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ABSTRACT

This inquiry explores how college students navigate the sociohistorical context of race on campus, guided by critical material and spatial theories. Specifically, I explore how students navigate the tangle of discourses surrounding race on a college campus from the history of buildings and monuments, the perceptions and stereotypes of the campus before arriving, and how they navigate, resist, and reproduce those discourses and rhetoric. This inquiry is informed by research from higher education, which has demonstrated not only a gap in experiences between historically marginalized students and their majority peers but a persistent culture of white supremacy that is reified through formal and informal policies and systems.

Specifically, I take up the idea of belongingness in relation to White supremacy and higher education to explore how higher education outcomes that are often positioned as neutral are historically situated and hegemonic concepts that are reproduced through institutional practices. In other words, this research explores and works the tensions between the idea of belongingness as an achievable, boundable, and predictable outcome, and the persistent reproduction of racism and White supremacy in higher education that works against belonging. I explore the contradictions between what institutions say they do (with regards to diversity, equity, and inclusion) and how those values are experienced and encountered in higher education by students.

This inquiry creates conversations between the experiences and navigations of students and the productions of place and space and race in higher education, moving between slippages...
in discourses between the South and Alabama, how the South is produced as racist, and how racism and White supremacy produce the South. This is followed by an exploration of disruptions in these slippages, moments where these slippages became visible, and the possibility for conspiratorial resistance, intervention, and reclamation of space. This inquiry suggests possibilities for higher education practitioners to consider the specifics of place, the context of our coeval becomings, even as we understand and take the global in perspective to inform how we make the place of higher education differently.
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1. ON MAPS

It is summer time and I am cleaning out the closet in my childhood bedroom. Trash bags of crumpled paper and long abandoned art projects fill the floor of my room, and an ever-growing pile of clothing to be donated grows in another corner. I am standing on my desk chair, peering into the upper reaches of the closet when a stack of lumpy papers coated in dust catches my eye. Pulling them down, I find myself sitting on the floor, cross-legged, surrounded by maps. A square of cardboard, painstakingly painted in shades of blue, with green salt dough land formations, tiny hand-lettered cities, and a decoupage glue lake fed by a yarn river. A handstitched book written in careful calligraphy, detailing the experiences of the protagonist in *The Cay*, a carefully colored map of Finland with tiny icons for exports and imports. Surrounded by the debris of my education, I trace the connections and intensities between them, feeling myself pulled again to the magic and allure of their cartographies, the embodied desires, and intensities they produce – from the cautious hand-stitching along the spine of a book to the edges of the paper I had carefully burned to add patina, the smooth and self-aware lines of colored pencil staying within the lines.
Deleuze and Guattari (1987) wrote, “the map does not reproduce an unconscious closed in upon itself; it constructs the unconscious. It fosters connections between fields” (p. 12). These school projects, forgotten and now excavated, produce cartographies that flicker out beyond the boundaries and lines of paper, cardboard, salt dough, and dust – connecting to memories and counter memories of education and connection, joy and isolation. They operate as maps at many levels, orienting devices and openings to fragmented histories and becomings that call to be told and retold through further explorations.

Maps can be entered at many points, they have only middles, they are made up of lines of connection that are constantly becoming (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). You may understand, then, my struggle with where-to-start, where to enter. A dissertation does many things at once. A checkbox towards admittance, certificate of approval, a stamp of acceptance into academia. A dissertation takes place over linear time (semesters of coursework, of writing), while also zigzagging and folding forward and backward across temporal and spatial scales, moving all-at-once, then seemingly not-at-all, even as it is always becoming, always already there. A concept that is woven throughout this dissertation is the haecceity: you are here, and you are part of it, even as you are making sense of it (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). St. Pierre (2017) described the haecceity as capturing becomings in action, bits of experience that cannot be contained. By becoming, I mean the potential to become otherwise, to become differently in an infinite series of ‘ands’. With becoming, there is always already potential, always already excess. Becoming with haecceities in this dissertation project embraces the messiness, the transitions, the in-between spaces of inquiry and methodology. Through this process, as I think with haecceity, I embark on a continuous inquiry of mapping and following the possibilities of qualitative inquiry. As I seek adequate mappings of the present, the concept of the haecceity guides me as I find
myself simultaneously producing, interpreting, representing, and navigating this dissertation. The haecceity is a concept that enacts the spatial and material theories that guide my inquiry and embodies my methodologies. You are here, and you are making sense of it, even as you are part of it.

This dissertation (this becoming PhD) operates as a map, bringing together moments, encounters, theories, philosophies, and methodologies towards an inquiry – an inquiry that invokes a both/and, exploring how college students navigate the socio-historical context of a college campus, but also, simultaneously, producing a cartography of the methodological orientations and navigations of this inquiry. These methodological orientations are ruptures and disorientations that changed my path, modulated my questions, sent me looping back to re-enter, re-create, re-orient to the map differently. Thus, my aim with this dissertation is multiplicitous. I hope to tell the story of my becoming through this inquiry, mapping the modulations and flows of my methodological navigations. Simultaneously, I traverse the context for my inquiry, creating a landscape of theory and methodology and history, leading to findings and implications that are situated in this particular journey. So, even as my research questions explore how college students navigate campus and how the socio-historical context of race on campus affects those navigations, this dissertation-as-cartography moves forward in spurs and starts, attending to my methodological becomings. This is not a linear or straightforward path, and, as such, there are times when my journey may feel haphazard or disorienting, moments where the leaps I take are tenuous or shaky, following lines that are becoming underneath my feet. This dissertation is a marking of a path that is always becoming, the always already failed project of pausing, capturing a haecceity. Throughout, I intersperse moments of reflection, methodological moments of reorientation and recalibration, moments where we pause on the journey to check the
compass, change direction, take a breath. You are here, and you are part of it, even as you’re making sense of it.
2. THE BOULDER\textsuperscript{1}

The boulder has resonated across the time spaces of this study and my time as a student and staff member at The University of Alabama in myriad ways. I first encountered it during the pilot study for this project when Jon, a senior chemical engineering major who had been involved in activism on campus focused on changing building names, bee-lined for the structure at the start of our walking tour in the Fall of 2016. I was startled, seeing the monument that first time\textsuperscript{2} -- a five-foot-tall rock, as it sits at the central axis of campus formed by the main library, and the President’s Mansion. Dedicated by the Daughters of the Confederacy in 1914, the text on the plaque of the rock commemorates:

\begin{quote}
The University of Alabama gave to the Confederacy—7 general officers, 25 colonels, 14 lieutenant-colonels, 21 majors, 125 captains, 275 staff and other commissioned officers, 66 non-commissioned officers and 294 private soldiers. Recognizing obedience to state, they loyally and uncomplainingly met the call of duty, in numberless instances sealing their devotion by their life blood. And on April 3, 1865, the cadet corps, composed wholly of boys, went bravely forth to the repel a veteran federal invading foe, of many times their number. In a vain effort to save their alma mater, its building, library, and laboratories from destruction by fire, which it met at the hands of the enemy on the day following. \textit{To commemorate this heroic record this memorial stone is erected by the Alabama division, United Daughters of the Confederacy.}
University of Alabama, May 13, 1914 (Mould, 2016).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1} I also take up this moment with the boulder in Flint (2018b)
\textsuperscript{2} Even as it wasn’t the first time, really. I’d walked by the boulder many times before. The boulder had not been invisible, but rather was produced as invisible through the configuration of materialities in my navigations of campus. In further sections, we will explore this tension between visible/invisible, seeing/not seeing, secret/not a secret.
Jon and I lingered at the rock as a campus tour walked by us. As we lingered, our talk about Jon’s activism and his desire to make the rock visible and the rubberstamped rhetoric of the campus tour entangled and overlapped, contradicting and intersecting. The text on the monument congealed with the script of the campus tour, a tour that tells a narrative of a campus burned during the Civil War (leaving out any mention of slaves or slavery). These narratives spiral out to other buildings lining the quad, as the tour guide points the attention of the prospective students to Nott Hall, a building that houses the honors college, and had also been the topic of protests the past year. Jon had been involved in those protests, which advocated for

*Figure 1: Close-up of boulder plaque.* photograph taken by author, September 2017
changing the name of Nott Hall, as the namesake for the building was a leader of the eugenics movement and advocated for the scientific proof of differences between races.

The encounter with the boulder produced material-discursive overlappings. Jon, discussing his experiences as a student visiting the campus and his knowledge and encounters with the monument, as well as the history of the monument and the buildings surrounding the

Figure 2: The boulder. photograph taken by author, September 2017.
quad, overlapped and plugged into the discourse of the campus tour guide (who walks by us as we are standing in front of the monument). Thinking through this encounter, I found myself mapping a visual and affective constellation of events and materialities, moving between bodies and affects, and becoming particularly interested in how race and racism were (re)produced through everyday material-discursive practices. Jon and I, standing in front of the monument, as the tour skips-slips by it. The discourse of Nott Hall and the honors college entangle. Credentials and entry for the honors college, which admits over one-third of each incoming freshman class even as only 1% of its members are Black (Finnegan, 2016), entangle with discourses of Nott Hall, a building named after a man who barred entry to Black students at Alabama Medical College and promoted a theory of biological difference between races. Through this encounter, the place of campus became differently. A cracking and stuttering occurred as Jon and I drew attention to the monument through the orientation of our bodies, quite literally walking off the sidewalk to stand in front of the grass of the boulder. Our deviation from the path produced the possibility that our bodies might draw the bodies of the tour at a later moment, pulling them toward us. Simultaneously, campus is reproduced through our movements, the tour continues on uninterrupted, flanked by the flags lining the paths on the quad that tell a narrative of academic excellence (where legends are made), surrounded by the carefully manicured lawns, yellow brick, columns, and staircases that echo and replicate the history of slavery on the campus.

This also resonates with experiences and encounters that had happened throughout my time as a student and practitioner at Alabama. For example, as a second-year master’s student, a

---

3 I situate the parentheses around (re) in (re)produced here to illustrate how production is always already occurring. (Re)production suggests that the repetition of productions are a production of difference, that each production (happening in simultaneity and multiplicity) offers possibility for affirmative difference, for the production to become differently – as opposed to a reproduction of the same.

4 “Where Legends are Made” was the marketing campaign for the University of Alabama, launched in September 2016
Crimson White article exposing the systemic practices of segregation within White Panhellenic sororities (Crain & Ford, 2013) led to a series of protests and activism on campus, including a march from the main library to the administration building, touted as “The Final Stand in the Schoolhouse Door” (walking past, incidentally, the boulder that would pull Jon and I towards it several years later). Or the election, in the spring following the protests, of Elliot Spillers to the Student Government (SGA) presidency, the first Black student elected to the office in over 40 years and backed by an independent coalition of student groups and Panhellenic sorority women, breaking the decades-long grip of the Machine (a voting bloc of “Old Row” Panhellenic and Intra Fraternity Council organizations with a history of intimidation and violent practices). And then, two years later, a second SGA election where the same voting bloc turned away from the White woman they had successfully backed the year before to support Jared Hunter, a Black student who was a member of an Old Row Fraternity – a tumultuous election season that included Hunter writing an op-ed in the student newspaper claiming the support of the Machine in an article titled “The answer is yes: The question that’s been dodged for over a century” (Hunter, 2017). This, layered with the long-awaited dedication of a plaque on campus honoring Autherine Lucy Foster, an event where Foster remarked wryly, “The last time I saw a crowd like this at the University of Alabama…” (Johnson, 2017, para. 1), and then, more recently, a series of racist Instagram posts by sorority women, followed by university denouncements, the students’ withdrawal from the university, and expulsion from their sororities (S. Bell, 2018; Lipan, 2018).

See (Weiss, 1992) for a dated, but still relevant historical overview of the Machine, or more recent articles from the student newspaper on the organizations recent iterations (A. Smith, 2015; M. Smith, 2016; Stansell & Jones, 2017). In addition, a podcast series, released in August 2018 titled “Greek Gods” explores the Machine through the 2017 student government elections (Yurkanin & Archibald, 2018.). Listen at https://www.stitcher.com/podcast/alcom/reckon-radio

This specific configuration of Machine-SGA elections-race-campus is explored further in Chapter 17: Not a secret
These congealing and contradicting narratives swirling around the boulder lingered with me, and I wrote about this moment, (Flint, 2018b), wondering, what did our pausing do? How did these material-discursive narratives matter, and how were they produced and productive of the place and context of Alabama? Writing and thinking through that moment, I followed the material-discursive configurations of Jon-me-boulder-SGA-Nott Hall-Autherine Lucy-honors college-slavery-Confederacy, to wonder what they made possible. Specifically, I wondered how the specific material-discursive intersections of Alabama, as an assemblage of encounters and intensities, produced and was produced by students in a way that higher education outcomes and theories failed to capture. I specifically wondered about how the particular configuration of place and the concept of “belonging” entangled with each other. How did place matter in student’s belonging in college? For example, Jon, a White man who was born and raised in Alabama, had visited campus many times before coming to the university, and during our walking interview, even as he led me to spaces that were resonant with the history of slavery and racism on campus, he also expressed a desire to represent the university differently:

*I mean I just think I mean there’s such a chance to be stewards for really the whole country    maybe this is definitely colored by my experience growing up in the South I see the South as really one of the predominant narratives in America and people who think or who find that weird contradiction of Southern and but Confederate flag and like America love it or leave it and literally the South tried to leave it you know -- the war and it’s just confusing to me and when people are silent about it we’re missing an opportunity and people might disagree with me about what it means exactly but I wish we would have it those discussions*

*(Jon)*
My conversation with Jon informed how I structured and facilitated walking interviews the following year, asking students to take me on an “alternative tour of campus” and at times intervening to ask specifically about particular monuments, landmarks, or narratives.

Over a year after pausing at the monument with Jon, I found myself on a walking tour with Leo, a Black queer student who was also a senior and was also involved in various advocacy movements on campus, and we again paused at the boulder. These two moments, with both Leo and Jon, spaced temporally over a year apart, entangled and congealed in ways that seem at times serendipitous: During my walking interview with Jon, I wondered if our pausing may have made the monument visible to attendees of a campus tour in ways that our walking past it would not have. Then, a year later, as Leo and I stood in front of the boulder, discussing his first encounter with it, we were joined by a trio of historians, and later by a family that stopped to take a picture of the boulder. Leo reflected, “[it] pulled more people to it, like what is this? Maybe I should take a picture, even if I don’t know what it is, people are looking at it.” The imagined pull of a year and a half before was enacted. Added to this, during our walk, Jon and I had paused to listen to the voice of a campus tour guide as she led a tour by the boulder, her rhetoric pulling our conversation towards Nott Hall and the ways that histories of building names shaped and produced the place of campus, and Jon’s efforts to start discussion on campus around the building names. A year and a half later, as Leo and I walked from the boulder towards Nott Hall, our paths again intersected with campus tour guides, although this time three of them were walking together down the same path we were walking on. At this moment, Leo, recognizing one of the tour guides, stopped them to ask how they talked about the boulder on their tour. After our brief interaction, we continued towards Nott Hall, turning back to see that the three campus tour...
guides had also continued towards the boulder, pausing together to lean in toward the inscription on its front.

The boulder, then, reverberates throughout this inquiry, a haecceity that folds space and time on multiple scales, through the duration of data generation, the history of White supremacy, racism, and slavery on campus, to the narratives of “the South,” and how the students I talked to through this study sought to remake and trouble these narratives and histories. Because of this, I situate the boulder as a touchstone that is threaded throughout the readings and paths of other walking tours and other encounters on campus. The boulder, in this way, serves as a line, connecting to other narratives and productions of place (such as Nott Hall, the South, campus tours), while also resonating where it is not mentioned, where it is passed over, unremarked upon, becoming implicated through silences. As Annaliese, another student reflected, “there are different types of history that would be important to different types of people.” Throughout this research project, as we move between narratives of students to explore the question of how college students navigate the socio-historical context of race on campus, the boulder and these moments will continue to be returned to, to consider differently through repetition.
3. HAPPENINGS

A dissertation slips and slides away, theories and understandings layering and congealing and refracting, always becoming. This is true even as there were things that happened. The back and forth with the Institutional Review Board, hanging recruitment posters, sending emails. Focus groups and interviews and guided walks with thirteen students that graciously and generously gave their time, transcribing, meetings, deadlines, and drafts. These things all happened. So, as this dissertation becomes a methodological map, I am thinking it might be helpful for you to know what happened, and with whom, before talking about why or how it mattered, or even returning to why I did what I did in the first place. This will not be the last time I talk about what I did, but perhaps it will provide you with some bearings going forward, something to hold onto as haecceities and maps layer.

The linear version of what happened: times, people, places, locations is a mapping I can hold onto, and that perhaps you can come back to. A reference as theory and literature get mapped around and through and between it, producing them differently. So, know that these are not the last mappings of what happened, but rather mappings to start from, and to disrupt. The first mapping are charts that I created for the purpose of my proposal defense and, later, research talks when applying for jobs and discussing this research with external audiences. These charts do something in that they present the happenings of this research in a linear way, easy to digest and understand. Therein is who participated (or pseudonyms of who participated), here are their identities (partial and static), this is (part of) what they did (during this particular time). Check,
check, check into boxes and lines of an Excel spreadsheet. Lather (2004) urged us to resist clarity and “the disciplining and normalising effort to standardise educational research in the name of quality and effectiveness” (p. 32). These charts code and bound my research into legible happenings, make possible questions of standardization – how many students participated? what were the demographics of the study’s population? How does this reflect the population of the school? Are your findings representative? Generalizable? Although these are not questions that are necessarily important to answer for me, following my theoretical orientations, their lingering and persistence in educational research leave marks and matterings on this dissertation. So, I include these mapping as a line of legibility to educational research, even as I disrupt and trouble the clarity they suggest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Guided Walks</th>
<th>State*</th>
<th>Classification*</th>
<th>Demographic Notes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Multiracial Woman, Honors College, Resident Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skylar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Black Woman, Honors College, Resident Advisor, Biology Major, Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>White Man, Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>White Man, Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>White Man, Atheist, Honors College, Chemical Engineering Major/History Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Black Woman, Christian, Resident Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>White Woman, Performing Arts Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* data from Residential Curriculum Survey, completed by students prior to taking part in this study
Table 2: Participants – Full Dissertation Study 2017 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Individual Interview</th>
<th>Guided Walks</th>
<th>State*</th>
<th>Classification*</th>
<th>Demographic Notes*±</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>White, she/her/hers, gay, Advertising Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annaliese</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>African American, she/her/hers, Resident Advisor, International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Hispanic, She/her/hers, Human Development &amp; Family Studies major, in a Panhellenic sorority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>White, he/him/his, Interdisciplinary studies major, in an IFC fraternity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cladius</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Black, he/him/his, queer, History major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Everywhere (Air Force)</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Black, she/her/hers, Telecommunications and Film Major, African American studies minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>White, she/her/hers, Architectural Engineering Major, in a Panhellenic sorority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>White, she/her/hers, English major, Million Dollar Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Black, he/him/his, queer, Biology Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>White, she/her/hers, Biology Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Muslim, She/her/hers, RA, Civil Engineering Major, Spanish Minor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>She/her/hers, third-year doctoral student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri/Texas</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>White, she/her/hers, Anthropology Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* State, classification, and majors from the information sheet
± self-descriptors from focus group/interviews
The second mapping is a numbered list of what happened, a map of duration and (somewhat) linear time. This format is inspired and informed by the writing style of the lyric essay, where objective and subjective material are juxtaposed in tension (Menkedick, 2014). As Deborah Tall and John D’Agata (1997) wrote in their introduction to the lyric essay in *The Seneca Review*, “the lyric essay sets off on an uncharted course through interlocking webs of idea, circumstance, and language” (n.p.). The format of the lyric essay maps a becoming that is both linear and simultaneously disruptive of the linear. For example, even as the map that follows is numbered, the text following the numbers moves backward and forward through time and space, creating new boundaries and redefining what counts and matters in the research project. I find this mapping useful as a sketch, a chart that begins to point to and insinuate the leaps and jumps and meanderings that happen in the pages to follow, starts and stutters and course changes. This map does something different than the first in that it begins to pull in the serendipitous moments and encounters that affected this research in unpredictable ways. Matterings like reading a particular book, changing jobs – these moments matter in how this dissertation developed and became. This mapping became important for me as I paused, halfway through writing my analysis and needed to think about where I had been and what I had done and why, connecting (and reconnecting) the dots between coursework, study, participants, readings, jobs – the multiple and often simultaneous orientations to this research that had occurred over three years. So, this mapping moves back over the previous mapping, charting another path through this dissertation.

1. The *American Academy of Arts and Sciences* found that the average time to complete a Ph.D. in the humanities is 6.9 years, a year longer than the average for all PhDs overall (Humanities Indicators, 2014). Where does the time go? Wondered an *Inside Higher Ed*
article in concert with my family (Flaherty, 2014). The question, an admonishment: hurry up already, what could be taking you so long?

2. This dissertation happened over three years: a year of a pilot study, followed by a year of data generated with a different group of students, followed by a year of writing. What year are you? I have never been able to answer this question succinctly. It never fits in a neat little box, bounded by admittance to a program or a sequence of courses. Instead, I haphazardly took classes for a few years, while working full-time in student affairs, entering the program at one point as a certificate student, and then as a Ph.D. student, and then, eventually, as a graduate research assistant. Time has tripped me up in other ways. Full-time student, full-time administrator, full-time coursework, part-time graduate research assistant where I split my time. Labels of duration that overlap and contradict, their boundaries blurring and merging.

3. The semester I did the pilot study (Fall 2016) was my first semester as an admitted Ph.D. student in the Department of Educational Studies. The semester before, I had taken a class where I read Doreen Massey’s *For Space*. In *For Space*, Massey (2005) wrote, “arriving in a new place means joining up with, somehow linking into, the collection of interwoven stories of which that place is made” (p. 119). The dissertation, becoming Ph.D., doctoral coursework, is a place of interwoven stories that span multiple scales, from the individual and granular to the global (for example, the *American Academy of Arts and Sciences* report, my family, experiences as an administrator, readings and and and...).

4. Before I became an admitted Ph.D. student, I had received a master’s degree in Higher Education Administration. The professional organizations in Higher Education
Administration (or Student Affairs) describe the field of higher education as “a dynamic enterprise facing unprecedented change… [where] there is a danger of exchanging holistic educational practices for narrowly crafted content outcomes in order to simplify metrics and minimally comply with regulations” (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). Specifically, as I was working in residential life and student unions, I began to feel this tension in my practice. I began to wonder about the gaps between what we said we intended to do, and what we did, the students, spaces, programs, and outcomes that were valued, and those that were not.

5. I went into higher education because of the experiences that I had as an undergraduate student, experiences of feeling valued by student affairs practitioners I worked with. I felt, going into my master’s degree, that in student affairs I could make a difference in the lives of individual students, that I could have an influence or make a difference on big things like racism and sexism and homophobia. And so, as a student affairs practitioner, I sought out opportunities to work on committees and research teams that considered equity and diversity and inclusion in higher education.

6. The students in the pilot study were recruited from a survey administered by a research team, that was interested in the experiences of belonging of residential students. Specifically, we described our research agenda as focused on the differences in student’s sense of belonging across race and gender and the influence of sense of belonging on academic success.

7. I was a part of this research team because at the time the research team was formed, I was a staff member in housing and residence life on campus and simultaneously enrolled in a

---

1 See: Garvey, Guyotte, Latopolski, Sanders, & Flint, (2018) for an overview of this study.
doctoral course on Student Affairs Assessment. In the course, our semester project included developing learning outcomes and metrics to measure the success of the Residential Curriculum, metrics and learning outcomes that would later become the survey taken by students who took part in the pilot study.

8. By the time we administered the survey, I had changed jobs and was working in the student union. I had changed jobs, in part, because of the tension between what ACPA and NASPA described as “simplify[ied] metrics and minimally compl[ied] with regulations” and my desires to make change. The job change shifted me up the administrative ladder, from a coordinator to an assistant director, from entry-level to mid-manager. This move, I thought, would provide more (or perhaps a different type of) agency to work the tension between metrics/regulations and inclusion/diversity.

9. The seven students who took part in the pilot study had checked a box on the survey about belonging which said: “let us know if you would be interested in participating in additional research on this topic.” I had emailed them and invited them to take part in a follow-up focus group on belonging on campus. After the focus groups, I invited the students to go on guided walks with me. Also, some students who could not make the focus group but were interested in the study went on walks with me.

10. During one of the walks, there was a moment where a student (Jon) and I stood in front of a boulder dedicated by the United Daughters of the Confederacy at the center of campus, and as we talked about it, a campus tour walked by us. The campus tour did not mention the monument.² Listening to the audio later, these overlapping moments (pausing, standing, silence from the tour as it passed) seemed important when I thought

² I wrote about this moment specifically in Flint (2018b)
about belonging on campus, and this moment stayed with me. Specifically, the moment with the boulder seemed to coalesce the tensions I was experiencing as an administrator.

11. I read Rosi Braidotti’s *Nomadic Subjects, Transpositions, and Nomadic Theory*. In *Transpositions*, Braidotti (2006) wrote, “I am seeking modes of representation and forms of accountability that are adequate to the complexities of the real-life world I am living in. I want to think about what and where I live– not a flight away from the embodied and embedded locations which I happen to inhabit” (p. 7). I thought about my responsibility to place, to the stories I told, the students in my study and the students I supervised, the field I had worked in and where I was still on the periphery. I wanted to write a dissertation that was adequate to the complexities of the moment with Jon and the boulder, the complexities of the field of student affairs, a field that so earnestly wants to do good and yet (in my experience) remained mired in technicity and extraction.

