*. Arbeiter Ring Pub.
- Sinclair, A. (2005). *Doing leadership differently: Gender, power and sexuality in a changing business culture*. Melbourne Univ. Publishing.
- Smirnov, N. (2016). Civic futuremaking: Social network participatory design with youth. Poster presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

- Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, D. E. (1990). *The conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge*. University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed books.
- Smith, N. (1992). Contours of a spatialized politics: Homeless vehicles and the production of geographical scale. *Social Text*, (33), 55-81.
- Sohng, S. S. L. (1996). Participatory research and community organizing. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 23(4), 77-97.
- Soule, S. A. (2009). *Contention and corporate social responsibility*. Cambridge University Press.
- Soule, S. A. (2012). Social movements and markets, industries, and firms. *Organization Studies*, 33(12), 1715-1733.
- Speer, S. A. (2005). *Gender talk: Feminism, discourse and conversation analysis*. Psychology Press.
- Spelman, E. V. (1988). *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought*. Beacon Press.
- Stephenson, W. (2012, October 18). Cue the math: McKibben's roadshow takes aim at Big Oil. *Grist*. Retrieved from grist.org
- Stetsenko, A. (2008). From relational ontology to transformative activist stance on development and learning: expanding Vygotsky's (CHAT) project. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 3, 471-491.
- Stevenson, M. (1998). *Traditional knowledge in environmental management?: From commodity to process*. Edmonton: Sustainable Forest Management Network.
- Stoddart, Mark C. J., & D. B. Tindall. 2011. Ecofeminism, hegemonic masculinity, and environmental movement participation in British Columbia, Canada, 1998-2007: 'Women always clean up the mess'. *Sociological Spectrum* 31(3): 342-368.
- Stokoe, E. H., & Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: Conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 12(2), 217-244.
- Swarthmore Mountain Justice. (2015, March 19). Breaking: 37 Swarthmore students and 6 alumni begin sit-in in finance and investments office for divestment. Retrieved from swatmj.org.
- TallBear, K. (2013). Genomic articulations of Indigeneity. *Social Studies of Science*, 0306312713483893
- Tandon, R. (1981). Participatory research in the empowerment of people. *Convergence*, 14(3), 20.
- Taylor, D. E. (1997). American environmentalism: The role of race, class and gender in shaping activism 1820-1995. *Race, Gender & Class*, 16-62.
- Tarrow, S. (2008). Charles Tilly and the practice of contentious politics. *Social Movement Studies*, 7(3), 225-246.
- Tarrow, S. G. (2011). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge University Press.

- Tasker, J. P. (2016, November 29). Trudeau cabinet approves Trans Mountain, Line 3 pipelines, rejects Northern Gateway. Canadian Broadcast Corporation. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/federal-cabinet-trudeau-pipeline-decisions-1.3872828>
- Taylor, D. E. (1989). Blacks and the environment toward an explanation of the concern and action gap between blacks and whites. *Environment and Behavior*, 21(2), 175-205.
- Taylor, D. E. (2000). The rise of the environmental justice paradigm injustice framing and the social construction of environmental discourses. *American behavioral scientist*, 43(4), 508-580.
- Taylor, D. (2014). *Toxic communities: Environmental racism, industrial pollution, and residential mobility*. NYU Press.
- Teeters, L. & Jurow, A.S. (2016). New tools to organize old practices: Activism in the food justice movement. Poster presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Thorpe, J. (2011). Temagami's tangled wild: The making of race, nature, and nation in early-twentieth-century Ontario. In A. Baldwin, L. Cameron, & A. Kobayashi (Eds.), *Rethinking the great white north: Race, nature and the historical geographies of whiteness in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Tilly, C. (1964). *The Vendee*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tilly, C. (2008). *Contentious performances*. Cambridge University Press.
- Titchkosky, T. (2011). *The question of access: Disability, space, meaning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Toronto350.org. (2013/2015). The fossil fuel industry and the case for divestment (/Updated). Retrieved from <http://www.uoftfacultydivest.com/files/fossil-fuel-divest-new.pdf>
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Accessed at http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Exec_Summary_2015_05_31_web_o.pdf
- Tsleil-Waututh Nation Sacred Land Trust. (2016, November 29). MEDIA RELEASE: TRUDEAU'S KINDER MORGAN PERMITS "DISAPPOINTING, DANGEROUS" AND "JUST THE BEGINNING", TSLEIL-WAUTUTH NATION SPOKESPERSON. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from <http://blog.twnsacredtrust.ca/blog/media-release-trudeaus-kinder-morgan-permits-disappointing-dangerous-and-just-the-beginning-tsleil-waututh-nation-spokesperson>
- Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *JCT (Online)*, 29(1), 72.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1).
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2013). *Youth resistance research and theories of change*. Routledge.