12. I left my job at the student union to become a graduate research assistant. This was for a variety of reasons, one of them being that the tensions I had begun to experience early in my career became untenable. I felt pulled constantly between contradictory outcomes. We value diversity, belongingness, inclusion – even as the everyday interactions between colleagues, students, and programs contradicted or worked against those values. I had begun to wonder about what we meant when we said belongingness, whose belonging? When is belonging invoked? How does belongingness manifest? When did we care about belonging and when did other outcomes – technicity, efficiency, profit – matter?

Belongingness began to be something that I followed around.

This dissertation, then, became a project of following belonging around. Sara Ahmed (2012) wrote that “words create lines and pathways in their trail. Once a pathway is created, we tend to
follow its trail” (p. 59). Belonging is a trail that I follow through this dissertation, a trail that becomes entangled (as I map in Chapter 5) with racism and White supremacy in higher education. Following belonging around enacts a haecceity: you are here, and you are part of it, even as you’re making sense of it. These maps, the charts, and lists, sketch this haecceity in different ways. Sketch because neither fully encompasses the study or the impetus for the study, a haecceity always exceeds, is always in excess. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) reminded us not to mistake the map for the territory, and as these two initial maps guide the next mapping, know that none of these maps can replace the territory – the dissertation in progress, the happenings and becomings and multiplicities of participants-field-data-encounters that the dissertation entails. Rather, these two maps might be considered sketches of the more detailed map to follow, light pencil lines that the rest of this project will build around and from and with, at times darkening and shading in, emphasizing, while other times troubling, working the tension, drawing multiple lines where one (or none) had existed before.

An Entry Point

Thinking dissertation as haecceity, dissertating with haecceity, the path that I create often meanders from the beaten path (you may have noticed, at this point, that we have ventured and will travel far away from the familiar geography of the traditional five-chapter dissertation). As I meander, moving nomadically and guided by theory, these maps act as orienting devices³ as I create new trails through what-has-happened. I find an entry point, in a particular narrative alluded to in the second mapping, a narrative that zigzags back in time to my first full year in the

³ A friend, reading this section likened them to family trees at the beginning of a historical novel or a map of lands and geographies at the beginning of a fantasy novel. Orienting devices you can return to, flip back to, even as the story complicates the linearity and simplicity of the map, makes the map able to be entered and read in different ways.
doctoral program, at a moment when the assumptions and theories that I had learned and enacted through my master’s program in higher education began to unravel and become undone, a series of moments when I began to question and trouble what and how to be a researcher/administrator/practitioner/student/supervisor in higher education and student affairs. When I began to follow belongingness around and wonder what it did. I pick up the thread of this particular moment as an encounter of ethical intersections and small moments that zigzag forward into the future to inform the conceptualization of my dissertation study.

The moment I start with is one of disruption -- a series of encounters that happened early in my doctoral journey. These encounters are an entry point -- moments that occurred after several years working as a full time professional in student affairs, when the clean and linear narratives of belonging, involvement, and engagement that guide much of student affairs practice for me began to rupture and fall apart. (Of course, this is not to say that this was the only moment that this happened, or even that this was the most significant encounter, simply that this is the moment that I turn to as an illustrative event). My narrative then leads to an overview of higher education and the notion of belonging. I start with the idea of belonging (even as this dissertation at times moves away from and troubles this concept) because, as a concept in higher education, it provides a particular set of assumptions and concepts to build from and pull apart, as well as to speak back to. I braid this literature on belonging with research on race and white supremacy on college campuses to consider how race and racism are produced and entangled in place. This grounding leads into my theoretical framework, which sets the stage for another encounter, a different reading which then sets the context for my research site, a turn away from belonging towards how race is produced in place and space, an awareness of the here-and-now and the role that race plays in how students navigate a college campus. This then leads into the
methodological design of the study I embarked upon to explore these questions of belonging, race, and place in higher education, the analysis, and implications of this research.

In refrain, my intent with the encounter I share is, to begin with, why. Not simply why this topic (which I map more extensively as I turn to the literature), but why this topic and me. It is common practice in qualitative research to employ the notion of subjectivity (Peshkin, 1988) to interrogate the researcher’s connection to their topic and the assumptions and biases that guide the study, and this opening narrative serves in this way as an entry point to my research topic, as well as the methodological and theoretical decisions that guide my study. As further sections of this dissertation ground my work in critical materialist and spatial theories following Rosi Braidotti and Doreen Massey, I tell this narrative as a fragmented, shifting, and contextual series of encounters – moments that resonate and spark with my topic and research, producing new relations and connections, a subjectivity in becoming.

... 

July 2016

I had applied for a job.

I quickly became aware that I was not the first choice for the position, and it was less than a week after an unceremoniously short phone interview that I received an invitation to attend candidate presentations for the position.

So, I was surprised when a week after the (other) candidates presented, I received a phone call asking me to (redo) my phone interview (this time with only one member of the committee) and was invited at the end (apparently passing some test I had failed before) to interview on campus. Part of the interview, I was told, would be a presentation for the division of student life on sense of belonging.
Specifically, I was asked to:

“Talk about how you would develop a sense of belonging on campus through marketing, student training and development, and programming.”

I could not believe my luck. I had been writing about belongingness all summer, developing an IRB proposal, a pilot research study in confluence with a larger grant-funded research project, and this presentation topic felt as though it was made for me.

I ran with it.

Presenting on belonging, confident in what I said. Aligned. Naturally introverted, I felt so at ease in that space, in front of a table twenty people long and packed on both sides, confident in a new suit, cracking jokes.

I am not really a joke cracker.

A week later: We are so excited for you to join us.

I had my first staff meeting with the students I supervised in early September. Thirty minutes before the meeting was to begin, Ben, one of the student workers, came to my office and asked, “can I talk to you for a minute?”

Of course.

He sat down. “I don’t know if you have heard about this, but I think a lot of people are going to want to talk about it at the staff meeting tonight.” He pulled out a folder filled with papers and began to narrate each file.

This was the email that we got when we were offered the job

This was the expectation sheet we signed when we accepted

This is my pay stub

It had to be a misunderstanding
At the meeting the other students voiced their concerns:

(Will) I did the math, and the difference in pay would mean two months’ rent over the course of the year.

(Sarah) It’s more than they didn’t tell us, that we had to find out on our first paycheck.

The next day, in a meeting with my supervisor:

I didn’t think I had to tell you, it was just a typo. I don’t know what they think we can do about it. It wasn’t a contract.

Looking helplessly at Ben, finding how to have on two hats at once as he asked me what he should do, to say-without-saying, I think you should go to HR, you should go to HR.

In whispered closed-door conversations with co-workers, this moment repeats, zigzagging back through the past year: housekeepers, grad students:

It wasn’t a contract.

Practices layer as I stare down at my weekly 1:1 sheet, frustrated and resisting the desire to crumple the page, “forget” to fill it out, caught in contradictions as I read:

“what efforts are you leading to encourage belongingness for diverse groups of students?”

Later, I look at my response to the student answering my call for participants in my pilot study, the university branded departmental signature hovering at the bottom of our short communication like a crimson brand. It takes up half the page.

I delete it, and type “Thanks, Maureen”
Figure 3: I belong here. Visual Memo created after interview with Sierra, November 2017
4. ENCOUNTERS AND INTERSECTIONS

The maps before zigzag between moments of rupture - disorientations that took place throughout this dissertation project as I took classes and worked full-time as an administrator in student life. Disorientations and tensions that I felt between what was said about belongingness and how it was enacted, caught in tensions between spaces where belongingness mattered and where it did not. In other words, I pick up the thread of this journey with this moment, not because this is the first encounter with these disorientations, but because of when and where they took place – throughout the pilot study that would grow into my dissertation research, the inquiry this document maps. The encounters and intersections of student pay, supervision, middle-management, human resources, meetings, diversity, and belongingness began to intersect and disrupt the clean and linear narratives of belonging and development and student affairs that had guided my practice in higher education and had been emphasized through student development theory and national competencies for student affairs administrators.

As a fractured and incomplete narrative of my encounters as a student affairs professional, these moments entwine with my research topic which explores how students
navigate the socio-historical context of race in higher education. More specifically, what I hope lingers from this mapping is the tension and frustration I felt between practice, place, and belonging. Through this narrative, higher education is constructed through encounters and discourses (my interview topic, the 1:1 prompt) as productive of belonging, at the same time as it is constructed through other simultaneous encounters and discourses as hostile and unsupportive (divisional invitations, student employee and housekeeping pay practices). In other words, the narrative maps the disconnect I felt as a student affairs administrator between what was said about belongingness, and what was done: how higher education attends to some practices and not others, producing place in multiplicitous ways that often are contradictory to the intent of student affairs practice. As I continue on this inquiry, I am interested in continuing to work these tensions between what is said and what is done, what Ahmed (2012) described as coming up against or moving against the flow.

Mapping this process of becoming undone, moving against the flow, situates my research within the field of higher education, as a (now former) professional in student affairs and as a researcher of higher education contexts. More specifically, coming up against the flows of belonging begins to map how I am ethically entangled with my research topic, which explores the production and construction of race and place in higher education. A goal of my research is to explore how a focus on place as a constantly constructing assemblage\(^1\) of relations might make possible different (re)presentations and understandings of belongingness for higher education and student affairs. Therefore, I am interested in the methodological implications of taking seriously the spatial material entanglements of higher education, as well as considering

\(^1\)I delve further into how I am defining assemblage in Chapter 8: Methodological Practices as I describe my data generation strategies.
the practice-oriented implications of how an exploration of students’ navigations of the socio-historical contexts of race on campus might affect and influence notions of belonging and inform higher education practitioners. In the pages that follow, I will present an overview of the literature on belongingness and race in higher education, to situate the need for research which turns to spatial and material theories to consider the complicated, layered production of higher education.
Figure 4: Focus Group Memo. October 2017
5. HIGHER EDUCATION, RACE, AND BELONGING

Higher education research in the twenty-first century has shifted toward increased surveillance through assessment and student tracking, with calls for greater accountability and transparency coming at a time of decreasing state funding and increasing tuition (Altbach, Gumport, & Berdahl, 2011; Bresciani, Gardner, & Hickmott, 2010). Within this context, understanding why some students stay or leave college has become increasingly important to administrators and researchers. The site of the university campus is conceptualized as a bounded place that students enter and leave, a black box in which much of higher education research is conceived of as a liminal space within which outcomes—leadership, cultural competence, citizenship, and knowledge—emerge. What matters in college has been studied through educational research as a linear progression of inputs, experiences, and outputs even as this research has continually traced surface level suggestions and implications for making the space of campus differently (Astin, 1993). In particular, the relations that factor into student retention, persistence, and success in college that informed higher education research in the 1970s have continued to be a focus of higher education literature.

Recent research has critiqued the field of higher education as assuming a homogenous experience for all students and failing to capture the full picture of student retention and attrition.1

---

1 I include this critique regarding the “full picture” of student retention and attrition as I believe it maps towards a contemporary assumption and trend in higher education of retention and matriculation prediction and modeling using analytics. Numerous examples of the danger of these models and prediction analytics abound, including O’Neil’s (2016) book *Weapons of Math Destruction*. O’Neil argues that the aggregation of massive amounts of data for the purpose of prediction is not value neutral, and often has implications and ramifications beyond the intent or
(Hausmann, et al., 2007; Hurtado, et al., 2015a; Museus, 2014; Renn & Arnold, 2003). This remains true even as contemporary research has shifted to explore these outcomes across identity categories such as race, gender, sexual orientation, and gender identity (Harper, Davis, & Smith, 2018; Museus, 2014; Museus & Quaye, 2009; Rendón, Jalomo, & Nora, 2000). In particular, the notion of “belongingness” or a student’s connection to the place of an institution has gained attention, particularly from critical higher education scholarship which looks to understand and improve the experiences of historically minoritized and oppressed groups on campuses (Harris, 2016; Hurtado, Alvarado, and Guillermo-Wann, 2015a; Museus & Quaye, 2009; Patton, 2016).

For example, Smith, Yosso, Ceja, and Solorzano (2009) noted that Tinto’s model of integration does not take into account the experiences of the campus racial climate for students of color. Models which focus on the frequency of behaviors such as faculty or peer interactions have been critiqued for failing to address how different students may experience those encounters differently (Museus, et al., 2017). Following these critiques, more recent studies have looked beyond interactional factors to the role that inequality, discrimination, and bias play in students’ experiences on campus, exploring the interactions between campus climate and belonging to suggest interventions and programs to improve climate and belongingness for

A brief example of the pervasiveness of this in higher education is loosely tied to this research, from the data collected in the survey taken by students who participated in the pilot study for this research. This pilot study was conducted to explore the experiences of college students in residence halls and included open ended and Likert scale questions about belongingness and student success, additionally incorporating data points from the registrar, university housing data bases to paint a “more full” picture of student’s experiences in the residence halls. Following the pre- and post- test distribution of this survey (in the Fall and Spring of an academic year), this data was then used to create a prediction model which was recommended to university advisors to target students at risk of failing or dropping out of college. This is example is not to position this trend or use of data as necessarily good or bad, but rather to demonstrate how “understanding belongingness” shifts to predicting retention. Furthermore, we might wonder, using this specific example, what this shift towards prediction does differently than understanding, and how this shift, undertaken uncritically or unthoughtfully, might in reality serve to reproduce or reaffirm existing inequities (e.g. O’Neil’s [2016] examples).
students (Hurtado et al., 2015a; Patton, 2016; W. Smith et al., 2009). Research on campus climate, or the “cumulative attitudes, behaviors and standards of employees and students concerning access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities and potential” have particularly focused on the experiences of marginalized students and their experiences through college (Rankin, 2003, p. 7). This research has demonstrated that students with marginalized identities experience harassment at higher rates than their peers with majority identities, and experience the climate as less welcoming (Hurtado, Alvarado, & Guillermo-Wann, 2015b; Stebleton, et al., 2014; Woodford & Kulick, 2015).

In other words, whereas a White student may experience interaction with a faculty member (who is more likely to look like them) as positive, a student of color may experience a similar interaction as marginalizing. Furthermore, in a summary of fifteen years of research on campus racial climates, Harper and Hurtado (2007) demonstrated that at predominately White institutions (PWIs), White students and students of color had vastly different experiences in college. Specifically, White students perceived the climate as more welcoming and reported higher levels of satisfaction in their college experience. In addition, a study by Stebleton, Soria, Huesman, and Torres (2014) that explored recent immigrants’ experience of belonging and campus climate at predominately White institutions described a pervasive White culture through academic and social spaces. White institutions, in other words, have particular ways of structuring space and developing processes that habituate the university and the students within it to White or dominant expectations and cultures. As researchers have sought to identify the factors that might make oppressed and minoritized groups more successful to meet external parameters and measures, belonging has come to the forefront as an intervention or a solution to gaps in student outcomes. However, the production and measurement of belongingness have
proven elusive for higher education practitioners and researchers. In Museus, Yi, and Saelua’s (2017) research on culturally engaging campus environments they argue that although the last several decades of higher education research have explored the negative relationships between campus climate and student experiences, “a coherent picture of the nature of the environments that allow students’ to thrive has been elusive” (p. 192). For instance, Strayhorn’s (2012) model described belonging as a contextual motivating need that is related to mattering and social identities and capable of changing over time or engendering other positive outcomes in college. Research has sought to measure, or fix, a sense of belonging through factors that can be manipulated. Research on belongingness has led to interventions on campuses that focus on factors of belonging through promoting involvement in student clubs or organizations, connections to faculty or other students, and developing structured programming models for the first few weeks of college (Hausmann et al., 2007; Museus et al., 2017; Stebleton, Soria, Huesman, & Torres, 2014). These programs and static definitions persist even as Strayhorn’s (2012) own model suggests that belongingness can change in salience and effect based on context (time, place, and environment). What higher education scholars describe as a static measure, often used to improve or increase retention, is a dynamic and in-process event -- an affect produced through encounters and relations between spaces and materials (Guyotte & Flint, in press; Guyotte, Flint, & Latopolski, in review).

Ahmed (2012) described institutional habits as, “not only to what an institution does or tends to do but also how certain people become habituated within institutions – how they come to occupy spaces that have already been given to them” (p. 123). The difference in experiences and belonging between White students and students of color, then, is not simply about levels of faculty interaction or involvement, but about how the space of higher education is produced and
maintained. Patton, McEwen, and Howard-Hamilton (2007) further explicated that, “race is a reality when students of color do not feel safe, welcome, or comfortable in an institutional environment that marginalizes them” (p. 45). In higher education, this affects not only the experiences of students of color on campus but produces understandings of climate and belongingness that are raced and racialized. Higher education, then, has perpetuated a system that disciplines bodies into human, not-quite-human, and less than human through policies and procedures as well as outcomes and measures like belongingness.

This is illustrated in Derrick Bell’s (1995, 2000, 2003; D. Bell et al., 1999) research on affirmative action, desegregation, and legal policies, and Stefanie and Delgado’s (1993) research on legislation surrounding freedom of speech in higher education. These research studies further map the ways that disciplining systems become ingrained in the fabric of higher education through policies and law. Furthermore, Blackness as a material-discursive force in higher education manifests not only through formal policies and systems, but through what Anderson and Span (2016) described as a value gap, reinforced by persistent acts of racism on campus, the ensuing silences, and resistance, or complete failure of any meaningful response. Moore and Bell (2017) further contended that this gap is reified through institutional responses to overt acts of racism – responses that often rhetorically situate overtly racist acts as ‘not representative’ of the campus community, or ‘isolated incidents.’ In other words, Blackness operates not only as a material-discursive force but is also produced through the persistence of White supremacy. In other words, White supremacism is perpetuated in often unconscious ways, and it is fluid and shifts in response to needs and circumstances (hooks, 2013).

Blackness, as defined in the absence of Whiteness in higher education, is reinscribed through research which focuses on what students’ of color lack, as opposed to how specific
contexts can offer nuanced insights into the ways in which racist institutional spaces undermine minority students’ success and reproduce White supremacy (Harper, et al., 2018). Harper and colleagues (2018) argued that explorations of the contradictions between espoused and enacted institutional values are needed to understand why racial inequities persist in higher education. For example, after Panhellenic sorority rush at The University of Alabama in 2014, a member of the Chi Omega sorority chapter posted a picture to SnapChat (a social media platform) that seemed to celebrate, using a racial slur, that the organization had not bid on any women of color. The president of the University at the time, Judy Bonner, made a statement to the press and the University community which described the incident as “particularly reprehensible and do[es] not represent the values or meet the expectations of our University community” (ABC 3340, 2014). While this incident happened within the University community and was related to campus activities, Bonner used the incident to assert the university does not abide by such actions. This statement served to position the university as separate from the racist acts, and therefore absolve the university not only of responsibility for the incident but also removed the possibility that the university should consider its own implication or role in the culture that made the incident possible. Moore and Bell suggested that by defining what racism “is” through denouncing overtly racist acts, institutions produce racism as invisible and reify the persistence of colorblind racism in the everyday practices and structures of the institution. The gaps and contradictions between espoused values and student experiences illustrated in the example of Bonner and Snapchat take up the call by Harper and colleagues (2018) to find entry points in these contradictions to intervene in and remake White and racist higher education spaces through a focus on how institutions are (re)produced.
The insidious history of race in higher education is further explicated in Wilder’s (2013) historical examination of the links between slavery and higher education, as he noted, “what is most surprising about this history is that it was never hidden” (para. 20). In other words, the inextricable link between higher education and racism in the United States is not hidden in the sense that visitors can enter a university archive or library and find a trove of artifacts and documents mapping the history of racism. College campuses are replete with monuments and buildings bearing the trace of slavery, segregation, and racism, from the bricks to the names ensconced on the front of buildings, to the memorials on college lawns. Through the material traces of artifacts, documents, and objects, the traces and markers of racism are present on the university campus while at the same time becoming hidden through institutional practices.

Returning to the example of the sorority at the University of Alabama, statements such as “this does not represent the university” not only define what counts as racism but situates those who report racism as a problem and as simultaneously not representative of the university.

In weaving together the literature on belonging and racism and White supremacy on college campuses, tensions and gaps became apparent between how belonging is researched and described: as something achievable, boundable, and predictable, and the persistent reproduction of racism and White supremacy in higher education that works against belonging. Specifically, research on race in higher education has looked to how processes of policies, histories, and systems perpetuate White spaces, while research on belonging often focuses on experiences in those spaces without a critical elaboration of how these experiences were produced through histories and processes. This follows the need that hooks (2013) described, to critically examine and challenge “the way[s] White supremacist thinking and practice informs some aspects of our lives irrespective of skin color” (p. 5). This tension aligns with calls by higher education scholars
such as Harper, Davis, and Smith (2018) who advocated for research that explores the contradictions between what institutions say they do (with regards to diversity, equity, and inclusion) and how those values are experienced and encountered in higher education. The gap between espoused values and experienced contexts maps back to my earlier narrative of belonging, student pay, programming, and institutional messaging, and led me to theories that helped me think with and through these contradictions. Additionally, as I thought about and began exploring what it means to “belong” and how belonging is produced and understood in higher education, the concept of belonging became entwined with race. Bringing together research on belongingness and race in higher education illustrates that belonging is not neutral, but rather a historically situated and hegemonic concept.

Belonging is a feeling (I feel/felt like I belong here), an outcome of other relations (I belong because...), and a force (I want or desire to belong here). Strayhorn (2012) conceptualized belonging as a force that becomes capable of producing student outcomes. If belonging is a need and a force that is productive of particular outcomes, how might belonging function in material-discursive relations? Belonging as need positions belonging as the operative force to success in higher education, and it follows that to not belong is to not succeed. The binary produced between belonging/success, not belonging/failure becomes complicated given that higher education spaces are produced through processes, rather than being static sites of learning. Weaving together research on race and belongingness, I find it important to consider how belongingness flows through the racializing assemblages of higher education, how it operates as both a feeling and a desire, and how it intra-acts with the accountability systems and external measures of the university. As a congealing of processes (admissions, recruitment, marketing, programming, courses, advising, etc.) and materialities (buildings, students, faculty,
symbols, etc.) belongingness circulates differently in various contexts and orientations and relates to how students are sorted by the racializing assemblages of the institution.

For example, Annaliese, a Black woman in her final year of the International Studies Program at Alabama maps complicated flows of belonging: she feels like she belongs in her academic major, where a professor has encouraged her to apply for a prestigious international scholarship, and she desires to receive this scholarship as an outcome of belonging (e.g. this recognition becomes a marker of belonging, she knows she belongs here if she receives the scholarship). She belongs in the residence hall she works in as a Resident Advisor, even as she is the only person of color on her floor and the only woman not in a Panhellenic (traditionally White) sorority. These variations of belongings circulate and operate, even as Annaliese notes that her family was skeptical of her coming to Alabama “knowing the history of the school,” even as she experiences racism from the students on her floor. Belongingness, then, operates on a multitude of scales from the local (produced through relations and connections with other students) to the institutional (recognition of academic achievement, history of the university). Belongingness works as a flow, a force, and an orientation. Belonging as haecceity: you are here, and you are part of it, even as you are making sense of it.

Though belongingness has been taken up by some researchers as static and measurable, I orient my study to the flows and orientations of belonging as produced by and productive of
higher education. Specifically, I turn toward spatial\(^2\) and material\(^3\) theories to follow belonging around the place of a college campus. Spatial and material theories move my exploration of belongingness from what belongingness is to what it does – how belongingness works and is produced. I find that this does something different to the idea of belongingness in higher education. A focus on belongingness as a force and a process situates belonging as a flow, as something to be followed, that changes and is fluid in relation to space and time. In particular, spatial and material theories situate higher education as a dynamic and in process event that is constantly in production and operating at many scales. Returning to Annaliese, what this means is a consideration of the immediate relations of individual experiences and relations along with the institutional history and culture, working a both/and. This is a different orientation to belongingness than higher education research which considers these outcomes as isolatable or bounded – for example, belongingness as tightly connected to a first-year experience program, or living in a residence hall with curricular components. Likewise, material and spatial theories make possible a consideration of non and more-than-human forces and materialities. What research on race in higher education emphasizes is the inextricable link between higher education and racism – that institutions of higher education are always already institutions of

---

\(^2\) Throughout this project, I refer to “space” as well as “place.” I find de Certeau (1987) particularly helpful in articulating how I am understanding these terms and how they relate to each other. Specifically, Certeau describes place as “an instantaneous configuration of positions” (p. 116). Place, in other words, is specific and local, a configuration of materialities: bodies, objects, symbols, histories, stories, ideas etc. Space is operational, produced through simultaneous relations, connections, and practices, “vectors of direction, velocities, and time variables” (p. 117). These definitions are not to say that place and space are always distinct, places are always becoming spaces and spaces becoming places (Certeau describes this as happening through stories “changing places into spaces and spaces into places” and Massey [2005] describes the interplay between space and place as a constant negotiation). However, considering place as a specific configuration of materialities that are negotiated, and space as the process of those materialities coming together is helpful for situating the analysis to come.

\(^3\) As noted above, by material I mean bodies, objects, symbols, histories, stories, ideas etc. By the material turn (which the next section explores further) I mean a turn to the ways that more-than-human and non-human bodies have agency and operate in the production and negotiation of spaces and places.
White supremacy, reproducing, disciplining, and sorting the bodies of students into human, less-than-human, and not-human. Thus, an exploration of how students navigate the place of campus – the intra-actions\(^4\) between bodies and materialities that produce place – moves forward with the assumption that the navigations and productions of place are coded and entangled with the racializing assemblages of higher education. This additionally informs my second research question, which asks how students navigate the socio-historical context of race on campus. This move to a spatial material perspective seeks to explore the affective and dynamic encounters between students and the campus. The following section outlines the theoretical assumptions of an ontological turn to the spatial and material guided by the overarching concept of the haecceity.