- US Department of the Army. (2016, December 4). *Memorandum: Proposed Dakota Access Pipeline crossing at Lake Oahe, North Dakota*. Retrieved from <http://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/stmt.pdf>
- Vakil, S., McKinney de Royston, M., Nasir, N.S., & Kirshner, B. (2016). Rethinking race and power in design-based research: Reflections from the field. *Cognition and Instruction*, 34(3), 194–209. doi:10.1080/07370008.2016.1169817
- Varese, S. (1996). The new environmentalist movement of Latin American indigenous people. In Stabinsky, D., & Brush, S. B. (Eds.). (1996). *Valuing local knowledge: indigenous people and intellectual property rights*. Island Press. 122-42.
- Vossoughi, S., & Escudé, M. (2016). What does the camera communicate? An inquiry into the politics and possibilities of video research on learning. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 47(1), 42–58. doi:10.1111/aeq.12134
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- Walter, P. (2007). Adult learning in new social movements: Environmental protest and the struggle for the Clayoquot Sound Rainforest. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 57(3), 248–263. doi:10.1177/0741713606297444
- Watts, R. J., Griffith, D. M., & Abdul-Adil, J. (1999). Sociopolitical development as an antidote for oppression—theory and action. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 27(2), 255-271.
- Watts, R. J., & Guessous, O. (2006). Sociopolitical development: The missing link in research and policy on adolescents. *Beyond resistance*, 59-80.
- Wetherell, M. (2003). Racism and the analysis of cultural resources in interviews. *Analyzing race talk: Multidisciplinary approaches to the interview*, 11-30.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. Columbia University Press.
- Welton, M. (1993). Social revolutionary learning: The new social movements as learning sites. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 43(3), 152–164. doi:10.1177/0741713693043003002
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S..1995a. Doing difference. *Gender & Society* 9(1): 8-37.
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S..1995b. Reply—(Re)doing difference. *Gender & Society* 9(4): 491-513.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125–151.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2009). Accounting for doing gender. *Gender and Society* 23(1): 112-122
- Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2008). Using conversation analysis in feminist and critical research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(2), 555-573.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

- Witt Smith, J., & Joseph, S. E. (2010). Workplace challenges in corporate America: differences in black and white. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 29(8), 743-765.
- Wolk, L., Abdelli-Beruh, N. B., & Slavin, D. (2012). Habitual use of vocal fry in young adult female speakers. *Journal of Voice*, 26(3), e111-e116.
- Worster, D. (1994). *Nature's economy: a history of ecological ideas*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage publications.
- Zelezny, L., & Bailey, M. (2006). A call for women to lead a different environmental movement. *Organization & environment*, 19(1), 103-109.
- 350.org. (2016). Do the math tour. Retrieved from <http://www.math.350.org>
- @sydnerain. (2016, November 23). For those of you who aren't familiar with all of the "spiritual journey" white folks who have been showing up to camp: [Tweet]. Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/sydnerain/status/801508798418587649>

Appendix 1

Division of Labour Statement

Because the doctoral dissertation is intended to represent original work on the part of the candidate, I carefully lay out the division of labour on the research project, and in particular on the jointly written chapters. This is intended to clarify for the evaluating committee what my contributions were and to make clear that this project was very much, and very intentionally collaborative through all of its stages. I briefly review here areas of the research project where I was solely responsible, areas where research collective participants and I shared responsibility, and then review the division of labour for the empirical chapters that were jointly written.

Sole Responsibility

Across all of the co-written chapters several things are true. This project would not exist outside of my dissertation process. I designed the research project's overall framework, was responsible for the ethics protocol, participant recruitment, data collection, data management, and administrative tasks related to ethics and data. I was responsible for training students on feminist and Indigenous research methodologies, mostly through discussions, targeted reading, and day-to-day practice, navigating epistemological questions about how we know and how we can support our findings within relational ontologies and anti-racist feminist epistemologies. I was also responsible for training students on how to use StudioCode software, how to do interaction analysis, and how to do iterative coding cycles. For all of the students involved, this was their first experience working on a research project, and so I trained and mentored them throughout the process. This included mentorship on academic article writing and academic presentations. I secured funding for co-researchers to co-present, and made sure they had opportunities to present our work alongside me.

Although part of the work reported in this thesis is done in a collaborative manner, I take full responsibility for the integrity of the work, the content of the writing, as well as the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Joint Responsibility

As a research collective, I share responsibility with the participants who have voluntarily opted to be more involved in developing our analytic approach. We collectively developed specific questions from within the broad framework that participants consented to, narrowing the focus of data analysis to be more targeted. After deciding on sets of questions, we collectively developed a process for analysis, decided on and refine codes, coded data and drafted memos about our early findings. The coding responsibilities and initial drafting has varied by project, and is outlined in the next section. We share responsibility for representing the work publicly, through presentations within the group to seek feedback, and through public presentations at conferences.

Specific Chapters

Doing Expertise (Chapter Three) is co-written with Jody R. Chan. Jody was involved with the divestment campaign during the second semester of year one of data collection. Jody and other students helped to design the specific questions and basic codes. Jody and I jointly coded the first half of our sample (seven videos). I finished the other seven, did the compilation and analysis (and got feedback from Jody), and then wrote the first draft of our paper. From there the process was very collaborative, with us writing together and sharing the workload very evenly. Though I have more experience and played a bit of a mentor role, it was a very productive collaboration. We then presented and I sought feedback, which we both worked to integrate. I managed submission to journals and conferences. I am the corresponding author.

Politicization in Practice (Chapter Four) is co-written with Amil Davis and Lila Asher. Amil, Lila, and I worked with Jade Wong and Tresanne Fernandes to conduct initial data analysis. We worked iteratively, individually writing sections, and then worked collectively to hone our arguments and frame within the literature. Here we worked equally to develop ideas, and I introduced Lila and Amil to the theoretical frameworks of the learning sciences and social movement learning. I synthesized the sections of the draft, writing the full draft in final form. We collectively edited and I finalized the draft for submission. We are all co-presenting the work publicly at conferences.