---

\(\text{4 Following my orientation to critical materialism, I am using the term “intra-act” following Barad (2003) here -- in other words, intra-action as the blurring of subject-object binaries between materialities towards a dynamic and simultaneous relationship of power and agency between bodies and materialities. I find this concept useful as I think with the ways that the materialities (including the bodies of students) entangle to produce place, and how these entanglements are also productive of those same materialities. Even as I am not necessarily drawing extensively from Barad in the writing of this proposal, I find that once I have become aware of this concept of intra-action, it becomes hard to shake -- I find it hard to return to interaction, and the bounded and static bodies it suggests. Therefore, I include this footnote as a theoretical nod -- an awareness of the impossibility of theoretical purity -- and that this thinking with Barad has indelibly influenced how I am oriented to this study, even as I draw more heavily from other theories.}\)
6. SPATIAL/MATERIAL HAECEITIES

Haecceity is the conceptual thread that I pull through this study, from theory (entangling and moving between spatial theories and new materialist or material ontological paradigms) to methodology (informing and guiding the data collection, analysis, and representation). Deleuze and Guattari (1987) described haecceity as defined by latitude and longitude, the sum total of the intersections and relations of movement (and rest) and intensive affects (and potential), “nothing but affects and moments, differential speeds” (p. 260). The spatial and material practices that produce a college campus, then, are produced not by a particular moment in time (or even by the labels or monikers they take on – terms shift and slip and slide) but, through their relation to other practices, materialities, and spaces.

As the last section explored, these productions are entangled with the disciplining systems of race and racism in the context of higher education in the United States. Thinking higher education with haecceity means conceptualizing how the place of campus is produced with “neither beginning nor end, origin nor destination; always in the middle, made only of lines” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 263). Haecceity is not, as St. Pierre (2017) cautioned, a substance that can be recognized and represented; and as such, I do not enter this research in search of haecceities, or even with the intent of recognizing haecceities as I research the context of higher education. Instead, haecceity suggests an orientation to entanglement and assemblages, to the intensities and movements that produce relations and connections, and the conceptual thread that braids together the paradigmatic assumptions of spatial and material theories. In other
words, haecceities, as in-process events of affect and intensity, guide the way I navigate the landscape of my research, rather than as an object that I am searching for. You are here, and you are part of it, even as you’re making sense of it. In the following section, I will map the assumptions of material and spatial theories while keeping the concept of the haecceity in mind.

**Material**

The critical materialist\(^5\) turn reflects an objection to the dominance of language in poststructuralism, the Cartesian separation of mind and body of nature from culture, as well as a (re)new(ed) interest in the world and nonhuman/more than human materialities (Tuck & McKenzie, 2015). Critical materialism moves away from theories that privilege “discourse, mind, and culture over matter, body, and nature” (MacLure, 2015, p. 96). In other words, this marks a movement from belonging as produced through bounded practices (interactions with a faculty member, involvement in organizations, access to particular resources, where each object is isolatable and has a measurable cause and effect), towards *intra-action*, where agency and affect are entangled between bodies, materialities, and place, blurring and transgressing subject-object binaries (Barad, 2003). Research on belonging then becomes attentive to the ways that more-than-human materialities affect and intra-act with bodies – for example, how discourses of race are produced not just through interactions between students and faculty, but through the buildings, histories, systems, and practices of an institution. A movement away from language to

---

\(^5\) I feel the need to make a note here that I am making several choices through this section with ethical ramifications. First, I am choosing to refer to this perspective as the “critical materialist” turn – as opposed to the “new” materialist turn – to acknowledge that this turn towards the material is not “new” in the sense that it echoes, repeats, and mirrors Western and indigenous perspectives. For this reason, I also cite Tuck and McKenzie (2015) whose writing and research on indigenous methodologies of place works both-and between contemporary (re)new(ed) materialist theories and indigenous perspectives. Second, I note that there are ethical ripples for choosing one theory or perspective over another – theory is a lens through which you view the world, and as such, it works as a bounding device whereby particular readings come into focus and others move out of focus. In this section, I am mapping critical materialism broadly, to situate the implications of this ontological turn, and then move to focus on the writing and work of contemporary feminist critical materialist/posthumanist Rosi Braidotti.
the interplay of matter is both an ontological and epistemological shift in attention towards matter at the same time as it represents an ethical concern for the inability of poststructural and critical scholarship to address economic and environmental changes (MacLure, 2015). What an ontological turn to the material makes possible is an attention to the connections and relations between materialities that make up the world – the speeds, and slowness, intensities, and stutters. For example, in the mapping of a job interview, a critical materialist reading might center the role of nonhuman and more than human actants and their agentic capacity. How ‘belonging’ as a material-discursive force in this narrative intra-acts with bodies and materialities to produce forces and intensities, or how the symbol/signifier of the university logo at the end of an email resonates beyond the blinking cursor, echoing in other spaces (signs lining the pathways of campus, emblazoned on football fields, stamped across t-shirts and hats), producing intra-actions that extend beyond text and human bodies. An ontological turn to the material embraces the ways that materialities beyond human bodies are entwined with our becoming in the world. Critical materialism is an ontological shift in that it expands the agentic capacity of more-than-human bodies. I understand this not as a de-centering of the human, necessarily. Because I am after all, human, and my maps always seem to return to me at the center, my implications, my reflections, my explorations, and understandings. Rather, critical materialism is an ontological (and epistemological and ethical) shift in that I seek to embrace the vibrant and productive capacities of materialities and bodies beyond my own. This is an ethical shift towards relationality and co-implicatedness, for which I turn to Braidotti’s nomadic ethics in the following section.
Nomadic Philosophy and Ethics

For this study, I take up critical materialism through the nomadic philosophy and ethics of Rosi Braidotti. Braidotti (2011) described nomadism as “about critical relocation, it is about becoming situated, speaking from somewhere specific and hence well aware of and accountable for particular locations” (p. 15). A nomadic philosophy begins by rejecting the notion of the broad sweeping global statement and instead recognizes the multiplicity of differences that produce particular and situated narratives – narratives that are fractured and material and told from specific contexts. Braidotti characterized the enactment of nomadic philosophy as practicing a politics of location, an orientation to small stories, (even as we hold the global in relation), and the rejection of the generalizable towards the specific. Following a politics of location, critical to enacting a nomadic philosophy is the concept of nomadic ethics, what Braidotti (2013) defined as “prioritizing relation, praxis, and complexity as its key components,” or a shift towards transformation, relationality and process, and affirmative otherness (p. 343). Dis-identification makes possible ethical accountability that emphasizes relation, practice, and complexity, promoting a shift from the Humanist subject in three ways. First, nomadism emphasizes a shift from Kantian moral protocols which assume a universal moral code confined to rights, justice, and the law towards an ethics of transformation centered on the forces, desires, and values that empower becoming (Braidotti, 2013). Second, nomadism marks a shift from the unitary and rationally driven consciousness of humanism, dislocated from the body to an “ontology of process” or an ontological relationality, situated in the here-and-now and operating from a politics of location (p. 343). Nomadism is an enactment of haecceities, oriented to process

---

2 This also weaves in/entangles with spatial theories and Doreen Massey, who will be elaborated on further in the next section. Primarily, I take up a politics of location to find an entry point with an embedded and accountable where – in this research’s case, the campus of the University of Alabama.
and connection, relations becoming. Thirdly, this shift to nomadism moves towards affirmative otherness or enactment of positive difference, disengaging the binary logic of negative difference from which humanism operates. The awareness of interconnections between knowing-becoming-experiencing necessitates a fundamental shift prioritizing relations, praxis, and complexity. For example, in the narrative of student pay, belonging, and a job interview, nomadic ethics mark an attentiveness to the ways that belonging as a binary construct entangles with practices of hiring and pay, programming, and communication to make visible some practices and not others. These ontological shifts make possible an epistemology that endorses qualitative shifts away from hegemony and microfacisms, “whatever its size and however ‘local’ it may be” (Tamboukou & Ball, 2002, p. 271). In other words, with nomadic ethics, I seek to shift belonging from a hegemonic moral imperative (you must belong/we must make sure students belong), which situates some student’s belonging as more important than others, toward belonging as a process that is produced in relation and in a multitude of ways.

Enacting these ethical shifts returns us to a politics of location, or situated and accountable knowledge practices (Braidotti, 2013a). A politics of location is both an acknowledgment of a “starting position of asymmetrical power differentials” (Braidotti, 2006, p. 130), and a material-spatial practice of drawing precise cartographies starting from embedded subjectivities of living, real-life identities and becomings (Braidotti, 2011). Cartographies, drawn from a politics of location, are oriented towards the lived and negotiated identities of subjects-in-becoming. What this means for researching students in higher education is that these cartographies reflect the embodied and embedded encounters of students – rather than starting
from same-ness and seeking difference, cartographies embrace the asymmetrical and different starting locations, mapping affirmative difference.³

As a becoming-scholar enacting and embodying nomadic philosophy and ethics through my work and writing, nomadic ethics also marks an ethical attentiveness to my entanglement with this research. In an earlier footnote, I remarked on the ethical cuts that are made when one selects one theory over another, a movement to look through one lens is necessarily a choice to move other perspectives to the periphery. As a White woman engaging in work that takes up the politics and reproductions of race, I find the concepts of relationality, dis-identification, and politics of location to resonate with my thinking and moving through this work. Specifically, these concepts challenge me to decenter my Whiteness, while simultaneously remaining aware of the weight of history that my subjectivities bring to encounters and interactions – what it makes possible and what it produces. Braidotti (2011) wrote that “feminist women are complicitous with that which they are trying to deconstruct… Being aware of one's implication or complicity is the starting point for a radical politics of resistance that will be free of claims to purity as well as the luxury of guilt” (p. 104). As I map the ways that students navigate the place of campus, beginning with the here-and-now and considering the ways that I am co-implicated in this work resists a becoming that blurs into an undifferentiated unconnected abstract movement.⁴

Nomadic ethics is an ethic of care, enacting “qualities of attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness that can help construct better citizens, as well as making life-affirming moral agents. Care allows for neither neutrality nor distance and calls for self-

³ I expand more on what this looks like in Chapter 8: Methodological Practices, when I discuss participant recruitment, and the research design as a whole.

⁴ I take this up in Chapter 8: Methodological Practices when I discuss recruitment and participant selection – namely, how this co-implication and working from the here-and-now guided my recruitment of students for the study.
reflection and constant reappraisals of one’s condition… a situated and accountable practice” (Braidotti, 2006, p. 119). With this consideration of care, I turn to map the landscape of spatial theory, and specifically the writing of feminist critical geographer Doreen Massey.

**Time and Space**

Critical materialism, as an onto-epistemological shift towards the connections and relations between materialities, makes possible increased attention to the world beyond human bodies, even as human bodies are still implicated. The spatial turn in many ways builds from and echoes these shifts and considerations, while additionally arguing for the inclusion of the spatial (along with the temporal) in consideration of how matter comes to matter (Gildersleeve & Kuntz, 2011). Soja (2010) observed that even in light of the critical-materialist turn, temporal perspectives of history and culture have superseded geographical and spatial perspectives, with greater attention paid to how processes develop over time and with space treated as a fixed, static, and external site. The following sections outline the concepts of time and place following feminist critical geographer Doreen Massey to situate how this study conceptualizes space.

For this study, I turn to feminist critical geographer Doreen Massey to conceptualize the production of space in higher education. Following Massey (2005), the assumptions this study takes up include: (1) remaking space as a multiplicity (as more than a surface or container where things happen); (2) the integral relationship between space and time; and (3) prioritizing space as significant in the production of knowing/becoming in the world. Massey further argued for the ethical implications of a spatial onto-epistemology, taking up Derrida’s concept of hospitality as not simply about how we relate to others, but ethics in our manner of being-there, navigating the throwntogetherness of place and space. Being-there entangles with Braidotti’s nomadic ethics, layering with the shifts of relationality, transformation, and process with an attentiveness to
space and context – in other words, how relations in the here and now produce and are produced by spaces. A spatial perspective, Massey (2005) argued, disrupts the hegemonic notion of local ethics to an imaginative awareness of others, a politics of grounded connectedness and relational ethics which recognizes the multiplicity of stories so far, forgetting to forget (Braidotti, 2006). A spatial perspective enacts haecceities, as space is always-already in the process of becoming through relations, connections, and intersections. These assumptions of connectedness and relationality connect with critical materialist assumptions and suggest implications for methodological decisions that I map in future sections.

Research in higher education persistently conceptualizes space as a container or a context for matter, a vehicle to track locations or to divide time in evenly spaced increments to produce specific and measurable student outcomes. For example, Freeman, Anderman, & Jenson (2007) studied the relationship between sense of belonging in a specific college class in association with academic self-efficacy. This conceptualization situates belongingness as a quantifiable metric that can be measured through engagement in a particular space (the college classroom) over a particular period of time (freshman year of college). What this definition of belonging misses is the multitude of ways that spaces and places are produced in and outside of the classroom (for example, interactions with peers, teachers, buildings, families, regions, involvements) and how time as affective duration is intimately tied to engagement with space. As Deleuze and Guattari (1987) intimated, “a girl is late on account of her speed: she did too many things, crossed too many spaces in relation to the relative time of the person waiting for her. Thus, her apparent slowness is transformed into the breakneck speed of our waiting” (p. 271). In other words, to solely look to how belongingness increases or changes over a student’s time in college is to miss the potential of the spaces, forces, and encounters that matter in student’s engagement with
space. To then assume that belongingness increases over time or that the classroom is a static site where belongingness can be transmitted is to smooth over the production and relationship with time and space.

Thus, a spatial perspective following Massey builds from research which explores how students interact with the institution over time (for example from their first year through graduation) to consider the ways that a student’s engagement with space and time is dynamic and in process. This perspective complicates the assumption that students’ belonging or connection to campus increases over time or happens in bounded time (i.e. over the course of four years). Instead, a spatial perspective explores how their relations and navigations modulate over time and in space, pulling in other times and spaces. Understanding the implications of how the relationship between space and time is conceptualized in research is important because it influences how we then interact with and interpret the world. Viewing space as a container for time erases the role of space as a dynamic actor in the production of student experiences and outcomes in higher education, and makes possible the understanding of spaces as neutral – that is, not produced through practices and material-discursive forces. Understanding space as neutral has implications for how we respond and interact with space. For example, understanding the University of Alabama as a neutral space (not one that is imbued with a history of race and racism that continues to affect the present) makes possible further practices which do not take the production of space into account – such as the statement by a university president that “this does not represent the university.” This response responds to the university as neutral (e.g. not able to be implicated in the action), even as the university made possible the racist action. Furthermore, this theoretical framework suggests an attentiveness to “here” (as echoed in the politics of
location of Braidotti, as echoed in the concept of the haecceity). Here, described by Massey (2005) is,

where spatial narratives meet up or form configurations, conjunctures of trajectories which have their own temporalities… but the returns are always to a place that has moved on, the layers of our meeting intersecting and affecting each other; weaving a process of space-time. (p. 140)

A spatial perspective then, argues for the interconnectedness of space and time, where neither space or time are reducible to each other but co-implicated in the process of becoming.

Tuck and McKenzie (2015) argued beyond a consideration of “space” to a place-focused methodology, explaining that a fundamental feature of social science research is that it is situated physically in particular locations. In the case of this research, this physical location is multifaceted: there is the specific site of the university campus and the broader location of higher education, which enfolds global assumptions of higher education as a vehicle to economic success, and as an institution founded on White and classist practices (W. Smith et al., 2009; Wilder, 2013). Following this, the site of higher education or college campuses is not just the site or surface where life happens (or where data is extracted from), but a dynamic, productive component of the research itself. For example, Massey wrote that “arriving in a new place means joining up with, somehow linking into, the collection of interwoven stories of which that place is made” (p. 119). Linking into place in higher education means becoming part of the place of the

---

6 When speaking of Tuck, it becomes imperative to mention that Tuscaloosa is a site through which passed thousands of Indigenous folk on the Trail of Tears. It becomes critical to acknowledge that the land that the University of Alabama is built on is the original homelands of the Mvskoke (Muscogee / Creek) tribe and the Choctaw tribe. Tuscaloosa as a site of a painful history of genocide and forced removal, conquest, disease, and brutality, and a site where it remains important to honor and respect the many diverse Indigenous peoples still connected to the land. So, therefore, even as this dissertation specifically takes up race and racialization, the forces of colonialization are always already present in this place.
university (as your body moves across the place, becomes entangled in the fabric of the institution), even as you become part of how the place is produced (as your movements and encounters resist or reproduce larger places, as the cartographies that you carry out map new boundaries segmenting the place of the institution). Furthermore, this means that students are always already part of the production of place, the University of Alabama, simply by being there. Methodologically, then, stories and narratives connect and produce places and spaces, embodying place as they map nomadic cartographies. The following section expands further on the methodological possibilities of Massey and Braidotti for this research project.

**Spatial Materialist Methodological Possibilities**

The ontological and epistemological assumptions of critical materialist and spatial theories following Braidotti and Massey produce particular methodological possibilities. In this section, I map what these theories make methodologically possible to inform the methodology for my study. First, starting with the here-and-now from a politics of location takes up an assumption that place, “here” is a site of interactions that are both local and global, power geometries that operate on bodily and global scales in simultaneity (Helfenbein, 2010).

Following this assumption, place is important, indeed, integral, for understanding what it means to be in the world, and for understanding college students navigations of campus. It is precisely the “throwntogetherness of place, the unavoidable challenge of negotiating a here-and-now” that makes place special, and why it matters (Massey, 2005, p. 140). Thinking with place offers an entry point for global action, to (re)produce different configurations and constellations of material and spatial practices. Following the literature on belonging, I am interested in exploring how place is navigated by students, and how the multiplicitous stories of place, and particularly those stories and histories of race, intra-act with student’s navigations. From a spatial material
theoretical framework, I am interested not only in how students represent campus and the stories they tell about place, but how we (the research participants and myself) are co-productive with the space of campus.

Second, following the spatial theories of Massey, perceiving the relations between space and time as integrally interlinked ruptures linear timelines and bounded notions of cause-and-effect (Massey, 2005). Instead, space as a particular moment of relations opens up a multitude of possibilities for “slicing the space-time-continuum” at multiple angles to explore how power, agency, and identity are produced through relations (Hohti, 2016). As Harvey (2001) suggested, we are already mapped in particular ways, but what the spatial turn (or thinking spatially) makes possible is changing the ways in which we map. Viewing space as a dynamic simultaneity for stories thus far produces the possibility for an ethical awareness of others, of a “kind of interconnectedness which stresses the imaginative awareness of others, evokes the outwardlookingness of a spatial imagination… the full recognition of contemporaneity implies a spatiality which is a multiplicity of stories so far” (Massey, 2005, p. 189). This means that throughout my research, I zigzag between the narratives shared by students about their encounters on campus, the encounters experienced during focus groups and guided walks, histories of place, and the national context at the time of the study. This means that this dissertation finds itself at times in unlikely spaces, thinking with a sketch from Saturday Night Live, or meandering through a university website, considering these knowledges as folded and imbricated with the production of place. A spatial turn, then, suggests a dynamic connection between local and global contexts that begins with the understanding of how we produce and are productive of our local contexts through daily practices.
Third, the nomadic philosophy of Braidotti makes possible a research design that operates in haecceities, without binaries of true and false or right and wrong. Nomadic ethics suggest an affirmative methodology, oriented toward positive difference, following the connections and relations between bodies and materialities. Instead of a methodology of classification, looking for particular experiences or encounters, a nomadic philosophy operates in cartographies, creating unfolding, non-linear mappings. I take up the concept of cartography as both the creation of a map – in other words, the path that I follow through the landscape of literature, theory, and methodology, as well as how I explore the questions that guide this study, encounters with participants, my own reflections and analysis, and ultimately, how the findings and implications from the study are (re)presented. This research project operates as a cartography that is layered and multiplicitous, that can be entered at many locations and read in different ways, even as there are paths that are charted. In the following section, I explore how these concepts of materiality and space guided the methodological design of my study.
named after a KKK leader.

I hate walking to the strip.

And you say, I was the only black girl there, only black student there.

May class, you saw me ask about this building.

Who never went here.

The flags and the quad.

Gorgas.

This is where my dad proposed to my mother.

It's colored it's in rainbow colors so kind of highlights my identity.

I just love it there's a fountain in the middle Shelby hall.

It was like 2 AM. It was like 2 AM. We were sitting in the sculpture.

I was like the only white girl and they were looking at me.

And every time I passed by it was so weird.

'Oh yeah, they're petitioning to chan

It's not about the chalk it's about what is behind the

[chalk] has this very long-lasting effect on the skin.

You can visually see that you're not alone.
I want to pause with this image of a compass – an image/idea/thought that I have played with and carried throughout this document. My use of the compass is intentional, as I think about orientations and navigations. I am navigating campus at the same time as I am navigating this journey of becoming-dissertation. I have played with this compass throughout – you may have noticed its orientation has changed in each iteration, as I find myself navigating differently. The compass has morphed too, sharpening and blurring its image along the way. Likewise, I find myself thinking with the compass in these encounters, reflections where I am calibrating, orienting, mapping. In some sections, the compass does not appear, as in these spaces I am tracing (literature, theory, methods) – as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) wrote, “[w]hat distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real… The map has to do with performance, whereas the tracing always involves an alleged ‘competence’” (p. 12-13).
In methodological moments, therefore, I am experimenting, tilting my compass, finding new paths, creating new maps – open to experimentation and possibility. In other sections, I am demonstrating competence -- tracing what has come before (that is, after all, a purpose of this dissertation, to demonstrate my competence, to prove my worthiness of a degree) – even as these spaces, too, are open to possibility (the map must always be put back on the tracing, the tracing leads to the map).
8. METHODOLOGICAL PRACTICES

I began this dissertation with a consideration of haecceity: you are here, and you are part of it, even as you are making sense of it. Research as haecceity enacts the spatial-material shifts of nomadic philosophy: always productive (and produced), folding and flattening. Productive becoming suggests a way of engaging with research that is embodied and embedded, resisting closure and synthesis and moving towards multiplicitous understandings. To enter the assemblage produced through haecceities, I take up a politics of location through artful methods. Artful research described by Garoian (2013) embodies a methodological consideration of the transformative potential of art to both (re)produce and create spaces and places. Specifically, I turn to artful methods for what they make possible – an ethic of creative experimentation and transformation that is woven throughout the process of my inquiry.

1 I use the term arts-informed, as opposed to arts-based throughout this section as I find that I both align and differentiate from much of arts-based methods. For example, I find that my work falls on the continuum that Barone and Eisner (2012) describe as from qualitative research projects that use artful methods or elements to projects that emphasize artistry throughout the project, and what Cahnmann-Taylor and Siegesmund (2008) describe as art for scholarship’s sake, integrated into existing qualitative research methods. I align with what these two conceptions of arts-based research put forward as the integral nature of art to the process of arts-based research, “an interest in art as a vehicle that propels research” (Cahnmann-Taylor & Siegesmund, 2008, p. 240). My research design (as the following pages will illustrate further) weaves together artful methods with traditional inquiry – focus groups and interviews. Yet, I also find that my interest in using artful methods differs theoretically from the field of arts-based research, broadly. For example, I want to trouble the notion proposed by Barone (2008) that ultimately, research is an instrument that is intended to contribute to the quality of education students receive and that arts-based research must ultimately be appraised on the extent to which the aim is realized (p. 23). Instead, I view the quality of the arts-informed methods in my research for what they make possible – the new connections and relations that they generate. What this also means is that for me, arts-based fails to capture the ways in which artful methods and becomings are integrated and entangled throughout my research process. Thus, I use the terms artful inquiry or arts-informed research to point to the ways in which art is entangled throughout the process of inquiry.
An ethic of creative experimentation spans and intersects this research project, from intra-action’s with participants, to my own encounters with the space of campus, to analysis (thinking through/moving through research), to how I represent findings and implications of the study. Starting from the here and now and located in a place also weaves in the assumption of the pedagogical possibilities of unraveling (or perhaps, becoming more entangled in) the productions of place. An exploration of place locates subjects and bodies in the contexts in which they are dynamically a part – productive of and producing – and makes possible an inquiry that questions the embedded humanist (and White) assumptions of “belonging” and “climate” that prevail in higher education research. Thus, instead of asking about the meaning of belonging, the goal of artful inquiry is to ask how belonging works and what it produces. For example, Barone and Eisner (2012) wrote that arts-informed research makes possible a re-creation of contexts in a manner that is responsive to power relations as well as ethical and political entanglements. Barone (2008) further suggested that arts-informed research, as a form of qualitative inquiry, makes possible the involvement of diverse viewpoints and perspectives in “history-making dialogue or… conspiratorial conversations” through empathy, connections, altered perceptions and emotions, and disturbed equilibria (p. 39). Artful research becomes a transformative tool for inquiry, representation, and dissemination for researching with participants, and lends itself to reflexivity (de Lange, Moletsane, & Mitchell, 2015). In this way, arts-informed research becomes less about tracing what has come before, and more about creating and generating new and different becomings, possibilities, and proliferation. Producing haecceities in the research project (Boulton-Funke, 2014; Rolling, 2010).

An artful methodology breaks from the grooves and striations of traditional methods (interview, coding, and themes that lead to often unsurprising conclusions) to enact spatial
material theories “dwell[ing] in openly ambiguous, ill-defined spaces, performative techniques that resist official demarcation” (Kuntz, 2015a, p. 135). An outcome of this research project is to produce affirmative difference, to (re)make place through the practice of doing research. It is this emergence of the new and different that an artful methodology embraces and enfolds as both an intent and outcome of the process. Namely, although some materialist and spatial theorists advocate for non-representational methodologies (e.g. Cadman, 2009; Colls, 2011; MacLure, 2013b), arts-informed research does not reject representation, but rather, seeks to transform and transgress hierarchies of representation and logic. For example, Barone (2008) wondered, about the potential of a research approach that, boldly but not rudely, humbly and not arrogantly, intervenes in the current state of educational affairs, one that expands the reach of our scholarship because of (and not despite) the fact that it is profoundly aesthetic, one that both finds its inspiration in the arts and leads to progressive forms of social awareness. (p. 34)

Bresler (2006) further argued for the essentialness of aestheticism in qualitative research to ensure deeper understanding and empathy throughout the research process. Barone and Eisner (2012) discussed arts-informed research as making possible an “aesthetic remove” – a transgressive coaxing towards the unfamiliar, presenting a new angle on the everyday. The aesthetic quality of artful research exposes and challenges assumptions, making visible the unseen and contradictory (Garoian, 2013). Therefore, artful methodologies seek different forms of representation that through association, juxtaposition, and simultaneity “open thresholds to liminal spaces where a range of ideas and images, and their prosthetic associations are possible” (Garoian, 2013, p. 72).
Several researchers have looked to artful methods to enact and embody spatial material theories. For example, in her analysis of student’s participating in theater and performance activities in the classroom, Perry (2013) used improvisational artful methods to open the possibility for nomadic thought that rejected universal meanings and moved beyond representational thinking. Improvisation, in her research, opened knowing for the students and her as the researcher beyond the mind to responsiveness to a wide array of forces: bodily, material, and cosmological. In this way, improvisational artful methods became a way of conceptualizing reality (as something that can never be known or predicted) and knowing (as a process guided by responsiveness and embodiment, an entanglement and co-implication with the materiality of the world). Similarly, Snowber (2011) encouraged the “ontological space of being present,” letting the body infuse the process of research with all of the senses (p. 190). Through a spatial material awareness of the body, Snowber advocated for an onto-epistemological becoming through the process of creating and producing research and art, as well as an acknowledgment of the embodied ways of being and knowing in the world. This enfolds Braidotti’s (2006) advocation of asymmetrical starting locations, that bodies matter differently in the world, carrying signs, histories, and narratives that transcend the materiality of flesh. In addition, Garoian (2013) considered artful research as a process of coming to know through “sensate embodiment” where “the materiality of the body engages the corporeality of materials, tools, and objects through art making, manifold sensations, associations, and understandings extend one another prosthetically” (p. 124). Each of these researchers looked to art and artful methods as a process of material-spatial engagement, an onto-epistemological orientation that is not simply about what results from artful engagement with research but embraces the possibilities that artful and creative engagements make possible.
My research practices seek multiple modes of representation, description, and illustration to make possible analysis and findings that employ artful methods and aesthetics as a processual engagement with inquiry. An arts-informed research project refers not only to artful outputs but also to an orientation that is infused throughout the research process. Specifically, this dissertation project has woven artful methods along the way, from visual analytic memos, to sounded compilations, to a peripheral gallery installation that entangled visual, audio, and geographic aspects of the research into an artful assemblage (see Appendix C). I consider Barone’s (2008) urge for arts-informed research to engender “history-making dialogue or… conspiratorial conversations” through empathy, connections, altered perceptions and emotions, and disturbed equilibria (p. 39).

Throughout this section (and throughout this dissertation), I use the term (re)present to acknowledge the always-in-process nature of representation and of inquiry. Like Magritte’s (1929) postmodern painting The Treachery of Images, Ceci n'est pas une pipe (This is not a pipe), the visual, textual, and verbal images that I create through this research produce new lines, new presentations of becoming/belonging, and cannot (by their very nature as happening after/outside of the encounter) duplicate or exist as a facsimile of the encounters. In other words, (re)presentation connotates that, “what we present in our research products never fully articulates our work as a complete whole, it cannot be a re-presentation, a presentation again, because it was never whole to begin with. Instead, it is always a presentation anew” (Guyotte, 2018, n.p.). Thus, in keeping the conceptions of improvisation, embodiment, and empathy, considerations I have in the (re)presentation of this research project echo Barone and Eisner’s (2012) questions of ethical implications of representation: How can I offer a telling (a [re]presentation) of stories that exist in tandem, in simultaneity and multiplicity while still working the tensions between an open
and inscribed circle (not leaving my [re]presentation so open as to function, effectively as a Rorschach test)? How can my (re)presentation offer a narrative that encourages complexity and contradictions while still raising critical questions and dialogue about hegemony? I navigate many of these tensions along the way, but some initial considerations of this process follow.

First, I turn to de Certeau (1984) who wrote: “places are unrecognized poems…The networks of these moving, intersecting writings compose a manifold story that has neither author nor spectator, shaped out of fragments of trajectories and alterations of spaces: in relation to representations, it remains daily and indefinitely other” (p. 94). As I move through my analysis, I journey along a series of layered paths, visual/audio narratives that travel the geography of campus to tell different stories, intersecting and interrupting each other. This branching offers multiple readings of the place of campus, multiple stories that exist in tandem with each other, multiple places to enter the map. This enacts what Boulton-Funke (2014) described as the possibility of arts-informed research to move beyond tracing what has come before and create the possibility for generating new and different becomings, possibilities, and proliferation. I see the possibility of arts-informed analysis as zigzagging between multiple modes. In other words, I see artful methods as a tool for thinking through the process of research (as in the analytic memos and journaling). Artful methods create different connections, further layering narratives and encounters (as in the sound compilations and the sounded portraits with students), as well as one way of (re)presenting the findings of the research into a multilayered narrative of how students intra-act with the socio-historical place of campus. In the following section, I explore the methodological orientations of my study, how as a methodologist, I sought processes and practices that used artful and creative approaches to embody spatial and material theories.
Specifically, I explore methodological choices in recruitment and participant selection, focus groups, walking interviews, visual journaling, and analytical practices.

**Recruitment and Participant Selection**

With this study, I sought to explore how students navigate the space/place of higher education and the role that the socio-historical context of race plays in student’s navigations of space. The literature on race and higher education situates how students of color and White students experience the place of campus differently, the persistent value gap between White and Black bodies in higher education, and the pervasive presence of racism and White supremacy in higher education. During participant selection, I wove this research together with Braidotti (2011), who argued for a feminist politics, of placing “real life women in positions of discursive subjectivity,” reconnecting theory to practice through narratives that are embodied and embedded¹ in place (p. 150). I wanted to begin from the here-and-now with my participants, weaving together spatial materialist assumptions with artful methodological practices while enacting nomadic ethics. In other words, through participant recruitment, I sought transformation, relationality and process, and affirmative otherness to produce different spatial and material configurations. Thus, while I was attentive to and interested in the ways that students described their identities and their relations to campus throughout the research process, I

---

¹ Embodied and embedded is a refrain through this research project, a methodological orientation unto itself, a phrase that I find myself using and repeating throughout this inquiry. Embodied, as an ontological turn to the ways that materialities operate and move and negotiate the world, becoming in (with) the world. Embedded, as the process of becoming with the world, becoming with this, in this, part of this. This being the configuration of flows and materialities and theories and encounters. Embodied, at the same time is a turn to the present, embodying the motions of doing-dissertation (sitting in this chair in a graduate student lounge, the ache that lingers between my shoulder blades because of my terrible posture, even though I took time to do yoga this morning). Embodied as the movements of doing research (walking with students across campus, transcribing interviews, pressing play on an audio recorder). Embedded as being attuned to the present-ness of this, the possibilities that walking produces. Embedded and embodied as a refrain that becomes differently in contexts, and moments and re-readings, meaning many things at once.
did not seek out a priori identities for the study. Instead, I sought to build cartographies from micro-instances of activism and resistance from a range of embodied and embedded locations and subjectivities.\(^2\)

I recognize that there is a danger in this approach, that being overly inclusive of a multitude of identities could result in a gender-blind/race-blind conception of “becoming” that dissolves into an undifferentiated blur, that ignores the very different starting positions and the embodied differences of intersectional subjectivities. Indeed, to fail to embrace the differences between becomings could be to reproduce the disciplinary configurations of humanism that sort bodies into categories of full humans, less-than-humans, and non-humans. This is a danger I have sought to continually remain cautious of throughout this study, working the tensions between creating complex and multiplicitous cartographies that resonate with the specificity of students’ identities while resisting relativism and over specificity.

To recruit the students in the study, I created a poster requesting participation in a focus group (about how students develop a sense of place on campus) and hung it throughout academic buildings on campus (see Appendix B). This included Maxwell Hall, which houses an arts-advocacy group (Creative Campus) that I worked with, and the Crossroads Office, which coordinates and leads intercultural programming for the campus. Thirteen students responded to the posters indicating interest in participating, and following this, I reached out to four additional students with whom I had worked with in the past in various contexts to ask if they would be interested in participating. Of the seventeen students contacted, ultimately ten participated in a focus group, and three participated in an individual interview (they were not able to make one of

\(^2\) We might return here to the maps in Chapter 3, the charts detailing the demographic information of the participants recruited.

the three focus group times or responded to the poster after the focus groups had concluded). For participation in each segment of the study, students received a five-dollar gift card to either Starbucks or Publix. Following focus groups and individual interviews, students were invited to participate in a guided walk. The following pages present poetic (re)presentations (e.g. Glesne, 1997; Görlich, 2016; Öhlen, 2003) created from the audio transcriptions of each of the students who took part in the study. These poetic narratives are excerpts and fragments from their interviews and focus groups, moments of belonging or recognition, of encounter alongside the maps they created during focus groups. These (re)presentations might be read alongside the maps made in Chapter 3, or Appendix A, which details the timeline of this dissertation study, or might be returned to (scrolled or flipped back to as you read sections to come). In other words, these poetic (re)presentations make possible a pause with each student who took part in this study, simultaneously serving as an introduction, an opening, and a summary. Methodologically, I considered the creation of these narratives a (re)centering of the participants in the study, they were created when I was partway through the writing of the analysis sections when the implications for the study were just bullet points in a separate word document. Creating these (re)presentations returned me to the embedded and embodied narratives of each of the thirteen students who took part in the study. Reminding me of their asymmetrical starting locations, the divergences and nuances between their narratives that analysis had abstracted. These (re)presentations, then, suggest possibilities to come, connections between narratives, fragments that are picked up and returned to in future sections, while other possibilities linger unreturned to.
Participants

Angela

My dad wouldn’t let me be an art major. He was like, “I will cut you off.” So, I’m an advertising major with an art minor.

Woods quad, this is my home. If it’s a nice day I’ll sit out here, and right there is where I had my first kiss with a girl.

I’m not really hiding it, I just haven’t mentioned it. I feel like if I treat it as not a big deal, it won’t be a big deal, and it will just be something that my parents know about me now.

Both of my parent’s graduated from here. Denny Chimes is where my dad proposed to my mother.

So, a lot of times when I am feeling like the world is terrible or whatever, I will come sit right here, and just like sit.

Because of the political climate, I started feeling uncomfortable going home. I used to like sob all the way down I-20. As soon as you like roll into Tuscaloosa it's just like I can be myself again you know? Just like an overwhelming peace: okay, home.

Figure 5: Angela’s Map, October 2017
Annaliese
I said, “never go to a school that puts athletics above academics.”
And then I put:
“cough cough Alabama cough cough.”
And when I got my letter graduation night...

Out of everywhere,
I did not want to be in Tut,¹
that's the exact place I did not want to go.
Then they were like,
“oh you're going to be in Tut.”
I hated it at first.
I cried my first day because I was like,
“I can't do this,
I don't know any of these people”
but it turned out I loved it.
and now I feel ingrained in Tutwiler society,
I am a part of Tutwiler.

There were comments made when I decided to go here from family members asking why I would go here,
knowing the history of Alabama.
And I was thinking,
“yeah, there's the history of Alabama,
but there's also the history of Auburn
and there's also the history of every other school in this country.”

My family is from Alabama,
and then I came here,
and you always have this perception of what Alabama is.
And my mom kind of put that in there.
She was like:
“you don't want to sound like you're from Alabama.”
But you see all these things all these amazing things that people do,
and they have done, and that you want to include yourself in.

¹ “Tut” or “Tutwiler” is an all-women’s residence hall on campus, located next to the football stadium and sorority row.
Annie
I live in Tut.
I'm very new here,
but um I did rush in the fall.
This is where I found a lot of my new friends
I don't know how I would have made friends
if I didn't do it,
I'm not super super social.
I did move around a lot as a kid so it's easier for me than some other people.

I'm a pre-med major
so, I have to make it a point to like get to know my professors.

I just got the vibe I guess that um like all it was football and like sorority life and fraternity.
If I hadn't gone to Alabama I don't think I would have [rushed].

Figure 7: Annie’s Map, October 2017
Bruce
The place I call home is Birmingham Alabama.
I was brought to UA because I got the most scholarship money,
and also, I enjoy the way like,
I really liked the feeling of completeness on campus.
I mean I've always been a Roll Tide fan.
My grandfather used to refer to Alabama as "The University."
So, it was kind of like a very uh expected thing for me to go here.

I ended up going against a sort of family tradition.
On my mom's side, almost every male had been in a certain fraternity,
but it was not the right place for me.

The time I feel like I'm the most on this campus is when I'm driving down University at sunset,
and the lights hitting all those trees, and you're looking down that tunnel,
and there's giant Bryant Denny, and Denny Chimes,
and just like the quiet hurry of everybody.

Figure 8: Bruce’s Map, November 2017
Cladius
I got here, and I actually didn't know any of the history.
I could obviously assume. I didn't know specifically what happened here until I started going to school here really.
Which is even now surprising to me because I know the person I am and I'm surprised I wasn't like, “Okay, let me google some facts about racism at the campus,” you know I don't know why I didn’t do that.

I just see power everywhere, just power power power.

I identify with my queerness before my blackness. I push that forward because it's the way that I see the world in a lot of ways.

My first real exposure to like feminism and feminist thought was from Mallet²
It was just like all these weird experiences I had in Mallet that informed who I am now. I'm starting to realize more and more that those were very foundational moments for me throughout college.

---
² Alternative fraternity on campus
Clark
I'd only ever visited.
I had like this one image
of what Alabama was.
And then the University of Alabama was
like the antithesis of that image.
I just thought it was going to be like real
Southern real just like you know,
Alabama small town.

My professor changed my life.
Women’s studies opened up like a whole
‘nother world of this university to me.

Once you know stuff you can't ignore it,
like the slave quarters behind the president’s
mansion.
It's a really beautiful mansion by the way.
And like one side of me is really offended,
you know, why hasn't there been change?
but then another side of it is like well,
I'm a Black student getting my education in
a place where historically I'm not supposed
to be and that’s empowering in a way.

I was working with this group of girls that
were all sorority girls.
That was the first time I've ever been in a
sorority house.
And it was so interesting.
I was the only Black girl there,
but there were like the workers and stuff.
The staff and they were looking at me,
giving me the weirdest looks.
They were just like,
“what are you doing here?”
and another thing is like, we were sitting in
the dining area with the TV on
and they were playing Love and Hip Hop.
It was the most bizarre thing to me.
like, I'm the only Black student in here.
but here it is with all these White girls like
just eating.
and they're watching Love and Hip Hop.
and I was just like that is a weird one.

Figure 10: Clark’s Map, September 2017
Elizabeth
Sometimes I'm just sitting here,
and I'm like this is weird!
We all just come here
eat our meals here,
I mean I love it,
but if you're not in a sorority,
or like if you don't live in Tutwiler,
and I feel like if you weren't a part of it you
would also be like whoa, like what is this?

Only like 33% of the campus is Greek but
it feels so much bigger than that to me,
because I always see someone wearing a
Greek shirt,
and I see my friends all the time
I'm a big fan but it is totally weird.

I considered not rushing,
coming into it,
I was like you know,
I don't need that.
But it is such a big part of this university.
I don't know,
my aunt was in a sorority, my mom was in a
sorority, my dad was in a fraternity
and I wanted that too for myself.

It's one of those things you just do.
from the South like you do it,
I needed to have a group that I could go to
I needed that.
I don't know how I would have done it if I
didn't have that
and I know that's weird because so many
people do it and they're completely fine and
like that's great
I just don't know if I would have been fine.

Figure 11: Elizabeth’s Map, September 2017
Kate
I'm like yeah, I love my university but... we have a really corrupt system here, it's unfortunate.
Then I don't know, there are other things too like, they're working on it but we still have a really shocking lack of diversity, it's like not the best, I don't know.

I am originally from Georgia, I lived there for fourteen years. and then I moved to Washington. My Mom's from Alabama, she lived here when she was in high school, and most of her family still lives down here. So, I have people down here.

Freshman year after band practice me and a group of my friends would go to Burke and we would have like our little family dinner in there like some evenings we would spend like three hours in there just talking it was really great.

I was like one of five White kids in my kindergarten class. Atlanta is super diverse So, that was always my idea of the South. So, that's what I was kind of expecting when I came back. I was like oh, I'll get to go back and like have some diversity but then I like showed up and I was like wait a minute.

Figure 12: Kate’s Map, September 2017

---

3 a dining hall on campus.
Leo
I really didn't know much about Alabama at all
It was just the football
because I honestly didn't want to come here
for a long time
because my cousins went to Auburn
and they graduated from there and I wanted
to be like them.

When I was working at the diversity center,
it always felt like resistance.
you're trying to make change,
or you're trying to do positive things,
and people don't really seem to care,
it feels like you're always going up against a
wall of like,
okay, we talk about diversity,
we want to move forward in making our
space feel more inclusive,
but who is really showing up and like filling
the seats?

I'm graduating,
and so, it's a struggle with me of;
at this point will it really make a difference
if I do work?
will it really make a difference if I continue
to put myself in these spaces?
and so yeah, I think it is a struggle
I'm so ready to go because it has just been a
rollercoaster of ups and downs
and disappointment and anger and sadness
and it's just a never-ending cycle of fighting
and it's the people who shouldn't even be
fighting you know?

It's also one of those struggles
of not only being a person of color,
but an LGBT person of color in this state
even if not directly,
has done so much harm to my identity.
And it's really hard to feel that responsibility
or even that obligation any more
because I'm like you don't deserve it
I would rather put my importance on self-
preservation because like to me personally,
I don't think the state deserves it from me to
continue to struggle and toil.
And to know most likely there's not going to
be much of a shift anyway.
You know things might get better,
things might change but we'll always still be
behind everyone else
so why would I want to be behind
definitely a struggle,
struggle's been the word of the experience.
Mary
I had no intention of coming to Alabama
I was like it's all about football
I'm not going to do it.

I still have a little bit of that cynical attitude
but the more I stay here the more I realize
like it's okay,
whatever you choose to become someone
will accept you.

I worked in a lab since my 10th grade of
high school
I'd done a lot of research
and he says like you should come up to the
university come check it out,
and I was impressed with the way
everything looked.
I was very impressed with the classrooms
and I realized it wasn't just football
it wasn't just like you know partying
if you didn't want to be part of that life,
you didn't have to be, people would accept
you anyway,
so, I decided to come here

Figure 14: Mary’s Map, October 2017
Sierra

I liked how [campus] looked on the website, because I hadn't been here before, but like that was good enough for me, and like I got into the Honors College

I thought it was going to be like super racist and like mostly White which it is about the mostly White but like, a lot of people here aren't as racist as I thought they would be, so.

I didn't feel like as unsafe because I don't wear the hijab currently So, it's like they won't know I guess unless I like tell them.

I joined the Arabic club and I did the coffee hour thing if I hadn't joined the Arabic club, I wouldn't have made that Muslim friend and learned about the prayer room.

and then you tell them you're Muslim and they're like "oh, you're that" and you're like…. okay...

I shouldn't be friends with you anyways. That's only happened like freshman year When I go back home like to dental school in Colorado or somewhere else I'll start wearing it [a hijab] and like stop caring because like I've been saying that I want to wear it since high school but like I haven't

Figure 15: Sierra’s Map, November 2017
Sky
I don't feel like I really belong on this campus
because I'm from somewhere else
and I know that I'm not going to stay here

So, although I'm an alien resident or
whatever you want to call me,
there are certain places where I can forget.
Swimming
as soon as I get in there,
anything I'm thinking about in terms of like
dissertation,
belonging,
ot fitting in culturally,
or teaching,
or whatever
I'm just zoned out
and I can just enjoy where I am.

I belong in the office,
although I don't feel like I belong in the office,
I should belong in the office.
I don't want to belong in the office,
but it calls me, and I have to be there.
and therefore it has to be a place that I belong.
and I have to become accustomed to
belonging in this space.

Figure 16: Sky’s Map, October 2017
Vivian

The Blount undergraduate initiative is a program that I am part of. It's a liberal arts and living-learning community. I think that the program, in general, has been so important for me in finding a sense of place and somewhere I spend a lot of time with friends and I think that's just kind of a central part of my experiences.

I'd always told myself I want I small liberal arts school,

I really thought this place was one dimensional even up to getting here. I was like okay, I've got myself in here, and I'll find a place. but people are going to be pretty much the same but just the size of the university, once you find your niche, it's actually sizable which is really great to see other people who have the same sort of thinking as you do.

Figure 17: Vivian’s Map, October 2017
Data Assemblage

As the participants' narratives begin to point to, as an assemblage, the “data” for this research extends beyond the bounded space of interviews and focus groups – to the encounters, experiences, memories, and intra-actions in place. For example, the narratives of my time as a student affairs professional or the memory of sorting through old school projects as an entry point for thinking about maps, or Bruce’s map (Figure 7) of the tree-lined boulevard leading to campus suggest particular orientations to the place of campus. Stories from these narratives zigzag out, producing multiple entry points, many lines that could be followed. An assemblage, then, brings together and embraces the seemingly unrelated, producing new connections. “Data assemblage” refers to how these methodological practices come together, the always-already happening nature of data (Nordstrom, 2015). A data assemblage thinks data as haecceity, producing connections and relations through movements of experimentation and differentiation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). As I move through the methods of data collection and analysis in this research, assemblages are produced in multiple and layered ways: visual images of maps created through the analysis sounded assemblages of student’s narratives, and textual assemblages of transcript excerpts, as well as encounters that exceed these practices.

Throughout this study, I also think with assemblage as analysis, how configurations and orientations to words and materialities and encounters make possible different understandings and readings. Considering the material theories that guide this research, the data assemblage of this dissertation extends beyond the bodies of myself and the student participants to encompass and enfold photographs, maps, histories, buildings, paths, as well as an embodied and empathetic awareness to the racializing assemblages producing the place of higher education. My methodology, then, seeks generative connections between materialities and bodies, producing
and constructing an assemblage that can be read cartographically as a nomad, exploring tensions, contradictions, and paradoxes (Tamboukou, 2009). This data assemblage weaves together the methodological practices of artful inquiry into a methodological approach to answer the research questions of this study:

- How do students navigate the space/place of higher education?
- What role does the socio-historical context of race play in student’s navigations of space?

In the following sections, I detail some of the practices of data generation for this research. Specifically, I detail the practices of focus groups, guided walks, and visual memoing. Each of these practices was included in an IRB proposal that neatly and carefully laid out a plan for the study from recruitment through analysis. These practices were approved as legible and legitimate methods of generating data for a dissertation, and throughout the study, I further legitimized them by connecting each practice to theory. Yet, even as these practices were legitimized through the eyes of IRB and for the purposes of my own theoretical practice, I emphasize that these are just “some” of the practices that produced the assemblages and configurations of data I moved through during this inquiry. These are just “some” because (and staying true to material theories), there were countless happenings and encounters that occurred during the course of the study – unanticipated, serendipitous happenings that were peripheral and unrelated, distracting and mundane, happenings that mattered and made possible the maps and configurations that I draw and move through in the sections to come. That is to say that I start with these practices: focus groups, guided walks, and visual memoing, even as other practices mattered methodologically. In these sections, I start with why I chose each practice and then talk about what they made possible – not only what I anticipated happening through these practices, but where they faltered, stuttered, and failed. Exploring how college students navigate the socio-
historical context of race on campus, these stutterings and failings become methodologically important not only for this study but future research in higher education contexts.

Focus groups. Conceptualizing this research project the summer before recruiting students, coordinating times, reserving rooms, sending emails back and forth, sitting in an empty room anxiously anticipating the possibilities to come, I imagined the focus group as an opportunity for dialogue among the participants. In the IRB for the study I wrote:

Focus groups enact and embody a spatial material encounter through the lines of connection and relation they make possible between participants (Wilkinson, 1998). For example, focus groups enact, “[the] event of place in the simple sense of the coming together of the previously unrelated, a constellation of processes rather than a thing” (Massey, 2005, p. 141). As an encounter, focus groups are a collaborative activity where participants are not only responding to each other but produce the encounter, distributing and embodying the experiences through the telling of stories and experiences (Hyden, 2013). (Personal document, IRB application)

I conceptualized the focus group as an opportunity to tell stories about being/becoming a student on campus, to construct together narratives that did not necessarily always have to agree, but that existed in tension with each other. The focus group aligned with the spatial and material theories that guided my study through enacting the space of campus in the immediate relations of the focus group, even as through those same relations, we were creating a new space. This did happen. For example, a series of moments in the first focus group where stories shifted suddenly from happy narratives of campus to a series of violent, disruptive stories: a break-in after a football game, a truck careening off the side of the road, a burning trash can and an ominous interaction with campus police. The relations and connections of these stories became possible through the specific material-discursive configuration of the focus group.4

4 I expand on these encounters within the focus group more specifically in Flint (2018a)
Although I did not, could not anticipate the specifics of the stories told, this was what I had anticipated through the focus groups – previously unrelated narratives coming together and overlapping, congealing to produce more nuanced, complicated, entangled understandings of the place of campus. Yet, there were also moments that I did not anticipate. Stutterings, pauses, failings that made possible unanticipated questions, that caused me to think about my role as a researcher and facilitator, examine my subjectivities in relation to my research questions and the students and the production of space on campus. These moments, produced through the focus groups caused me to consider my role as a researcher, and what it meant/means to do research, to engage in inquiry. I wondered: When do I intervene? Do I intervene? Does not intervening make me complicit? How is complicity complicated by my identities – educated, White, woman, heterosexual, cisgender? What weight do these identities carry as I engage with research, or how do they come to bear? These questions, and others led to other questions that I am still grappling with and thinking with as I write this document – about the purpose of my research, what it does, how ethics in research expands beyond the consent form to an ongoing relationality and responsibility to the participants in my study, as well as the place of my study. I think about this responsibility to place as an ethical obligation to represent the place of The University of Alabama as nuanced and complicated. Focus groups, then, make possible a reflexive engagement with place through lines of connection between participants, an engagement that is not just about the stories told – what is said, but also the unsaid, the silences, the moments where the focus group does not work as expected, where it fails.

5 For example, a moment with Mary, Vivian, Annie, and Annaliese that I expand on in a future section, the uncomfortable silence after Mary shares her surprise that people were once discriminated with because of their skin color on campus and her assertion that she is glad it is not like that anymore. In that moment, I was troubled by the silence, I wondered what it did, how did it implicate me in the production of race and racism, how did I become complicit through my silence?
In addition to the talk among participants during the focus group, I also incorporated photographs and map making within focus groups to guide talk about students’ navigations with place. My methodological decisions to incorporate artful practices within the focus groups make possible representations of space that move beyond the discursive toward visual, affective, and material encounters.

*Photographs.* Photography as a data generation practice pulls from artful methodologies of photo-voice or photo-elicitation where participants are provided with cameras and prompted to document/represent their lived experience (Osei-Kofi, 2013). For this study, I was interested in incorporating photography as a method reflecting a feminist orientation to providing participants control over their representation. This further reflected the assumption that providing channels for participants to have their voice/perspective heard (or seen) makes possible avenues to social change or justice (Guillemin & Drew, 2010). Winton (2016) used photo-elicitation along with group discussion in her study of place-making among young people and found that the photographs taken by the participants in her study reflected the “emotional power of place” through the memories, experiences, feelings, and symbols they evoked (p. 433). Photographs fold the space of the focus group into the space of campus, adding to the data assemblage through the lines of flight the photographs evoke to memories, experiences, and feelings (Winton, 2016). As a practice, photographs also encourage a spatial material engagement with place, as participants may be pulled to take a photograph before (or following) the focus group as they consider how they interact with and are embodied on campus.

This study incorporated photographs during focus groups. Students were asked to bring a photograph or a series of photographs that “captured” the space or place of campus for them, and I additionally invited students during guided walks to take photographs of the places and spaces
we visited. What I did not anticipate with these invitations was how they would produce and shape future conversations, as well as the ways that they would make possible engagements with place in the future. These engagements often expanded beyond the physical manifestation of the photographs themselves to the idea of a photograph, the idea of pausing or stilling the material-discursive productions of place in a visual capture. For example, during one focus group, Clark reflected:

_Campus for me revolves a lot around Reese Phifer Hall._
_So, I didn't take a picture of it,_
_I wish I had because I know exactly how I would take._
_It would be um there's a little on the first-floor kind of in the back of the building,_
_there's this big window that shows kind of the front of um Bryant Denny Stadium,_
_and where like all the coach's statues are and stuff,_
_and so, people ride their bikes by there all the time,_
_and I'm usually there because I have a class from 5-6:15,_
_so, I'm usually there when the sun's going down,_
_and it's just like the perfect sunset sort of picture,_
_so, I need to like find a really good sunset one day and take that picture._

For Clark, the idea of the photograph, of visually capturing the material and affective qualities of a place, made possible a specific and embodied engagement with place that then informed further conversations. A few days after the focus group, Clark texted me the picture she had described (Figure 18), enacting and capturing the moment she had described.

The picture and the subsequent interactions and engagements with place the picture then made possible led to other conversations, other engagements with place. Researchers who have used photography as a method of inquiry have emphasized how the act of taking a photograph: the act of selecting, cropping, zooming, bounding an image, enacts a reflective and iterative form of inquiry (Irwin, 2006). Considering the theoretical grounding of spatial theory for this research study, the act and embodiment of photography led to further considerations of those spaces and places, an attentiveness or closeness to those spaces and how they are produced. For example,
when we went on our guided walk several weeks later, I asked Clark about taking the picture and she said,

*It's so weird like whenever I go to that one class I have in Reese Phifer, during like sunset, the last couple times, there's been like, every time I walk up there's like this huge group of White dudes in like polos and khaki shorts and belts that are just like a herd of them with their backpacks and I'm just like where are y'all going?*

We might imagine how, following the focus group, Clark became more attentive to this space. She talked about stopping by the large picture window she described several evenings in a row until the sunset was “right” – fitting her description and vision of the space. This attentiveness then made possible another engagement with the space, an awareness of the groups of White men (she later speculated they were fraternity members waiting for a chapter meeting) congregating in the hallways. This observation spirals out, connecting with other conversations and encounters on campus, her experience learning about Greek life and the Machine, a voting

*Figure 18: Photograph of sunset by Reese Phifer taken by Clark. September 2017*
bloc of fraternities and sororities from her women’s studies professor her freshman year, the connections with those organizations to the persistence of racism on campus, an awareness of other spaces and places where Whiteness congeals. Photography, then, methodologically makes possible enactment of the embedded and embodied locations, an awareness of the here and now, situating bodies in spaces and places where they are produced and productive.

Collage. In addition to photographs, during the focus group, participants were asked to “draw, write, or visually describe the place of campus,” thinking especially about how they might describe the place of campus to someone who has never visited. The particulars of this method morphed and changed in entanglement with theories through the duration of the study. During the pilot study, this was enacted as map marking – drawing and marking maps of campus. Specifically, I asked students to mark spaces and places they felt connected to and to trace paths they frequently traveled. Methodologically, this approach was inspired by a desire to locate students in the space of campus through the use of provided maps, following research by human geographers such as Kwan (2008) and Kim (2015).
These prefabricated maps also engendered particular readings of the place and space of campus. For example, Richard, talking about the predominance of football culture on campus, described the stadium as the “mother-ship,” pointing to the illustration of the stadium on his map (Figure 19). Through this material-discursive movement, the oval shape of the stadium immediately became recognizable and readable as a flying saucer, leading to other associations.
and understandings of the culture of football on campus. Yet even as this engagement with the physical maps of campus made possible particular readings, they foreclosed others. For example, the students had trouble locating themselves on the map (for example, on Richard’s map [Figure 19], you can see where he circled and then crossed out a building). The maps themselves limited possibility, bounding what could be understood or read as the campus. On his map, Jon began coloring in the river area (Figure 20), where the university has built a several-mile-long walking path, then paused and asked, “does this count as on campus?” As a guiding concept of this study, then, I found, unexpectedly that the use of maps did not necessarily make possible
mapping. Instead, the prefabricated maps snagged at mapping as a theoretical process of creating openings, connections, a process rather than a thing.

Methodologically, I responded to these snags, and in the second focus group, I moved away from physical maps to incorporate concepts of collaging, using images or text cut from magazines, or drawing, cutting, and pasting on their paper to create a collage. Collage, or the process of creating a composition from multimedia (photographs, magazine images, text, found objects, drawing and writing, and other media) has been used by qualitative researchers as a conceptual tool to gather disparate perspectives, as a process of analysis or synthesis, and as a tool for inquiry (Butler-Kisber, 2008). As a process of juxtaposing images next to one another, cutting, overlapping, and marking, collage offers an opportunity to disrupt the linearity of

Figure 21: Skylar’s Collage, November 2016
narratives or written texts, and produce connections to other places and spaces (Osei-Kofi, 2013). I provided students materials from campus resources (admissions flyers and brochures, campus magazines for faculty and staff, recent student newspapers, and alumni materials) and asked them again to “draw, write, or visually describe the place of campus.”

The conversations during this focus group began to move toward more nuanced discussions of the embodied and embedded experiences of being a student on campus, although there were still methodological snags. Skylar, for example, talked about what it felt like to stand in the middle of Shelby Quad (pictured in the upper left of her collage [Figure 21]). Although this was an emplacement, locating herself within the space of campus, connecting her to embedded and embodied realities, the materials provided also limited the possibility of what could be considered campus. This bounding happened differently than the use of the maps – rather than limited by physical boundaries (e.g. the Riverwalk is not campus, the Quad is, as defined by the university created map), place was limited by the discursive potential of the campus materials. This is perhaps best illustrated in Ryan’s map (Figure 22), which features a picture of Nick Saban, the university’s head football coach, at the center, surrounded by cut out words including Hazing policy; Greek Life; Kinnucan’s (a local store); and UAPD.

This is not to say that campus is not these things, but rather we might wonder about the map Ryan would have made had the campus created materials, pictures, and phrases not guided or informed how he should think about campus. Similarly, how might Skylar have illustrated her campus experience outside of university leadership opportunities and academic majors, the shiny portrait of how-you-should get involved as a student? Considering the purpose of this research
study as exploring how college students navigate the socio-historical context of race on campus, the use of university materials (whether that be university created maps or university brochures), might limit the aims of this research in additional ways. For example, Ahmed (2012) notes how institutions use the language of diversity in mission statements to enact non-performative statements: “Diversity provides a positive, shiny image of the organization that allows inequality to be concealed and thus reproduced” (p. 72). The image of the university as produced through university materials, then, might limit and bound how students understand the production of race and racism on campus. This might be because it is in the university’s best interest to not discuss these things, or to only talk about race and racism affirmatively. This image of the university produced by the institution is produced not only through the pictures taken and stories covered in

Figure 22: Ryan’s Map, November 2016
university brochures but also through the buildings marked and numbered on campus maps, the sites that are highlighted and discussed on campus tours.

Following these reflections, in the Fall of 2017, as I facilitated focus groups for the second iteration of the study, I sought to merge the concept of mapping and collaging, asking students again to “draw, write, or visually describe the place of campus, and the places and spaces they might highlight and the stories they might tell.” I provided markers, colored pencils, and permanent markers, as well as glue sticks and fashion and travel magazines. These representations began to bridge the intents of marking maps and creating collages, moving from marking maps to making them. For example, as Clark described her map (Figure 23) as separated into boundaries, spaces of knowing and not knowing:

I kind of have the campus sort of separated into these groups, because these are kind of how I see campus I guess. 
So up here, I call this place the suburbs because this is where all the newest dorms are, and there's always like freshman there and I try to avoid that area altogether. 
And that leads over to where like I guess it doesn't really match up at all, but this is where like University Boulevard is and sort of like The Strip in general, and I see that kind of as like the flashy sort of party sort of slash giant sports stadium area. 
It's the part of campus that gets the most attention I would say, and then in the middle, I have The Quad it's just like big and it's like little Gorgas and little Denny Chimes. 
Over here I put that's kind of like an old-timey school, but this is like where I have most of my classes. 
So, that's where I associate all my school kind of things.

6 I wondered, later, how the choice of magazines – I used the ones that I received through free subscriptions, and were reflective of my background and former life as a fashion major: Harper’s Bazaar and Vogue, along with the Travel + Leisure that the former occupant of my apartment had subscribed to, also affected and shaped the representations of campus that students created. And, how those materials made possible or manifested other inequalities (for example, representation of people of color, particular socio-economic statuses, body types and gender expressions and sexualities).
And over there is the rec, I didn't really put anything there, but like the rec and then like the soccer fields. And then over here is like a mysterious area to me because this is kind of where the band and Butler Field is, and nursing and I never go over there, I never have a reason to be over there so yeah.

Clark’s visual/verbal descriptions of campus began to complicate the narratives shared through the photographs. The process of creating and bounding her map created cuts (literal and agential) in her decisions of what to include or not include. Her narrative encompasses local knowledge and experiences, “this is where I have most of my classes” along with global understandings of place “the part that gets the most attention.” Through this process of making cuts, other (re)presentations of place, and the production of place as a constellation of stories and encounters spanning and connecting many spaces becomes visible. The process of making the collaged map produces lines to other spaces and places, connections, and ruptures, enacting

Figure 23: Clark’s Map, September 2017
nomadism through dissolving generalizations towards micro-connections and transformations (Braidotti, 2006).

Guided walks. Following the focus groups, students were invited to embark on a guided walk or walking inquiry, framed as an ‘alternative tour of campus,’ guided by the places that affected or connected with them during their time on campus. Walking inquiry opens up the space of research to place, sound, and interaction, embodying the improvisational nature of becoming in the world (Ross, Renold, Holland, & Hillman, 2009). As an artful method, walking can be entwined with the process of data collection through embarking on guided walks led by participants, or go-alongs (Carpiano, 2009), and can also become a way of engaging with the research product. Examples of this include the Cities and Memory project, which compiled sounds into an evolving and ever-shifting global map of place (Fawkes, 2017), or the Linked project, a three-mile route of transmitters that emitted testimonies from owners of the homes demolished along the path making way for a freeway in East London (discussed in Myers, 2010). Burke, Lasczik Cutcher, Peterken, and Potts (2017) combined walking interviews, artmaking, and writing to embody improvisation, embodiment, and empathy as a process of active theorizing. Walking inquiry has also been used as a tool for remaining present in the research process, an active form of curriculum or pedagogy, and as a means of slowing down the process of inquiry to practice empathy an awareness of the researcher’s entanglement with the world (Irwin & Sprinnggay, 2008; Triggs, Irwin, & Leggo, 2014).
During the guided walks, I used a geotagging application on my phone to follow the path of our walk, a practice which both made possible emplacing the audio (through correlation between the audio and the path [Figure 24]), and made possible connections to other walks, producing a layered series of paths that intersect and congeal in particular places, visually enacting the production of place (Certeau, 1984). The walk was guided by an open prompt: I asked students to take me on an “alternative tour” of campus – echoing the language of other alternative tours, such as those led by a professor in the history department that trace places significant to the history of slavery on campus. As we walked, I asked students their initial perceptions of the University of Alabama, and how those perceptions changed once they arrived on campus. We discussed what they knew about the history of the campus, and how they learned about it, and often this talk pulled us to monuments, landmarks, and buildings that for those students represent the history. Through these intra-actions, the bodies of the students and I intra-

*Figure 24: Geotagged paths from walks. see an animation of these walks here: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P49Z2a4_vM&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P49Z2a4_vM&feature=youtu.be)*
act with the socio-historical context of the campus – pulled by objects such as a Confederate Monument. Walking, then, became more than the motion of bodies across space, and was not a neutral act, rather, it enacted and embodied the racializing assemblages that produce the place of the institution. Because of the active and productive quality of walking, it also made possible particular intervention, moments that I engage within the following section, but include, for example, Leo walking up to a campus tour guide and to ask them how they talk about the Confederate monument. Through the possibility of rupture and intervention, walking inquiry enacts nomadic ethics of a politics of location, embodying the entangled and complex web of interactions and becomings that produce (and are productive of) students and place, while remaining open to serendipitous moments and improvisation (Braidotti, 2011).

**Visual memos.** The focus groups and guided walks as encounters with participants are experiences that produce place, and through their practice, particular stories become possible (Ross et al., 2009). These practices become lines of flight for other processes as I move nomadically between writing and creating visual memos after focus groups, creating my own maps, embarking on walks, transcribing audio, and researching other histories of place. Visual journals build from artistic practices of sketching and journaling, and reflexive qualitative research methods of memoing and field notes (Clark/Keefe, 2014; Guyotte, Sochacka, Costantino, Kellam, & Walther, 2015). For example, in Clark/Keefe’s (2014) exploration of student’s identity development in college, the creation and production of art journals by students functioned as documents and processes for analysis. Clark/Keefe created her own visual memos of the process of doing research, and the students in the course digitally combined aspects of journals to create new meanings and inquire differently. Likewise, Guyotte and colleagues (2015) found that visual journals created space for the students in a cross-disciplinary
engineering and visual arts course to reflect, explore new ideas, and document their process of collaboration and creation. Art journals than can serve as a documentation and reflection of the creative process in conjunction with other artful research methods, as a tool for inquiry, documents to analyze visually by participants, or as the final research product (Clark/Keefe, 2014; Guyotte et al., 2015).

Throughout my inquiry, visual memos and journal entries (Figure 3-4, 25-26, 31) begin to intersect and connect the data assemblage, bridging between the assemblage and analysis, enacting and embodying analysis of the assemblage. Visual memos are a space to document and reflect through the process of inquiry and are productive cartographies existing in the liminal space between assemblage and analysis (Guyotte et al., 2015). Such practices seek to engage
with research as a nomad, and the focus groups, the guided walks, the memos and maps all open the processes of data collection to the encounters and productions of place.

**Figure 26:** Visual Memo: Walking Interview with Cladius. October 2017

**Analytic Practices**

Through the data discussed above (plus other data not yet discussed), this study follows the threads of connection and vibration between bodies to explore place as an assemblage: ever-constructing, variating, always-multiplicitous (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Following these threads, I understand place as a site of complex intersections across local and global spatial and temporal scales (Helfenbein, 2010). Arts-informed research affords an analysis which explores these complex and intersecting relationships in tension (Barone & Eisner, 2012). The analysis in the sections to come embodies the concepts of nomadism to explore the ruptures, resistances, and reterritorializations in the encounters of place. As Braidotti (2006) advocated, “if power relations
are not linear, nor is resistance… synchronizing the discordant time zones is as good as a strategy gets on the micropolitical lines of flight” (p. 142). My analytic practices embody this nomadic synchronization.

An artful nomadic analysis is an iterative, processual movement – seeking connections and divergences, moments of resonance and disruption, enacting haecceities. An artful nomadic analysis visually and creatively explores moments that do not fit along with moments that make sense, finding connections and ruptures between, among, and within them (MacLure, 2013a). Returning to the idea of the data assemblage, these lines of connection flow between individuals or within a single individual, as well as outward to events in the past and present of campus and the country. An arts-informed aesthetic vision suggests alertness to patterns and complexity, examining details in context, relations, parts, disorder, and disruption, for they are always mixed. This aesthetic vision offers the possibility for a multiplicity of knowings and becomings in the world, enacting the onto-epistemological assumptions of arts-informed research. For example, nomads move in haecceities, and this search for connections and disruptions decenters notions of belonging or becoming as a student on campus towards “a continuous process of differentiating, connecting, and rupturing, and grow into divergent lines that energize the actualization of life and human subjectivity as an ongoing process of becoming” (Loots, Coppens, & Sermijn, 2013, p. 121). In other words, students are a part of the production of campus even if they do not “belong” in the ways that higher education codifies belonging. For my analysis, I turn to the (re)presentational possibilities of sound (along with the aesthetic and visual discussed earlier in the data generation process) for the possibility to bring together disparate elements and layer affects, creating an aural assemblage along with visual and textual representations.
**Sound.** Gershon (2013) argued that spatial-material ontologies which embrace the interconnected and related nature of bodies and materials to produce space should turn to sound as a “theoretical site for conceptualizing what might ‘count’ as ‘data’ in qualitative research” (p. 257). Sounds, aural, vibratory affects that are intrinsically bound with the spatial material production of place make possible representations of multiple contexts and encounters, conveying an “affectively rich sense of place” (Gershon, 2013, p. 260). Qualitative researchers who use sound argue for the medium beyond semiotics (what is said) to a multimodal event that can be seen, heard, and felt (Cersaso, 2014). In this way, sounds offer methodological possibility in that they produce the possibility for simultaneity in the intersections of specific individuation and culturally resonating affects (Gershon, 2013). As a methodological practice, sound has been incorporated to produce representations (such as Gershon’s [2013] sound ethnographies of middle school classrooms and Gershon and Van Deventer’s [2013] sounded narratives), of mapping sounds in place (Wood, 2010), and considering the signification of rhythm and intonation in transcription and oral history (Madison, 1993). Cersaso (2014) described a method of multimodal listening to approach sound as an embodied and situated event that influences feelings, behaviors, and actions. For example, Gershon wrote about his co-created sound narrative with George Van Deventer, a poet, “it is a curricular and artistic narrative as a piece of art that is simultaneously a story about the possibilities and importance of art—at once a piece of art, a story, and a piece of research” (Gershon & Van Deventer, 2013, p. 99).

Sound creates an entry point with the here and now, operating from a politics of location in specific bodies, times, and places (Braidotti, 2006). My analysis, then, is imbued with sound, moving outwards from sounded moments to connections, moments of disruption in student’s narratives, or in the paths or places we take on the walking interviews. These narratives and
sounds layer and proliferate through multi-modal mediums, layered with text and visual representations, paths walked and embodied, overlapping at times and then branching onto others, some layering again and again, and others leading us far away, to return and be picked up again. This mapping carries out “the labor that constantly transforms places into spaces or spaces into places[…] organizing the play of changing relationships between places and spaces” (Certeau, 1984, p. 118). The creation of this map is an artful nomadic analysis, a visual, sonic, and verbal trail to follow students as they negotiate the place of campus (Tamboukou & Ball, 2002).
Illustration 6
9. THE WALL

In the previous sections, I neatly mapped out a plan of data generation and encounters. A methodology that thoughtfully embodied the theory that guided my research, that sought multiple entry points and affirmative difference and proliferation. Yet this story is proving more difficult to tell than I anticipated. I feel the pull to tell a different story, the pull to tell a clean story of collecting data and making meaning from it.\(^1\) Linear lines between this data that I collected, almost a year ago, and pithy and resonant findings that might prove useful or insightful for researchers and practitioners. Findings. Findings that can be bulleted and titled neatly with themes and sub-themes. This desire for linearity contradicts the theories that have guided me methodologically, but it feels so logical. Because at this moment, over a year after my first focus group, I find myself with all this data. Data that slips and shifts beyond the transcripts (transcripts that I dallied over and resisted, transcripts that pushed me away, that became in spurts and starts), data that has entangled with the year becoming in the interim. Data that spirals out connecting with moments I had not intended to be data: interactions between students in a political dialogues class I taught, encounters on campus, lectures, and workshops attended, conferences, segments from podcasts, national news stories, life-in-general. These moments entangled with the data bounded and delineated through my IRB proposal outlined neatly (or as neatly as I could) during my proposal meeting.

\(^1\) Perhaps, more accurately, I should say that I feel like I should tell a different story here, that the handbooks of qualitative research and logics of extraction (Kuntz, 2015b) still linger even as I have mapped up until this point, how I have sought to become differently.
I had not anticipated the way my maps would fall apart once I started to immerse myself in the data, locate and plot myself with their coordinates. Data as the lines of a constellation between theories, layered and overlapping, data as paths traversing the territory. Data disappearing as the grass sprung up around it, as clouds covered the stars, as waves wiped away my marks. I plotted out these steps (even as I left them vague, open to interruption and serendipity), and during my proposal, as some future endeavor, it seemed like this part, the analysis, would be the easy part. Because that data – the audio from focus groups, from interviews, my notes during the process – was already there. I had already collected it, stored it away neatly in folders (backed up of course), just ready to be accessed and analyzed. Simple. Writing this now, six months after my proposal meeting, I can feel the hubris emanating from this thought (even as I am still frustrated and struggling with why this moment, this movement through my data is not coming easily to me, my desire for it to be simple). Maggie MacLure (2011) critiqued the need to signify, to inscribe meaning on the child that will not speak. Research as enacting our desire to categorize bodies and moments and encounters into a representational regime, prioritizing analysis and interpretation. Findings. What does all this data
mean? How do I move through it? And so, not knowing how to signify it all, it sat. Untouched, the neatly categorized audio files sat through May and June, even as they loomed at my edges and peripheries. I did not quite know where to begin, but I knew I had to begin somewhere, so, in July and August I knuckled down and began transcribing. I hated it. As a qualitative methodologist, I loathed transcription. This, even as I recognized the inherent usefulness of listening through every audio file, re-listening to the pauses, the catches, inflections, the starts, and stops.\textsuperscript{1} Transcription as analysis, as (re)presentation. In practice, though, what moved me through transcription was thinking about it as time. Ten minutes of audio can be transcribed in twenty-five minutes. Transcription became about production and efficiency. I just needed to get it done because transcription was the entry point for analysis.

And this leads us to this moment, a right now, as I am sitting at my dining room table in a new apartment. I have shifted and moved in a multitude of ways since laying out the plan for this

\textit{Figure 28: Marked up transcripts. October 2018}

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{1} Contradictorily, I wrote a paper about transcription as reflexivity (Shelton & Flint, 2019) at the same time as I was finding every reason not to transcribe my own data.
study too. I’ve continued to become. There is an inch-high stack of printed pages in front of me, pages that have segments that I pulled from transcripts. Each segment is titled in bolded font and all caps things like “LIKE EVERYBODY KNOWS” and “DOES SHE THINK I’M A RACIST?” On the floor next to me are pages that I have gone through, color coding and highlighting and scribbling notes on the side “finding/remembering,” “AHMED, going against the flow,” or “contradictions.”

I have shifted and moved and reoriented them on the floor, finding connections, creating new maps, new pathways between stories. And I am overwhelmed. Here is the thing about multiplicity and simultaneity, always-under-construction and production: it is exactly that. The “data,” now represented through efficiently created transcripts, still moves beyond the page, even as the vibrancy of the audio is dulled by the density of the text. Moments say multiple things, exist with and alongside and in contradiction to other encounters. Data resonates beyond the walking interviews and focus groups, to the lecture I went to by a founder of the Black Lives Matter movement, to a dialogue I facilitated on Confederate monuments, to a conversation with a staff member at a university where I had applied to a faculty job about histories of race on their
campus. And all this resonating and entangling and the persistence of the extractive logics and representative regimes that linger form a wall. I imagine this wall as made up of data, an assemblage of connections that have become so dense that the only way through it is to hack a path – violent cuts that destroy the connections and lines between parts. And, in a sense, that is what I have done up until this point, violently hacking my way through – transcription/time as efficiency, segmenting and cutting apart each interview and focus group into analyzable segments. And this is not wrong, necessarily, but it is not working.

As I attempt to retrace my steps on the paths I have traveled this far, the theories and concepts guiding my way, I wonder if there might be another way through this wall, a different entry point that aligns theoretically and conceptually. And perhaps I could skip over this part of not-working and get to the business of analyzing (which still will not be simple), but somehow, I feel like I needed to write this, because this dissertation, guided as it is by concepts of compasses and maps, is just as much about the journey as it is about the result. And somehow, in the writing of a dissertation, it seems important to acknowledge, think with, and trouble the ways that the logics of efficiency and neoliberalism and productivity and extraction territorialize and striate the intentions of non-linearity and assemblages and rhizomes. Given this, in the next section, I rewind and start over, retracing my steps back to theory to move through this wall differently.

So, we return to the boulder.
10. RETURNING TO THE BOULDER

Zigzagging in time to the moment with Leo and me, stopping by the boulder, something that lingered with me in this encounter was how Leo had only recently taken time to stop at the rock. Leo had been on campus for four years and was fairly involved in campus activities. Over the past year, he had been involved with an activist group on campus that organized protesting the national anthem by remaining seated during home football games, had moderated and participated in weekly dialogues about political issues, and worked as a student employee at the intercultural center on campus. Yet, as we talked, he noted:

_I stumbled across the rock probably like a month or two ago, and I had heard about it—people had said there was a Confederate Monument on the quad, but I never really knew... and they said it was a rock and one day I was just walking, and I was like let me stop and actually read this. And it just shook me._

_The fact that I—It’s just so central to our campus and this rock is huge and the placard on it is it just says right here, this is to commemorate the heroic record..._

“_It just shook me._” Leo said. Shook him, even as he had shared during our individual interview about a time the year previously where he had taken a class he was mentoring on a tour of the president’s mansion, making sure to tell them the history of the slave quarters in the back of the grounds. This shook-ness, as Leo described it, then, is not just about the rock and the history that it holds. “_I had heard about it, _” he said, “_but I never really knew._” There is something about the encounter with the boulder in space and time, pausing at the central axis of campus to read the
inscription, that resonates differently than the knowledge of the rock existing on campus. On our walk, Leo continued,

[it’s] like right here, and it’s saying to commemorate the record, like I mean I get that you want to preserve the history of the university you want to preserve like the fact that one, the University survived through all that you know and the soldiers who fought. and like I get, you know, honoring their lives and their services -- but the fact that it was erected by the Daughters of the Confederacy, you know, not by UA to memorialize the sacrifice of what former students and military staff personnel did, no, it’s about literally the confederacy still living on through this rock. And you know, [it says] even though we have lost the battle, we—that doesn’t mean we’ve lost the war. It just says it right there, it’s not secretive, it’s not hidden, it’s just here...

As Leo continued, the rock becomes beyond simply a marker of history, of-what-happened, it takes on other meanings, “it’s about literally the Confederacy still living on through this rock.” The boulder, here, is marked as a material-discursive body with agency. Through the association with the Daughters of the Confederacy, its dedication decades after the conclusion of the Civil War, the boulder becomes not just about marking a particular place, time, or event, but draws lines to the future, “that doesn’t mean we’ve lost the war.” The rock produces and connects to the local assemblages on campus, immediate happenings, while simultaneously enfolding narratives of the South, global narratives of place and space. Indeed, the particular moment that Leo and I embarked on this walk was just over a year into the presidency of Donald Trump, when political polarization had become increasingly volatile and divided (Pew Research Center, 2017). This, mapped onto the political climate of the boulder’s founding, pre World War I, when the last Confederate soldiers were dying and a push was being made by organizations such as the
Daughters of the Confederacy to hold onto and re-memorialize White supremacist legacies through memorials. “The war” then, is not just about the Civil War, but about present-day struggles for visibility and validation, the question of who has the right to take up and claim space. The particular assemblage of boulder-location-UDC-present-past-future-time has implications for Leo’s engagement with and the production of the space of campus.

This moment of encounter with the boulder provides an entry point to how objects in space become haecceities that enfold spaces and times to disrupt or confirm the narratives of campus for students, affecting their navigations in place. Leo had heard about the rock before he encountered it, and ostensibly his knowledge of the rock informed his encounters and movements on campus. But it was not just the existence of the rock that mattered, it was the encounter itself that changed Leo’s perception.

*And the fact that it’s a giant rock you know,*
*I feel like that itself says something.*
*Because rocks have this idea of being immovable.*
*Or you know and just strong and kind of everlasting.*
*You know they're just they just get worn away but they're still here.*
*And just, yeah, it's just when I when I actually took the time to read the placard I was like wow.*

*Maureen: Yeah, what caused you to seek it out?*

*Leo: I had heard people talking about it before, just saying like, “the rock.”*  
*And I was like what rock?*  
*You know, I don’t know what you're talking about.*  
*And one day I actually just noticed the rock and I had time.*  
*So, I was like well, I mean let's find out.*  
*Since people had said things and I didn't know what was going on.*  
*And the two flags too, right there.*  
*The Alabama state flag, ugh, and interesting an interesting relic,*  
*also a reminder of the Confederacy.*  
*I wish I could remember more specifically [...] about the history behind it and just it did something it was something about like the design and where it came from...*
Here, Leo described how the materiality of the rock – its size, location, and framing by the Alabama and American Flag, resonate and produce the rock as mattering differently in the space of campus. The rock becomes “immovable” and “everlasting,” and Leo noted, “You know they’re just they just get worn away but they’re still here.” The rock becomes something more than its physical presence and stands in for the unsaid and silent dominant narratives of campus, their persistence, and pervasiveness.

Figure 30: The boulder surrounded by flags. Photograph taken by author, November.
The South

I am interested in this encounter with Leo, read along with other student’s navigations of the context of race on campus to unpack the multiple meanings they hold and make possible. My intent is not to trace a path of monuments or histories,¹ but rather to explore what encounters with these monuments and histories do. This exploration starts with the assumption, following Doreen Massey (2005), that spaces are never neutral, that they are always under production and being produced. Furthermore, the production of space does not suddenly begin when students arrive on campus, but rather, spaces are being produced and encountered even before students physically arrive on campus. As I reflected early in this dissertation, I marked my own exploration of this topic from my encounters with place and belonging. However, we could also zigzag back farther in time, before I moved to Alabama or applied to graduate school. The space of Alabama was still produced through national news, histories, and vague associations with the South that affected how I thought about belongingness, how I thought I might join up with spatial narratives. For example, in the months between choosing to move and embarking on the drive from Upstate New York to Tuscaloosa, Alabama, the assemblage of the University of Alabama continued to expand. The friend from high school who sold me my car, miming in a distorted Southern accent, with surprise, “you’re moving to Alabam-ey?” A family friend who asked if they had running water in Tuscaloosa, veiled questions about my “safety.” Alabama is not a neutral place, but rather, exists in the imaginary of the nation in ways that produce the space of the campus in particular and specific ways. For example, Annaliese reflected that,

_Nobody thinks of Alabama as important.
Like we're a right-wing, conservative, extremely conservative._

¹ However, you can find a far more comprehensive and linear guide of the history of slavery on campus here, compiled by University of Alabama Faculty, Dr. Hilary Green: 
Small, when thinking in political terms, we're very small. But when you think of like socially when it comes to the American landscape when someone from overseas thinks about the United States, they don't think Alabama. They'll think of the South, but they don't think of Alabama. But for a place like that, we have a lot of things that make the headlines. And so, you have like what, this summer, with Megan Rondini, and then with Harley Barber. And then my freshman year – remember when they had that incident where some comments were made on Snapchat? Like there were no there were no Black people in [sorority]. And we have one every single year and it's not just about like race it's about gender. And sexual assault and every year like something big happens and there's this big hullaballoo and everyone is like ‘I can't believe UA would do something like this, I can't believe this...’

Annaliese mapped this tension between the South and the specific locality of Alabama “but for a place like that, we have a lot of things that make the headlines.” Alabama, then, is produced as a place that is both small and resonant – easily looked over in the national consciousness, blurred and slipped into broader narratives of the South, even as the specificity of Alabama and what happens there makes national headlines. “And we have one every single year and it’s not just about like race, it’s about gender and sexual assault... and everyone is like ‘I can’t believe UA would do something like this.’” In the audio recording, as Annaliese spoke, her voice drips with irony at this last section, connotating that in fact, she can believe it, and yet we (as the university as a whole, individual students, the administration) continue to not believe it, expressing surprise each time a new event happens, proclaiming to the national audience that “I can’t believe this.”

---

2 Megan Rondini was a former student of Alabama who took her own life in February 2016 after being raped the previous summer by a prominent Tuscaloosa businessman. Her story made national headlines in July 2017 when a Buzzfeed article (Baker, 2017) detailed Rondini’s frustrating, gendered, and exploitative experience reporting the rape to the police and seeking medical and legal options. Rondini withdrew from the university the semester following the rape, and the article points to the lack of care and treatment that she received at Alabama following the incident as a cause in her death.

3 Harley Barber was a former student of Alabama who posted a video to Instagram in January 2018 where she used racial slurs, indicating that she could use them because she was in Alabama (Robinson, 2018). Barber was expelled from her sorority and withdrew from the university following the incident.
The focus and implications of national attention have become increasingly prevalent in the years since I moved South as the University of Alabama has won multiple national college football championships. Alabama, the Crimson Tide, Nick Saban\(^4\), and these narratives entangle with other productions of the South. For example, in December 2016, Saturday Night Live featured a sketch which included a guest appearance from John Cena (Saturday Night Live, 2016).\(^5\) Cena played an Alabama football player who needed to get an A+ on his science project to be able to play in the “big game.” Narratives converge, as Cena presented his research on bananas by displaying a piece of plywood with “bananas” nailed to it (one is an orange) and lists five facts he learned about bananas (including: “they are yummy”) to a panel of Alabama football-gear wearing professors who have pledged not to give him “special treatment.” Football matters, then, in how Alabama is understood and produced in national understandings. And this entangles with Megan Rondini and Harley Barber, SnapChat and sororities that Annaliese alludes to as she talked. Furthermore, interconnecting and entangling with other understandings of the South, this particular portrayal of Alabama becomes differently, matters differently than had this sketch been of another team. This portrayal only becomes possible through the specific material configuration of Alabama-football-the South.

Leo reflected on the intersection between national and local spaces as well, noting:

> because we're such a football school we're in a national spotlight.
> It [becomes] a national conversation too.
> You know of a struggle between the administration,
> between people who don't even go to school here,
> and who are criticizing you and your own students and the arena too?
> And yeah, it's just a very big struggle that's how I probably called my time here,
> just a struggle.

\(^4\) Head football coach at Alabama during the time of this writing.
\(^5\) view the video here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yrrj0076E9U
Football zigzags out from the campus, producing Alabama (and The University in turn) as visible in national conversations. For Leo, this meant that his involvement with protests and advocacy on campus as a queer student of color became compounded and multiplicitous. His involvement in an organization protesting the national anthem at football games became not just about Alabama football, but the national conversation around Black lives and nationalism and sports, and this matters in particular ways because of the specific material configuration of place. Furthermore, this tension between national and local contexts affect Leo’s navigation in visceral ways. “It’s just a very big struggle.” That struggle, as Leo went on to elaborate is not just about the tension between the administration and the portrayal of Alabama nationally, but his own lived navigations, his embodied and embedded reality on campus. He explained.

With the whole [protesting] at the at the football games, about the national anthem.
Or how not just students but just in general, is it morally or ethically okay to sit during the national anthem?
You know if you don’t believe the national anthem is really for? Like has ever really represented you or this country?
Has it represented you?
you know?
It's just debating and arguing about your rights of,
You know even just your ability...
like you have the right to stand or sit wherever,
but suddenly whenever you put in the context of this revered anthem,
now suddenly everyone else has a has a right to tell me what I can and can't do with my body.
(Leo)

Simultaneously, this intersection of local-global conversation matters differently, becomes resonant differently because of the specificity of place. The anthem and protesting the anthem matter differently in context, and enfold and resonate with other questions – Leo wondered “Has it represented you?” This question enfolds with the context of the university, the place of the protests. Does the anthem represent you? Does the university represent you? Simultaneously, the
mundane decisions to stand or sit matter, as Leo’s movements with the protests on campus become visible because of the specificity of place. In this material-discursive configuration, the place of The University of Alabama, sitting or standing at the football game during a national anthem matters in ways that would be different or distinct from the same actions at another school. The production of the University of Alabama matter in particular and specific ways for Leo’s safety on campus, and his decisions to stay or leave the state after graduating.

Leo’s experience with protests at football games maps the production of place between the global and the local in simultaneity. This simultaneous production can produce other navigations too though, as Angela reflected on how this mattering and material configuration of space produced her choice not to participate in the protests at football games because of the intersections of her family and her identity as a White gay woman.

Last year I was in the band,
so, I couldn't do anything with
[the protests at the football games].
Or, I don't know if I would be comfortable enough to do that on such a visible platform.
Even though like I know I should do it.
My, my family if they saw pictures of me –
not good.

Even though you know, it's the right thing to do.
I have to take my own safety into consideration.
So as much as that sucks because
I know African American students don't get to hide like that.
So, it's like a very loaded question or thing.
Or very just I don't know.
There's a lot of things to consider
With my safety and their safety and everybody’s safety, you know?

In Angela’s narrative, Alabama’s notoriety as a football school – the fact that games are televised nationally and watched by millions of people each week – affected how she interacted with, participated in, and intervened in inequities on campus. “If my family saw pictures of me – not good” she reflected, “even though it’s the right thing to do.” Angela’s navigations of campus
matter and become possible differently because of her embedded and embodied locations as a White gay woman. “I know African American students don’t get to hide like that” she reflected. So, she chose not to participate in the protests even as she knows it is “the right thing to do” because through participating in those protests, she visibly comes up against the narrative of the university and is marked as other in ways that have real and material possibilities – “with my safety and their safety.” Coming up against the university means being marked as a trouble-maker, as other, as a problem.

Notably, Angela has the choice to not come up against the university, as a White woman, her body is not marked as not belonging or as other. This coming up against becomes possible differently for Angela – she only becomes visible as “coming up against” through interactions where she is marked as other. She can move along with the flows of the university, join up to narratives of belonging, or be assumed to be a part of these flows. She is assumed to belong unless she acts otherwise. This is not the case for other students, as she alludes to, such as students of color, who simply by being-there, joining up with the institution, are marked as other, are assumed to not belong. The different navigations of campus between Angela and Leo become possible through the productions of White supremacy, meaning that the same movements (standing or sitting) at a football game in protest have different outcomes for different students. Coming up against the university, resisting the narrative of campus, produces different potentialities from the asymmetrical starting locations ofLeo and Angela.

---

6 I’m thinking here, also, about how higher education literature reproduces this production through what Harper and colleagues (2018) described as deficit focused research – research which focuses on why students of color (and other marginalized students) don’t belong. This research starts with the assumption of not-belonging. What this project seeks to do differently is to follow belonging around, see how it works and when and for whom, enacting affirmative difference, embracing multiple modes of belonging.
Coming up against the university matters in the specific material configuration and production of space and place. Being labeled as a trouble maker at the University of Alabama has a history that informs the present perceptions of this labeling. I am thinking about my second year on campus, during the student government election campaign of Elliot Spillers, and the worry and fear of students that I supervised during the time who worked on his campaign. These concerns came from their marking as trouble-makers, as going against the flow for supporting and working on a campaign of a candidate who was also going against the flow, breaking from the decades-old tradition of student government candidates supported and elected through a voting bloc of fraternities and sororities. This marking layers in space and time with other experiences of coming up against the flow. For example, Atherine Lucy Foster’s speech on campus in 2017, standing in front of Graves Hall where she had, sixty-one years earlier, been harassed and heckled, ultimately expelled from the university because of fears for her “safety”. “The last time I saw a crowd like this at The University of Alabama,” she said during her speech, trailing off amidst a tentative wave of laughter in the crowd (Johnson, 2017).

I am thinking about how these recognitions and configurations of how place affects bodies and navigations are different than the material configurations I encountered on other campuses during my consulting work with dialogue that I did throughout the course of this study. Place matters, and coming up against the university, being marked as a “trouble-maker” has different material effects in different material configurations. Coming up against the university mattered differently at a northern University of California system campus differently than at The

---

7 Elliot Spillers was ultimately elected as the second Black president of the Student Government of The University Alabama. His election became possible because of a coalition of sororities that broke with the Greek life voting bloc known as the Machine, as well as multiple independent organizations on campus including the Mallet Assembly and the Honors College. Spillers served as president during the 2013-2014 academic year.
University of Alabama, mattered and became differently at a small liberal arts college in Ohio than at UA. This is not to say that there was not still a history of violence or intimidation that imbibed present comings up against in other places and spaces. However, participating in protests, the practice of coming up against the university at these two other colleges was described by students as part of their experience, they came to college expecting to come up against the flow, indeed, the university websites highlighted advocacy and activism as part of the college experience (leading to a whole different, outside-of-the-scope-of-this production of space and place). It matters that at Alabama, coming up against the university has a history, has practices and moments and encounters that are associated with it, which inform students present/future navigations of space and place.

The production of Alabama as a state and the university in local, national, and international consciousness, the socio-historical understandings of the South, and the reputation of the University of Alabama as a flagship institution of higher education and as a football school, maps multiple slippages in the production of place. Annaliese, Leo, and Angela each navigate and produce the place of campus through their individual negotiations and interactions, informed by their own assemblages, configurations, and subjectivities. Leo’s negotiations of place as a Black queer student are qualitatively different than Angela’s as a White gay woman, are different than Annaliese’s as a Black woman, are different than my own as a White woman. I keep these differences in mind starting from embedded and embodied locations (Braidotti, 2013), and in what follows, I am interested in beginning to map how these slippages between local and global spaces that inform/produce the socio-historical history of campus are discussed and negotiated by students before they arrive on campus.
I start with student’s perceptions of campus before they arrived – memories and reflections of narratives that they were told or that they had before arriving on campus. As mapped above, these perceptions entangle with students’ perceptions and ideas of the South and Alabama as a state, and the following section maps those narratives. I then explore students’ experiences finding out about the history of campus once they arrived in place, then move to other disruptions in place, other ways that the socio-historical context of race is navigated and experienced. This leads, finally, to how students make and remake space on campus, carving spaces of belonging and connection, negotiating contradictions, and what they do to intervene in the socio-historical context of race. Thus, our itinerary for this part of the journey going forward may look like this:

- Perceptions of campus/the South
- Slippages and Disruptions
- Making spaces/Intervening in space

As a disclaimer, I provide this narrative roadmap and the bulleted list for your convenience, dear reader, to ease your anxieties about where we will go, to build trust in my navigation skills as your guide. But you may find, (indeed, I hope you find) that these paths are not as linear and straightforward as I have laid out here, but rather, these narratives blur and bleed into each other, doing many things at once, taking us along rabbit trails, producing more questions, looping back and contradicting. To facilitate this, I represent my readings of these narratives in multiple ways writing a path through these narratives, highlighting connections, congealings, and disruptions guided by Braidotti and Massey, while also, simultaneously providing other maps and moments – excerpts from transcripts compiled and curated in assemblages, and compilations of audio that overlap, congeal, and parallel with the written text.
11. MORE MAPS

In the following sections, I create multiple maps. I created these maps in an effort to produce multiple entry points through the data I had generated. I created paths through the data, seeking nomadic movements through the narratives, encounters, and configurations of students and place. Methodologically, this is a practice of seeking proliferation, connection, and relationality throughout my analysis. Some of these maps have become visible or recognizable as maps only after writing this section – for example, you will notice that in sections where I take multiple, short clips of transcripts to create a dense textual assemblage of narratives, I use footnotes to mark not only which participant each excerpt “belongs” to, but additionally the date, time, and event where the statement took place. You might think of this map doing multiple things – connecting back to the charts and participants at the beginning of this dissertation, or to the introductions and maps made by participants. Simultaneously, it also locates and situates these narratives as within time and space.

The sounded compilations or audio clips that accompany some of these sections also function as maps, bringing together the previously unrelated voices of students, branching outwards towards other spaces and places. Finally, the writing-through of each section that
follows functions as a mapping of mattering, building and following the connections and relations between the stories and experiences and encounters and materials. Each of these maps functions in different ways, make different understandings possible, and you will notice that there are stories and experiences that layer and repeat, refrains that echo through the landscape. I think of this repetition as productive, and as theoretically true to spatial and nomadic theory. Massey (2005) cautions us that we can never return to the same place twice, as it has always moved on, picked up, become something different. This is true even as we stay in place. Likewise, as nomads, we find that each return to a place, a segment of data, an idea, new connections, and understandings become possible – these places have moved on and become different in the process, and so have we.
12. SLIPPAGES

I had planned for these compilations, these readings, to be separate. I had planned that I would first map how student’s thought about the place of Alabama before they came to campus, and then see how these perceptions intersected and overlapped and congealed with understandings of the South, of local and global places and spaces. In my analysis, I had made piles of transcript excerpts, marking with sticky notes moments when students talked about their perceptions of campus before arriving, and highlighting when these narratives slipped and slid into understandings of the South. This happened frequently. For example:

*I just thought it was going to be like real Southern
Just like you know, Alabama small town.
That's like all I had experienced of Alabama,
so that's what I thought The University of Alabama was going to be.
But no, it's the complete opposite just smack dab in the middle of Tuscaloosa.*
(Clark)

*I came from Georgia and I was like one of five White kids in my kindergarten class.
So that was always my idea of the South because that's where I lived for 14 years. I would come to Alabama to visit my grandparents and stuff like that, but I never really spent time here. So, that's what I was expecting when I came back. I was like oh I'll get to go back and have some diversity. But then I showed up and I was like wait a minute.*
(Kate)

*because even though I lived in Alabama before I came here, you always have this perception of what Alabama is, and my mom kind of put that in there she was like, “you don't want to sound like you're from Alabama”*
(Annaliese)

*I just like visualized it as like the Deep South.
It would be a lot of old White people yelling at you as you walk past and stuff like that.*
(Sierra)
“Alabama,” in these narratives, resonates as a state, as an idea, as materiality that affects the ways that students navigate the campus. For example, Annaliese noted that her mother had told her, “you don’t want to sound like you’re from Alabama.” Or Clark and Sierra who conflated and congealed ideas of Alabama as a backward and racist place a “small town” in their perceptions and expressing surprise when they arrived on campus and their experiences did not match the caricatured version of the South they had pictured or painted. And Kate, who connected her experience growing up in Georgia with what she expected from Alabama – expectations that included, among other things, “diversity.” Even more specifically, there is an expectation that Alabama would provide diversity, diversity is something that could be “gotten” through an engagement with the specific configuration of place of Alabama.¹

These expectations and perceptions are interesting not just because of the slippage and conflations with the South, but because of the contradictions and nuances they point to. “Even though I lived in Alabama before I came here you always have this perception of what Alabama is” Annaliese reflected. In other words, this perception (embodied in “sounding like you’re from Alabama”) is immutable even as lived experiences and encounters contradict them. Alabama is sticky materiality, holding on to other materials and discourses (Ahmed, 2012). Alabama, as sticky to the idea of the Deep South, the South, small southern town, is inherently racialized. And that racialization is immanently tied to what happened in place – Alabama specifically, as well as the South more broadly. As Elizabeth noted:

That [race] is such a thing here at the University of Alabama.

¹ Even more specifically, we could map [although at the moment this is outside of the bounds of this paper] how diversity operates differently from different embodied and embedded locations of subjectivities. Sara Ahmed (2012) discussed what happens when particular bodies come to stand for “diversity” in institutional contexts, and it follows that there are bodies that can become diversity, and others that can “get” diversity or “encounter” diversity. Diversity becomes a commodity or an experience that can be provided and managed by an institution through practices like recruitment, retention, literature, and programming.
Especially with like, I mean it is in the Deep South, and the 1800s or whatever early 1900s it was...
Uh, college campus, and that's just the history of it, and it's sad that that's the history of it.
[...] but it's just sad that that's the history.
And that is the history, and there's, there's nothing you can do to change that.

“There's nothing you can do to change it” she reflected, pointing to the history, but also, ostensibly, the production of race and Whiteness and the history in the present. That sentiment is echoed by Bruce:

*like obviously UA definitely has,*
*like there are negative connotations.*
*Like very negative connotations to the way things were done in the past.*
*um and it*
*[5-second pause]*
*[ [...] Also, it's important to not erase the signs of the things that were wrong that happened.*
*Especially here in the past.*
*Because you can't change the fact that it happened.*
*And covering up the fact that it happened or ignoring the fact that it happened is only going to make it—*
*I guess you're never going to learn from history that way.*
*So, it...*
*[10-second pause]*
*So, I think it's important for people to be conscious of the way like racism and stuff was so prevalent on this campus,*
*but I don't think that the way that we build buildings in a classical style and kind of maintain the way that things have been done for 150 years.*
*I don't think that just because these terrible things happened means that we should change how we do everything to say like we're making this total separation from that time.*

Bruce’s perception, like Elizabeth’s, slipped from perceptions of campus to histories in place to his perception that those histories are immutable – you cannot change them. Bruce looped back to the material conditions of campus, “I don't think that the way that we build buildings in a classical style and kind of maintain the way that things have been done for 150 years [...] should change how we do everything.” By pointing to the buildings and their classical style as echoing
the style and feel of “The old South” Bruce worked a both/and – noting that these buildings and their style both echo the history of campus because of their connections to the old South, at the same time as he refuted that this has a material effect on the campus. This is a rhetorical binding that is echoed in how institutions respond to and handle race and racism on their campus. You “can’t change that it happened” and so buildings stand, names remain, because to remove or intervene is to both acknowledge that there is an issue that persists, at the same time as in this configuration it becomes fruitless to change the history.

Leo suggested how the materialities of buildings and monuments on campus might make possible different configurations and possibilities, and as we embarked on a guided walk, he reflected,

> And I’m thinking about it as we’re walking, and like realizing that one big draw of people to the university is our campus though, and the traditional college campus and style of buildings. Like I have to say it’s really like you know, our campus is beautiful, and I can never take that away, but it's also very reminiscent of like the old South you know, and that in itself is whether conscious or unconscious draw to our campus, you know?²

The buildings produce place not just in their connection and mirroring of the old South (aesthetically and through their namesakes), but through what they do – through being reminiscent of the old South, buildings then draw or pull prospective students to the campus. We might also wonder how this discourse produced through the entanglement of building style/old South/Alabama works on the campus and students in other ways – pushing, rein-scribing, silencing, validating particular material-discursive configurations.

² I find an interesting methodological note here, that Leo becomes or notes this contradiction or configuration of place through our walking. This is not to say that would not have noticed it otherwise, or that it would not have come up in interview room, but/and, this particular encounter and moment is made possible “as we’re walking.” The walking encounter also makes possible a nuanced moment there is a draw or pull of the buildings even as they’re beautiful. Encountering the buildings makes possible multiple readings through the encounter, through their material engagement.
And so, as I try to separate these two ideas out, perceptions of campus, and conceptions of the South, they slide back into each other. Even as, through making the compilations that follow on the next two pages (first, two audio compilations of narratives, and then textual compositions of transcript segments) the tensions between perceptions and conceptions are productive. And, by mapping what they do – the ways that these perceptions influence and affect the ways that students encounter and navigate campus, makes possible understandings of how to intervene, how to re-make place, how to resists the rhetorical slippage from “you can’t change what happened” to an acceptance of White supremacy and persistence of race and racism.

Listen to Perceptions

Listen to The South

---

3 www.maureenflint.com/perceptions
4 www.maureenflint.com/the-south
I've lived in Alabama my entire life. You always have this perception of what Alabama is in fourth grade, you take Alabama history... and you're like yeah, this state was freaking racist for a long time. and it still is.

I came from Georgia and I was like one of five White kids in my kindergarten class. So that was always my idea of the South.

I thought it was going to be like super racist and like mostly White.

When I started high school we had to write a letter to ourselves for when we graduated. I said, “never go to a school that puts athletics above academics” and then I put: “cough cough Alabama cough cough.”

My freshman year was also the year right before the sororities got in major trouble. I was like looking at the University of Alabama that was all I saw.

I just got the vibe all it was, was football and sorority life and fraternity life.

I just thought I thought it was going to be like real Southern.

I could obviously assume... [but] I didn't know specifically what happened here until I started going to school here.

I really did not know much about this place at all. I did know it was a predominately White institution, so I did know I was getting myself into that.

---

1 Focus Group, 10/6/17 Angela, 50:00
2 Focus Group, 10/1/2017, Annaliese: 48:00
3 Focus Group, 10/6/17 Angela, 50:00
4 Walking Interview, 10/16/17, Kate: 21:30
5 Individual Interview, 11/10/17, Sierra: 21:30
6 Walking Interview, 3/30/18, Leo: 59:00
7 Walking Interview, 4/2/2018, Bruce: 15:45
8 Focus Group, 10/1/2017, Annaliese: 48:00
9 Focus Group, 10/6/17, Annaliese: 42:00
10 Focus Group, 10/6/17, Annaliese: 28:00
11 Individual Interview, 11/10/17, Bruce: 5:30
12 Walking Interview, 4/2/2018, Bruce: 16:46
13 Walking Interview, 10/24/17, Sky: 9:15
14 Walking Interview, 10/16/17, Kate: 22:30
15 Walking Interview, 10/16/17, Kate: 22:30
16 Focus Group, 10/6/17, Angela, 50:00
17 Interview, 11/10/17, Bruce: 5:30
18 Walking Interview, 10/6/17, Clark: 5:30
19 Walking Interview, 10/6/17, Clark: 4:00
20 Walking Interview, 10/9/17, Cladius, 10:00
21 Walking Interview, 3/30/18, Leo: 1:01:00
I just thought there would be a lot of kids with like camouflage clothes and like confederate flags. I just like visualized it as like the Deep South. It would be a lot of old White people yelling at you as you walk past and stuff like that. When someone from overseas thinks about the United States, they don't think Alabama. They'll think of the South, but they don't think of Alabama.

So, it does exist but like it's like a secret. But that happens in the north too. It is just so different coming to a place that has so much history in that it is such a thing to be and especially to be just Alabama in general. Just confederate flags, you know? Any university in the South, the history there, there's going to be some kind of negative history.

I didn't expect a lot of Muslims to be here in the South, in general. Because I generally think that you'd stay away from somewhere you might get attacked for your faith. Nobody, nobody thinks of Alabama as important.

I came down here because I knew it was the South. I've heard people say it before too like I came down here because I knew it was the South. People think that when you come to Alabama it's just going to be a place of complete backwardness. It's just going to be you know, hillbillies everywhere and n-words flying. It's Alabama but we still don't—at least most—a lot of us don't tolerate that type of thing. "you don't want to sound like you're from Alabama.

When someone from overseas thinks about the United States, they don't think Alabama. They'll think of the South, but they don't think of Alabama. People think that when you come to Alabama it's just going to be a place of complete backwardness. It's just going to be you know, hillbillies everywhere and n-words flying. It's Alabama but we still don't—at least most—a lot of us don't tolerate that type of thing. "you don't want to sound like you're from Alabama.

Because of the whole idea of what Alabama is. Not just the campus but the state. Our campus is also very reminiscent of like the old South, and that in itself is whether conscious or unconscious draw to our campus. I came from Georgia... and that was always my idea of the South because that's where I lived for 14 years.

Nobody, nobody thinks of Alabama as important. They can do it because it's the South, right? I didn't expect a lot of Muslims to be here in the South, in general. Because I generally think that you'd stay away from somewhere you might get attacked for your faith.

Any university in the South, the history there, there's going to be some kind of negative history. They can do it because it's the South, right? I didn't expect a lot of Muslims to be here in the South, in general. Because I generally think that you'd stay away from somewhere you might get attacked for your faith. Nobody, nobody thinks of Alabama as important.

I came down here because I knew it was the South. I've heard people say it before too like I came down here because I knew it was the South. People think that when you come to Alabama it's just going to be a place of complete backwardness. It's just going to be you know, hillbillies everywhere and n-words flying. It's Alabama but we still don't—at least most—a lot of us don't tolerate that type of thing. "you don't want to sound like you're from Alabama.

I don't think the state deserves it from me to continue to struggle and toil.
Moving between narratives of the South and perceptions of campus, I am thinking about how these stories matter and the weight they carry. There is a refrain in the stories, moving between the simultaneous productions of perceptions of campus and the South. Perceptions of the place of campus produced and constructed in ongoing relations before students ever arrive, through news media, family, friends, their own experiences in the South. These are encounters like expectations of joining fraternity or sorority life:

*I considered not rushing, coming into it,*
*I was like you know,*
*I don't need that,*
*but it is just such a big part of like this university.*
*(Elizabeth)*

*I had seen like the things on Facebook.*
*Especially because the summer before I came to college was when they had that the sorority with their video...*  
*and it was like every single like [...] the blowing glitter.*
*I always remember that I was like,*
*is that really what people, do people actually do that?*  
*Like do they just blow glitter in the wind?*  
*But anyway, so I was like, that's a little culty.*
*and maybe one of the reasons that I hesitated on joining a fraternity because especially because the one that I was rushing at the time was one that like people on my mom's, like a lot of men on my mom's side of the family had been in.*  
*So, there was definitely a little bit of,*
*not necessarily pressure just encouragement,*  
*or I could tell that you know they would want me to be in that one.*  
*But I didn't like the vibe I guess.*
*(Bruce)*

And/or the role of football and sports on campus:

*I just got the vibe all it was, was football and sorority life and fraternity life I wasn't really into that.*
*If I hadn't gone to Alabama I don't think I would have [rushed] but having people tell me that if you don't do sorority life or whatever then like you do nothing.*
*(Annie)*

*When I started high school, we had to write a letter to ourselves for when we graduated. I said: “never go to a school that puts athletics above academics”*
and then I put:
“cough cough Alabama cough cough”
I put that in my letter, and when I got my letter graduation night...
(Annaliese)

I really didn't know much about Alabama at all.
It was just the football, and I knew that the recruiter wanted me really badly.
Because I honestly didn't want to come here for a long time,
because like I was an Auburn person for a while.
Because my cousins went to Auburn,
and they graduated from there and I wanted to be like them.
My mom tells the story now of when I was younger,
like I had other family friends who went to Alabama and they were like:
“you're going to come to Alabama right?”
And I was like:
“no!
I'm never going to Alabama!”
(Leo)

So, the only [association] I had [about Alabama] was football
and I don't like football.
So, that was just a loose connection that my family cares about more than I do.
And so, I got here,
and I actually didn't really know any of the histories at all.
I could obviously assume,
you know, something,
I didn't know specifically what happened here until I started going to school here really.
Which is even now surprising to me because I know the person I am,
and I'm surprised I didn't be like okay let me Google some facts
about racism at the campus.
You know I don't know why I didn't do that.
Um, I think I was so caught up in the transition of going to school that I never thought
about where I was going to school until I was here.
(Cladius)

These student’s perceptions tell multiple stories and point to the multiple congealings and
configurations that produce place. And as Cladius’s narrative mapped, “I could obviously
assume” they suddenly, simultaneously, all at once slip and slide into perceptions of the South
and of Alabama not as a University but as the state, as a global place. This slippage blurs the
specificity of place. As Clark reflected earlier, “that's like all I had experienced of Alabama, so
that's what I thought The University of Alabama was going to be,” or Kate, who remembered, “I
came from Georgia [...] So that was always my idea of the South.” These perceptions and this slippage matters because it affects the way that students experience campus and place, these discourses have material effects on the negotiations of campus. For example, Annaliese remembered her mother telling her “you don’t want to sound like you’re from Alabama.” The discourse of Alabama as connected to the South as identified by speech patterns and accents as signifying Alabama – this discourse then affects the way that Annaliese talks, presents, moves through campus. Before sharing this story, she had remarked,

you know the flags and the quad leading up to [the main library]? like of all the things that everybody does with the University? When I first saw that I was really surprised seeing, because even though I lived in Alabama before I came here, you always have this perception of what Alabama is, and my mom kind of put that in there she was like, “you don't want to sound like you're from Alabama” but you see all these things all these amazing things that you see people do, and they have done and that you want to include yourself in. And you kind of think of Alabama as the underdog...

Alabama works in multiple ways – affecting her speech (resisting the signifiers of Alabama), while simultaneously producing Alabama as an underdog, as a place she wants to be included in, wants to be a part of, wants to belong to.

Mapping from the embedded and embodied locations of students, these discourses of Alabama work on bodies and the material-discursive effects they have matters differently. Considering the navigations of the socio-historical context of race on campus, the difference, and contradictions in the embedded and embodied experiences of students then, matters. Braidotti (2006) advocated for mapping from the asymmetrical starting locations of embedded and embodied subjectivities-in-becoming, nomadic narratives that zigzag across time zones and spaces. This is a process of “forgetting to forget,” a political project of cartographic accuracy, mapping, recognizing, and empowering efforts of resistance through affirmative difference
(Braidotti, 2011, p. 115). Thus, recognizing the material effects of visible difference and how it produces different potentialities for Angela and Leo from their embedded and embodied positions as raced, gendered, historicized, regionalized subjectivities makes possible mapping empathy and interconnectedness. Forgetting to forget, in this project, then, is not about seeking to walk the paths of individual student’s navigations, to be in their shoes. Rather, this is a project of creative and empathetic imagination of the lived differences between students, a process of recognition, awareness, and re-memory that maps new cartographies between subjectivities in becoming.

**Forgetting to Forget**

Continuing the journey of forgetting to forget embraces the possibility (and reality, as mapped in higher education literature) that students of color join up with the narratives of campus differently than their White counterparts. Specifically, they join up more aware of discourses of race because of their embedded and embodied subjectivities. This is illustrated by Annaliese, who described,

*like I've had the awareness [about race on campus]*
*because not only I went to class to learn about it*
*and it's kind of thrown in my face every time,*
*like when I was first applying here it was thrown in my face*
*like,*
*“Oh, why are you a Black person going to Alabama?*
*Knowing how crap it is or knowing the history behind it?”*
*It's like,*
*“because it has my program, that's why I'm going to Alabama.*
*and I like the University and I like Tuscaloosa...*
*and I genuinely love being here.”*
*But I do know about the injustices,*
*and it's a problem that other people don't know*
*and it's not entirely their fault,*
*not everybody has to be woke 24/7*
*like that's it's not up to me to make sure that they're culturally aware,*
*and it's up to them*
(Annaliese)

Annaliese, who also worked as a resident advisor on campus, zigzagged between discourses and matterings and materials – the effect of discourses that matter differently, become resonant differently for her as a student of color (and as a woman). She situated this simultaneously as she positioned herself as taking advantage of the resources of the institution, in spite of and also because of those inequities and injustices. The ways that the histories and narratives of The University of Alabama congeal and coalesce matter both for student’s navigations on campus, while simultaneously shooting off in other directions, becoming forward in time “you gotta keep this going.” Returning to the literature on higher education, belonging, and race, the University of Alabama as a predominately White campus continues to be produced as a space that is overtly and subversively hostile to students of color. At the same time, precisely because of the systems of White supremacy that produce the inequities of the institution, the University of Alabama is well resourced and funded, offering opportunities and resources to students not afforded by regional colleges or Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This is echoed by Clark who, when I asked her how she encountered histories of race as a student responded,

---

I just I always feel like there are two schools of thought on it
it's like one, like one side of me is really offended.
Like why hasn't there been change,
or you know acknowledgment of like the horrible stuff that's gone on?
but then another side of it is like well, I'm a Black student getting my education in a place
where like historically I'm not supposed to be
and that's you know, gratifying that's like empowering in a way
(Clark)
---

Again, similar to Annaliese, Clark worked a simultaneous both/and as she considered the way that place matters in her experience. She is both offended and simultaneously empowered/gratified. This simultaneity does not function to cancel the other out, but rather, they exist in tension, a contradictory resonance that does something, has a material effect on bodies,
and these resonances matter and become differently for different bodies. They map different becomings, and these becomings are possible because of the connections and relations-in-place, how place is produced in specificity. Specific to the configurations they are a part of, place congeals and becomes legible to particular bodies in particular times through particular encounters. The configurations of the place become differently for students on color on campus, configurations that make possible simultaneous experiences of feeling gratified/empowered and hyper-visible and hyper-aware of Whiteness, race, and racism on campus. As Annaliese described, “[it was] thrown in my face.” Being there, becoming part of the assemblage of the campus produces disruptions differently for students of color. Mundane acts become differently because of this configuration.

and it just hit me that I might not have been here if one thing
butterfly effect
if one thing had changed.
(Annaliese)

For Annaliese and Clark, this congelation of materialities: The University of Alabama, the South, race, Blackness, history -- resonated with contradiction – a sense of this is not a place I am meant to be, this place was not made for me, but/and I love this place, it is gratifying to be here. For other students, the coalescing of these narratives is able to be entered differently, make possible different entry points, different matterings:

I've heard people say it before too like,
“I came down here because I knew it was the South,
I knew it was different and I wanted to be in an environment that was different.”
And you know for everyone that difference is –
I don't know, they have different things that they're prioritizing with that.
So, some are like:
“"I can finally be as bigoted or ignorant or whatever you want to call it.”
They can do it because it's the South, right?
Like everyone in the North is just so is so liberal blah blah blah.
That's a common thing, and even if we don't realize it.
Because of the whole idea of what Alabama is.
Not just the campus but the state. People who have never been here think that when you come to Alabama it's just going to be a place of complete backward-ness. It's just going to be you know, hillbillies everywhere and n-words flying like no other but it's not like that. (Leo)

While Clark and Annaliese spoke of a simultaneous pull and push of discourses – a pushing away (“historically, I’m not supposed to be here”) and pulling towards, belonging here/succeeding here means something more (“you’ve gotta do this great thing”) – Leo pointed to how the discourses of the University pull other bodies toward it with those same discourses. He reflected on incidents where student’s posted social media posts using racial slurs: “They can do it because it’s the South, right?... because of the whole idea of what Alabama is, not just the campus but the state.” Discourses congeal and matter in multiple ways, and simultaneously as these discourses empower, they can also reify the dominant production of place, pulling students towards it who are seeking an affirmation of the narratives of the South. Leo discusses this as an unconscious narrative – “even if we don’t realize it” or, when he discusses the building styles “and that in itself is whether conscious or unconscious draw to our campus, you know?” The ways that the South, race, and Whiteness become part of the configuration of the place of Alabama is produced then through the multiple and overlapping discourses of local and global moments – recruitment practices, football, sororities and fraternities, building styles, student bodies. Furthermore, this is not simply a global discourse, but one that is negotiated within the everyday movements and navigations of bodies, materialities, and campus.

Slippages in Practice

To assume that the slippage between The University of Alabama and the South is unconscious – that it emerges from the ether, and not through specific practices – is to ignore
what the narrative does and how it benefits the university. For example, Hutt, Bray, Jones, Leach, and Ward (2010) described how The University of Alabama shifted enrollment strategies between 2005 – 2010 to increase enrollment by 22% through changes to the rhetoric of the honors college and structure, admissions, recruitment, retention efforts, residential life, and campus grounds. One example of the rhetoric included in this shift is the “Crimson Is” marketing campaign, which used narratives from students and alumni to emphasize the strong tradition and prestige of the university. Six years later, a New York Times article (Pappano, 2016) returned to the question of enrollment at The University of Alabama, following an 80% increase in freshman applications from 2010 – 2016. Pappano (2016) draws portraits of Alabama student’s and recruiters, describing one student who “visited, took the bus tour, [and] was tickled by the Southern hospitality” and a recruiter who “held a send-off lunch at her home with sweet tea, lemonade and a game of corn hole in the backyard.” Pappano (2016) described the campus as “where pristine brick Greek Revival buildings seem like toy models slipped from boxes and set on green plots amid curvilinear streets of fresh black asphalt.” Southern-ness, then, becomes a recruitment strategy for enrolling high-achieving students from the North who do not qualify for financial aid – a recruitment strategy which also includes a $92.3 million increase in merit aid (up from $8.3 million in 2006), 64 new buildings, and an “army of recruiters” (Pappano, 2016). In other words, the slippage between the South and The University of Alabama is not accidental or unconscious, but rather, an intentional and focused marketing effort to brand the university as prestigious and selective, a fitting place for students with nationally recognized scholarships and high-test scores.

To return to Leo’s narrative, the branding of the University of Alabama as the South is productive in multiple ways. The South as a material-discursive configuration of columned
Greek Revival buildings, sweeping staircases, and pristine grounds is a narrative that connotes selectiveness and prestige for particular groups and not others. In fact, the very idea of selectiveness is to imply that others are left out. To be selective is to select some and not others.

In response to this New York Times article, a student from the *Crimson White*, the student newspaper on campus, wrote:

> If the University’s exponential growth is driven by its recruiting, we would do well to examine what culture University representatives promoted as they attract potential students to campus. As best I can tell, the recruiting strategy veils the complexities of the region while embracing the nation’s simply charming (read: not unfavorable) stereotypes of Southerners. The New York Times tells of our recruiter in Long Island, who invites admitted students to her home for sweet tea to prepare them for what it must be like to live in the South (I’d like to note here that both my mother and grandmother, two unassailably Southern women, drink unsweetened.) Sit long enough in Woods Quad and you will hear a tour guide tell a story as sweet as condensed milk to explain how the University first admitted women and played football in 1892. Taken against a backdrop of multi-million dollar antebellum-style Greek houses, the UA brand risks inviting a superficial understanding of not only this campus but the South at large. (Rogers, 2016)

Rogers describes how this narrative not only has implications for the production of place at the University of Alabama but the South as a whole – as Massey (2005) described, place is produced through the relations between local and global spaces. In other words, the local space of The University of Alabama produces the South at the same time as the South produces Alabama.

It follows that to be an institution that embraces the narrative of the South as a way of communicating selectiveness is to work a dangerous both/and – for whom is the university produced for? Who is left out? Who benefits? My intention with these questions is not to create a hard and fast binary between these groups or to say that it carte blanch is the university’s intention to (re)produce the university as White. Rather, I ask to emphasize that this narrative *does* something, and that then affects who belongs, who feels welcomed, and their navigations, experiences, and encounters on campus. Furthermore, this discourse is both productive (pulling/pushing/sticking/following) particular students and particular materialities on campus, at
the same time as it is produced by those students and materialities. Annaliese and Clark produce disruptions in the White supremacist discourse by being on campus at the same time as a student who attends because “[they] can finally be as bigoted or ignorant or whatever you want to call it” reaffirms the discourse. So, to follow the tensions between perceptions of campus and the South is to ask what the intersection of these narratives does and makes possible. How are these tensions disrupted, resisted, and reaffirmed? These questions guide the following section.
Illustration 9
I am struggling with these ideas as themes and as categories -- the South, Alabama, perceptions, slippages, I want to show how they slip and slide and elude. How they become haecceities. How they are haecceities, my sense making of them is always already a part of it. I am here and I am making sense of it, even as I am a part of it. And I am trying to resist these words are a stand-in for the encounters. Being careful not to make them representative. Saying things, contradicting myself the next statement. Writing affirmative difference: even as, meanwhile, simultaneously. I am thinking about how to be theoretically faithful, faithful to my theory in my (re)presentations and how I tell this story. And faithful to the students in this study, their voices, the encounters, emotions. And yet I keep getting pulled back to what was said. Words paused by the transcript slip and slide and move me away from the encounters. They move me away from the materiality of the moments, away from the feeling of it all. I am telling a friend, as we meet to write at a coffee shop, that was I to do it again, I would have entered this data differently.
Transcripts have made marks on my data as though it is stable, paused the doings and the encounters in words that lie flat on the page. I have written about how I have been pulled to the audio, but the transcripts pull me too, with their clarity and accessibility. Who else talked about buildings on campus I wonder, hitting “CTRL-F” on my keyboard and typing in “building” to my transcript document. These connections engendered by the transcripts move differently, they are focused on the saying, the meaning, the extraction again, rather than the doing. So, I move back to the audio, to listen, and I find moments that remained unextracted from the document I had created with transcript excerpts.

Angela and I, on a walk, pass by the “vagina statue” in Woods Quad, where she tells again the story about kissing her first girl there, a story she had shared in the focus group months before. A story that she had followed up during the focus group by saying “... this whole quad just feels like home to me,” followed by a pause pregnant with awe? I am not quite sure what it was. Appreciation? Something undefinable at the weight of what she shared. And Sky breaking the silence by saying “it’s where you became you.” And the quiet, full feeling that filled that little room for a few moments. After she shares the story again, on our walk, I say to her “I think about that story every time I walk by here.” And when I say this, I do not mean her story, exactly, but that moment. The sharing, the encounter. The relationality and connection between the three of us in that little room in the education library. And on that walk, her re-telling, our being-there made that moment become differently again. The story became different in the retelling, through being there through the presence of the space. On our walk, it led to other stories, resonated differently, became differently, then in the focus group. As I listen to more audio, there are more moments like this, where stories led to other stories unextracted in my analysis. In my hacking and cutting through my data to divide it into chunks and themes. These
stories, followed nomadically through text and audio and memory, create possibilities through not just their telling, but the particular configuration of the materialities of the encounter with other stories and materials, and memories and histories.

These pauses, these methodological tensions somehow seem more interesting to me than the “findings” – the sayings. I want to linger in the failings, the stutters, the ways that I am struggling to reconcile the neatly boxed and categorized themes with these encounters that pull me and beckon me to follow them down rabbit trails, glowing (MacLure, 2013). I want to linger with these moments and maybe not to reconcile them, but to keep them vibrant, have them resonate with multiplicity and contradiction and connection. I want to dwell in the messy spaces between my data, the unexpected connections that occur. I am wondering what this might do to this dissertation-as-document. Dissertation-as-artifact.

Even as I am thinking about following these trails as seeking theoretical faithfulness. Theoretically faithful, as faithful to my theory, as embodying and enacting my theory. But and also, I am thinking about the different phrasings of this, the other orientations of theoretically faithful. Theoretically, faithful. Faithful in theory, but where it falls apart in practice, in the doing, in the embodiment. Faithful until you realize that you have been unfaithful. Faithful until you learn otherwise, until that jolt of recognition happens, and you see that it was not the case. Un/faithful, as a relational becoming with the theories that guide me, to reading and being and doing with/in this project. Enacting nomadism methodologically, embodying the production of space and place as always already multiplicitous, under production, creating and recreating boundaries.
Figure 31: Visual Memo: Walking Interview with Sky. October 2017
14. DISRUPTIONS

In the last section, I mapped the slippages that occurred between the South and Alabama, and how those slippages produced and are productive of both. And we have just paused in our mapping to muse about the notion of becoming theoretically faithful. Theoretically, faithful. A process of seeking to remain faithful to theory, even as there are moments of disruption where suddenly, you realize that you were just faithful in theory. Faithful to theory, even as theory is always becoming, faithfulness never an achievable identity but a process. Faithful as I construct and navigate and negotiate theory in process. Seeking faithfulness, even as theory (and my understandings of theory) are fluid and shifting, a process and negotiation that is always becoming. Theoretically, faithful, a haecceity.

This navigation is an ever-expanding, happening, becoming, constructing process. Through being/becoming with theoretical faithfulness, there were moments that pulled and stuttered this process. Disruptions, moments where suddenly the smooth slippages of these discourses (from, for example, the South to Alabama) became jagged, visible. Moments where the smooth and uninterrupted machinery of place were disrupted and interrupted. During this study, the boulder became a materiality that produced multiple disruptions in configuration with other materialities. Significantly, it was not just the boulder, as an idea, or the boulder, as an object, but/and the boulder as an encounter, making possible a shookness (to quote Leo) that became possible through the configurations of materialities of idea-object-place. The boulder as
an encounter carried weight and stickiness in its materiality that produced disruptions and made visible\textsuperscript{1} other productions and configurations.

To understand how students navigate the socio-historical context of race on campus, I am interested in these disruptions for what they make possible, and how they make possible other configurations and encounters. I am interested in both in the narratives told by the students in the study about their navigations of race and place, as well as the disruptions that became possible through the methodology of this study, my process of seeking theoretical faithfulness. My entry point is a map created by Leo’s during our individual interview. This map (Figure 32, next page) includes the main library, the president’s mansion, and Denny Chimes, drawing a line between these structures which includes and intersects the boulder. The boulder, not included in Leo’s map, nevertheless resonates, threaded through his description of the map as well as this inquiry. His creation and description of the map leads to multiple disruptions in the telling/doing/embracing at that moment and beyond, providing a map to move outwards from.

\begin{quote}
I thought about the straight line between \\
the president’s mansion, \\
Denny Chimes, and [the main library]. \\
So, I was in a 101 class one time, \\
I was teaching assistant, \\
but I learned a lot about campus history, \\
and when I, when I first heard about \\
like there was a straight line, \\
and I was like, oh yeah, there actually is, \\
and that is kind of cool. \\
And at the same time just thinking about how it was laid out in such a very specific way \\
knowing that it was a military school in its past \\
and that made sense of how everything was arranged that way, \\
but also, it made me think of, you know being a military school, \\
I feel like that’s where we get a lot of our strict traditions, \\
and we’re like state order and don’t stray too far, \\
like we just need to be a straight line.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1} Here, when I say visible, I do not necessarily mean visible as in literally, the boulder was not there and then it was, but/and I do also mean that, in a way. I unpack this more later on.
Like that’s, like don’t make the line curvy, you know, let’s not you know shake it up, we’re just going to keep it orderly. (Leo)

As Leo described his map (Figure 32), he pointed again to the production of place through the layered and simultaneous history. Alabama’s history as a military school becomes visible through the layout of the campus, the straight lines connecting the power of the

Figure 32: Leo's Map. November 2017
president’s mansion to the knowledge of the main library. Leo described this straightness, this rigidity, as also coming to the fore in the traditions in the present. “we’re like state order and don’t stray too far like we just need to be a straight line.” This rigidity becomes important not just in its delineation of the current production of campus, but in what it silences, what it does not allow, the encounters it forecloses. There are admonitions in a straight line, as Leo quoted, “don’t stray too far” “don’t make the line curvy” “let’s not, you know, shake it up, we’re just going to keep it orderly.” Straight lines are reproduced not only by the architecture but by other paths and lines that are drawn across campus. Narratives of tradition and prestige. Clark reflected on this as she remembered spontaneously following a campus tour around with a friend,

We just kind of like went along with it.  
And went in like Bryant-Denny and stuff,  
just to see what they say about campus it was pretty funny

(Maureen) what did they say?  

(Clark) eh, just your run of the mill like history of the building,  
blah blah blah blah come to the University of Alabama  
(Maureen) yeah, what was like funny about it for you all as...  
(Clark) it is just like because we actually know the campus,  
and we like know  
and it's funny seeing like the reactions of the people who have never been  
or like just don't go to school here...  
of like Alabama because it would be so different  
Like I would I would take people,  
-- that's actually another place we should go is Bryce Lawn  
I lived there last year but yeah I would take them there,  
and I would give people real histories of places,  
like they never mention the slave quarters  
well, of course, they don't

There is a tension in Clark’s narrative between different knowings. The tour guides embody the straight line of the university, they make possible another line, pulling the students and families on the tour to the University of Alabama through the straight narrative they tell. “Blah blah blah come to the University of Alabama” embodying the straight line as tradition and prestige. This
line, enfolding and layering with the production of place and the South, pulls high-achieving, high-SES students from the west and northeast (Hutt et al., 2010). The tour guides, who lead tours down the same line drawn by Leo as representing the military history and rigidity of the university embody a particular history. The history of the tour is different than the history that Clark pointed to, the real history, which involves the slave quarters, “well, of course, they don’t.” “Of course,” because the slave cemetery disrupts the line of the South that the tour creates, making visible the unsaid but still present resonances of the South. The slippage mapped in the previous section. Clark suggested an alternative “like I would take people... [to] Bryce Lawn [residence hall] ... I lived there last year... and I would give people real histories of places like they never mention the slave quarters.” In Clark’s telling, her personal history of living in a dorm far removed from the center of campus, Bryce Lawn, connected to another location not mentioned on the sanctioned campus tours, the slave quarters located behind the president’s mansion.1 Similarly, Leo noted how the military line of campus forecloses, reproduces, smooths, and stops other narratives. As he continued to describe his map, he pointed to the president’s mansion as an example:

    and I feel like that’s still,  
    like our military background still comes through in a lot of different ways,  
    even thinking about like the different monuments on campus,  
    and the different people that we memorialize,  
    like we have a very strong support I guess of [...]  
    going with the grain,  
    and being with the status quo.  
    So, I felt like a straight line kind of represents that really well.

---
1 I wonder, too, how this moment becomes particularly possible through the method of the walking tour. Clark and I had this conversation at the center of Shelby Quad, to the far north of campus, a short walk from Bryce Lawn, and near to the slave cemetery. Clark remembered this moment because of other walks she had taken through that quad, cutting across it to visit her friends living in the dorms closer to the center of campus, to visit her friend who she had joined the campus tour with, who she had a conversation about the missing histories of campus. Of course they don’t mention the slave quarters echoed across time and space – a conversation had before, a statement said in other times, on other walks? Walking, then, made possible a zigzagging of memory, a nomadic movement across time and space connecting unexpected spaces and places.
And then I did the president’s mansion, well I wanted to first, I did arrows throughout that next, and it was my thinking about if someone was on a tour, where would they take them you know, what areas would they go through? And then kind of thinking like, what kind of questions might the people ask? or when they get to these sites, you know? what would they tell them you know? [...] and so then I wrote a speech bubble that said, “but where are the legends made?” And so that’s our slogan of course, where legends are made, [...] you know where do we put emphasis on? who are our legends?

Through the creation and narration of his map, Leo disrupted the clean and linear narratives of the university line, drawing curving lines and speech bubbles to represent multiple interruptions of the narrative. What questions would they ask? Where would I take them differently? This line of thought leads Leo to remember a time when he embodied this disruption, accompanying a class of first-year students to the president’s mansion for a tour:

 [...] at the end of the line, I have the president’s mansion, and I still going on with the tour with the arrows they eventually come to the president’s mansion because they have to show that. and then a bubble says, “what’s on the back?” And that’s referring to like the back of the notecard, but also, at the back of the president’s mansion, because they have the slave quarters back there.

---

2 Clean lines and clean narratives enfold and overlap with the straight lines and straight narratives of the university. We clean up to straighten out, make lines easier to follow, to digest, to pull. Simplify, clean, straighten. And with this I am thinking of multiple levels/layers/configurations of cleaning and straightening. Methodological cleaning, the choices I made in presenting/representing the audio of my conversations with students throughout this document, cleaning up straightening up to make it more digestible, palatable. Or practices of removing “outliers” from qualitative data, data that does not fit. Methodological straightening, making it fit. I am thinking, through this project about how I am both resisting making it fit, methodologically. I am leaving lines and paths unfollowed, untied, open to messiness or other entry points, other readings, (becoming theoretically faithful, I am here and I am part of it, even as I am making sense of it) while also the project of producing this document-as-dissertation is one of methodological cleaning and straightening. Creating paths and lines through the study for you to follow. So, I am thinking about how I am doing both/and – and there are times when I am doing one more than the other, times when the document is messy, the guide posts few and far between, the path just a slight indent in the leaves. And times when it is marked heavily, spray paint lines and notches on trunks, a path hacked and cleared through the thicket for us to walk abreast. Both/and.
[and] I remember very vividly taking my BCE class on a tour there with
and we had a Capstone woman, of course, do it and I made it a point to say,
“Hey! Can we go out to the backside?”
and she was like “s.u.u.u.ure....”
And then made it a point to say,
“what is that building over there?”
and she said
“oh that’s where we house the flowers, it’s an um, it’s an I think a flower
arrangement area, or it’s something it’s something about flowers” [...]
and I said:
“Oh, but no, but like what was it before?
I get that now it’s a flower thing, but what was it?”
and she didn’t say, she was like
“oh it’s just a flower thing, that’s what it’s always been.” and—

(Maureen) what did you do?

(Leo) I just let it I mean, I obviously, I know the politics of this campus,
I know, I know people who are capstone men and women,
I knew at that point when I asked again,
I knew she was going to stick to that as the narrative of it.
but I made sure after the tour when I was with my class to point out,
“Okay class, you saw me ask about this building,
and you saw her answer, and while it [may] very well be this now,
[a place to store the flowers],
we know historically it was also something different,
it was the quarters for slaves,
it is a very important historical marker
that most people don’t even have an idea about”
but I feel like in those moments, where if someone’s directly asking you and to feel like
you still have to cover it up, and she might not have known but either way I think there’s
been enough talk about things to kind of understand there might be more to the story than
what it is.
and that kind of goes along with my thought bubble of “what’s on the back?”
So, this is the pretty campus we have outlined,
but like what’s on the other side of it,
what’s the part that you’re not seeing right then?

As Leo described the encounter with the slave quarters behind the president’s mansion,
multiple disruptions occur. The disruption of the campus tour, leading the guide off the path
prescribed by the university, the disruption in the narrative of campus for the students in the
class. “What was it before?” Leo asked, persistently troubling the narrative produced by the
institution. Then, later, his follow up with his class, noting “you saw me ask about this building... we know historically it was something different, it was the quarters for slaves.” His follow up becomes a collusion, a marking of multiple disruptions, rippling out and producing future possibilities. This moment maps on to other encounters, moments of recognition where other students realized or became aware of the history of campus as materialized in a marker or monument. Leo’s “we” becomes conspiratorial, branching out to make possible different engagements with campus, different navigations and relations.

This conspiratorial resistance becomes in other ways as well. For example, earlier, we moved through the perceptions that students had of campus before arriving, mapping how these perceptions mattered in material ways for student’s navigations of campus – how they talked, where they went, their emotional and affective engagement with the place of campus. Yet, even as many students noted a general awareness of the history of place as informing these perceptions (histories which slipped between the specific locality of The University of Alabama and the broader histories of the South and histories of race and White supremacy in the country), they often noted that they did not think about the granular and day to day effects of that history before arriving on campus. More specifically, even as some students described an awareness of the history of the campus and its impact and influence on their experience, there was a general perception that those histories were “hidden” or had to be “sought out” once on campus:

*I think unless you seek the information you're not going to find the information. You would never know. I would ask questions when I heard people say, "oh, this is a PWI campus"] and I was like, “I don't understand, what are you talking about, what does that term mean?” and they'd be like, ‘well it's not really a POC [people of Color] campus.” [...] I still don't know enough, I'm still very ignorant to it.*
I just learn by reading a lot, and then when I first came here I saw there was a lecture slash talk congregation at one of the churches that spoke about the freedom riders, so I went to that. And I'd like google things, [...] I'll google stuff to find out what they're talking about [...] so I suppose I just seek it out

(Sky)

I think it's a matter of telling stories – like they had Foster come back and she was like celebrated at Foster Auditorium, like that's some pretty cool stuff. And, I don't know, I wouldn't mind if they did more with that. Like you know, they do the [alternative] tours and everything, but I still feel like there's a lot that students don't know. Depending on the classes that you take and the professors that teach you about the university.

(Kate)

There is a contradictory catch in these stories, as students both note the relevance and importance of these histories for how they understand campus, but also that finding out about the specific history takes either a personal interest (googling it, attending particular events) or registering for particular classes or taking particular professors. This discourse has implications, in that the perception that a student has to seek out the (returning to Clark) “real” history of the campus oneself, or only finds out about it through particular classes or particular events produces that knowledge as secret, as illicit. These narratives then stand counter to the narratives of the university, even as these histories are not hidden in that they are not explicitly banned or forbidden to students. However, we might think about how they are produced as invisible, and not only how they are produced as invisible, but for whom.

Furthermore, we might pause with Kate’s reflection. The implications of this narrative, the inaccuracies of what Kate described as “pretty cool stuff.” Because although Autherine Lucy Foster did come back to campus in the year that Kate referenced, Foster Auditorium was in truth named for Richard Clarke Foster, president of the University from 1937 to 1941. In this telling, faithfulness becomes in other ways. Even as this fact is not “true,” this telling is faithful to
Kate’s understanding. To whom am I faithful, and what does this faithfulness do? The truth of the history is still hidden, in Kate’s telling, even as has become visible in other ways. What would it have done at that moment, to intervene, to interrupt, to correct? Am I interested in the truth or the tellings? When does the telling become truth? When do (or do these) tellings cause harm, reassert racial trauma, reaffirming white supremacy? And yet, I wonder about the fantastical narrative – the leap of imagination and the suspension of reality, the pause in the machinery of the everyday, that it takes for Kate to believe this statement. For us to believe it along with her. What does it do to imagine Foster Auditorium, site of the stand in the schoolhouse door, a marker of racial trauma, as named (as always named) after Autherine Lucy Foster? Foster, the first woman to attend the University of Alabama in 1956, seven years before the stand in the schoolhouse door, seven years before James Hood and Vivian Malone would be barred entrance to a building named after her. This narrative, while factually inaccurate, is a creative zigzagging through time and space that makes possible a reimagining of spatial justice, a retelling that works a both/and – forgetting to forget the injustices of space and materials, the trauma of the space, at the same time as we imagine how it might be otherwise. To be clear, I am not advocating for the telling of inaccuracies, or erasing, painting over the truths of space, I do not follow this narrative to hide truths. Instead, I simply invite you to imagine with Kate, what it might mean to hold this and other truths in tension. I am wondering this moment in relation to the questions that plague this work, the questions of what to do, how to intervene in spatial narratives, to not forget our histories even as we imagine our futures differently. How this imagining might not be the answer, but a creative line of thought that might help us as we imagine spaces differently.
The previous section mapped how material-discursive narratives of the South and of the University of Alabama slipped and congealed with each other, simultaneously becoming part of the narrative told by the university. In these slippages, some narratives (tradition, prestige, antebellum glamour) were picked up and used intentionally by the university for recruitment and admissions, at the same time as other narratives (slavery, race, and racism) were resisted, denied, or made invisible. Clark and Leo’s stories of interacting with the campus tours and the Capstone men and women who lead them map how these narratives are disrupted, resisted, remade, and reproduced in multiple ways. There are the local disruptions of joining up, linking in, telling other stories, drawing new lines. Clark imagined how she would give the tour differently, connecting to her lived experience in a dorm room far removed from the center of campus, and Leo, who pulled his class aside after going on the tour to say, “we know it was something else” – a moment of conspiratorial resistance. These moments are important, as understanding the production and navigations of place is not simply about mapping one-way disruptions of White supremacy and racism on campus, but considering the multiple and simultaneous ways these narratives disrupt and what their disruption (or reproduction) does.

To explore this, the following section moves from small, local moments and encounters in place to swirl out beyond the boundaries of campus, interacting with the national news media and culture, moments such as the 2016 U.S. presidential election that become felt and encountered in the local productions of place. Mapping through these encounters, moments that I describe as disruptions, my goal is to move beyond simply pointing to these encounters as “disruptions” in the production of place mapped previously, but to ask what these encounters as disruptions produce, what they make possible, and for whom. I do this even as I feel as though I should be troubling even the notion of disruption itself – disruption, in this instance is a flawed
word as it connotes a becoming different, a ripple or shift in the narrative, when, in fact, many of
the moments that I talk about in this section are reaffirmations. We might rather consider
disruptions as moments of pause, encounters that made visible the workings and productions of
place in particular ways.
15. STILL MORE MAPS

I was making maps. Sitting on the floor of my living room, with tracing paper and vellum and markers and piles and piles of transcripts. Tracing over the lines and marks of a map of campus, cutting out the words that students used in their descriptions of campus, the stories they told, tracing over the lines of roads and labeling and noting buildings. These maps around me, I started drawing paths and lines through them. Paths walked by students and me, on our guided walks, the path followed by the “alternative tour” led by a History professor\(^1\), which told the history of slavery on campus, and I wanted to draw the path followed by campus tour guides for prospective students. Clicking around on the university website I stumbled on tour.ua.edu, an interactive map which has multiple filters to explore campus virtually (Figure 32). In addition to pin drops under various categories such as student life, admissions, athletics, and points of interest, there are two click-through-able “tour” options for a Commemorative Tree Tour, and a tour of Campus Historical Markers, which invites users to “enjoy a visual tour if campus and

---

\(^1\) Dr. Hilary Green
historical markers located across our beautiful expanse of property.” The historical marker tour starts with the University Club, an antebellum mansion in downtown Tuscaloosa donated to the university in 1944 and continues down the main street (University Boulevard) and across campus, showing pictures of each historical marker or plaque without commentary.

Moving along this map, you zigzag between a commemorative marker for the Delta Kappa Epsilon house and Morgan Hall, the newly dedicated Atherine Lucy Foster Monument, a marker dedicating the 175th anniversary of the university’s founding in 2006, a plaque dedicated in 2004 commemorating the stand in the schoolhouse door, and the “Civil War memorial,” or boulder (Figure 33). This map makes possible multiple readings, but also is significant for the readings it forecloses. We might ask of the map, where and for who are markers dedicated? Who

Figure 33: Screenshot of Campus Map: Historical Markers from tour.ua.edu. Retrieved December 18th, 2018
is remembered, and when were they remembered? What markers are not included? What rises to the level of “history” and what structures make that possible? Who decides what is history and how it is marked?

For example, the 2006 apology marker from the faculty senate marking the slave cemetery behind the biology building is not included on this map. Likewise, the slave quarters located behind the president’s mansion are not marked.

For example, Greek organization markers only commemorate the founding of historically White fraternities and sororities (IFC and Panhellenic), and none of National Pan-Hellenic Council, despite eight of the nine NPHC councils existing on campus and being “an integral part of the UA community since 1974” (https://ofsl.sa.ua.edu/greek-governing-councils/national-pan-hellenic-council/).

**Figure 34:** Screenshots of Markers on campus. From left to right: Delta Kappa Epsilon Fraternity House, Morgan Hall (home of the English department), Atherine Lucy Foster Marker, Founding dedication marker.
Furthermore, I might put this map in relation to another map of markers and sites created by Dr. Hilary Green, the “Hallowed Grounds Tour” which exists as a physical walking tour (referred to by many on campus as the “alternative campus tour,” but also a virtual tour on her website: http://hgreen.people.ua.edu/walking-tours.html On this tour, which Dr. Green titles “Hallowed Grounds: Race, Slavery, and The University of Alabama,” markers, buildings, sites, and monuments are put in relation to context and history. For example, the plaque for Morgan Hall is shown, along with the following text, followed by a picture (Figure 34) from inside the building:

Prior to the construction of the current building, a two-story brick kitchen that prepared food for the Campus Dining Hall was located here. Enslaved men and women prepared

*Figure 35: Cassandra, 1967, Ben Smith (American, b. 1941) Wood Block Print on Paper.*
the food. Enslaved men, women, and children carried buckets of water to the building and then moved food to the dining hall.

John Tyler Morgan, the building namesake, was a former Confederate general who worked to extend Jim Crow segregation across the nation, advocated for the forced African American migration, and rose to leadership in the Montgomery chapter of the Ku Klux Klan.

Morgan's portrait hung in the foyer until late Fall 2015. Students, faculty, staff, and visitors are now greeted by a piece of art from the university's Paul R. Jones Collection of American Art.

"Cassandra" by Benjamin Smith invites individuals to reflect on Morgan's legacy, slavery, and race relations more broadly. (Green, n.d)

Through Green’s telling, history, place, markers, buildings, and materialities are put in relation, as opposed to being presented as one congruous, neutral, or homogenous narrative. Considering the university monument tour and Green’s in relation makes visible the ways in which the University is produced as “historical” in various ways, what that means, and for whom.⁴

---

⁴ We might also take up the language of the “alternative tour” marking Green’s tours, a delineation that communicates that this is the “alternate” e.g. “optional” e.g. “not-sanctioned” history of campus. That the tour that explicitly takes up slavery and race on campus is denoted as “optional” does something to the history of campus and how that history is taken up and perceived – e.g. that history then becomes optional. It becomes optional (for some) to interact with that history.
16. FOR WHOM

Returning to the students, this question of “for whom” produced through considering the two virtual tours of campus history was echoed by Sky. In the following narrative, she remembers being confused during a class discussion when her Black classmates resisted her advocating for everyone to speak in Ebonics or African American Vernacular English (AAVE):

And I remember like all of the African American girls in the group were like, “you don’t understand you don’t understand.”
And I was like no, “I understand, I do understand.”
But I still didn’t really understand, because I’ve always known that I’m privileged […] And you know I know that, but I never realized to the extent that I was and I don’t think I really realized it until [my professor’s] class and [a campus sponsored] talk on segregation last year.
(Sky)

The cadence of “you don’t understand, you don’t understand... I understand I do understand... but I still didn’t really understand” maps the disconnect between the ways that history is experienced and negotiated between different students. The realities and embodiments of those realizations of that history become differently. Likewise, Sky’s narrative maps back to the process of finding out about these histories, an active process of becoming-visible through particular means and avenues – professors, talks dedicated specifically to the topic of race or segregation. The spaces that you are in matter to learn about a history that is hidden. Your identity matters, the subjectivities you map from matters to learn about the history that is hidden. You are always already engaging with places, joining up and linking into narratives and stories of place, becoming part of and with them, even as you are not always aware of all the ways that
place has become before. The always already production of place matters when students join into the narratives of campus with perceptions and conceptions of campus as raced and racist, as a space with a specific history.

The specificity of the history, and for whom it becomes visible to is reiterated by Annaliese as she remembers going on Green’s tour with her class:

> And it was just it's incredible, it's incredibly beautiful to see that and you go by the slave quarters or the mansion, or you go by Nott Hall, or you go by [...] the cemetery outside the bio building. And it's just it's incredibly moving. And I when I see that I I kind of reflect on it. But, someone else who doesn't understand, or either doesn't understand, doesn't care or doesn't know. they wouldn't, it wouldn't be as important to them. There are different types of history that would be important to different types of people. (Annaliese)

In Annaliese’s telling, encountering the monument is described as “incredible” and “moving,” making possible a “kind of reflect[ion].” Simultaneously embedded in this telling is also the assumption that this same encounter would not produce the same response from other students. “Someone else who doesn’t understand, or either doesn’t understand, doesn’t care, or doesn’t know... it wouldn’t be as important to them.” Annaliese maps from her embedded and embodied location of the configuration of her subjectivities. As a student of color, as a woman, as someone who grew up in Alabama, these subjectivities and relations as part of the configuration of place produce a different mattering, an orientation to the histories of the slave quarters and the mansion and the cemetery that is moving, that produces a reflection. Even as this same configuration of materialities might be encountered or negotiated differently by other subjectivities, in other configurations.
Indeed, Annaliese noted, the tour where she encountered the cemetery, slave quarters, and mansion had been part of a class that was assigned when the professor had been out sick. This layers with the “*it wouldn’t be as important to them*” as she noted that she and a friend took themselves on a self-guided tour, “*we had to do it by ourselves because our tour guide was sick that day, so a lot of people just didn’t go.*” The positioning of the tour as an alternative or optional encounter makes possible its avoidance by students. The histories of slavery and race, then, are both simultaneously visible (the students in that class *knew* of the tour, as an assignment for the class), but the intricacies of the tour itself, the content and affects of the tour remain unencountered. The lack of encounter then becomes productive of a different configuration, the possibility of opting out of knowing. During this project, these different knowings become visible in the paths mapped through walking tours taken with students, the ways that materialities pulled at some students and not others, the shifting magnetism of configurations in relation to the subjectivities and materialities we encountered.

The histories told on the tour of the slave cemetery, the monument, the slave quarters, become visible to the students who take the tour, at the same time as they remain invisible to those who have not taken the tour. This invisibility is not literal invisibility in that those materialities or markers are not there for the students that did not take the tour, but rather, that the way they operate in configuration becomes differently possible. This might operate as invisibility – in that they are skipped over, unremarked upon, unnoticed, blurred in with the landscape, or it might work also as a pull in a different way, working in configuration with other narratives. For example, following Annaliese’s telling, another student in the focus group, Mary, brought up her own encounter of becoming aware of the Foster Memorial, a clocktower and plaza area dedicated to Vivian Malone and James Hood, the first Black students to enroll at the
University, and who were barred entry to register for classes by student protestors and the governor of the state of Alabama at the time, George Wallace. The site of the Foster Memorial is the location where Wallace physically stood in front of Malone and Hood, declaring “segregation now, segregation forever” as National Guard soldiers moved him aside, and escorted Hood and Malone into Foster Auditorium to register for classes. Mary remembers reading the plaque one day,

(Annaliese) like I didn't know any of this existed.
I would never have known this existed unless I had taken that class

(Vivian) think about how many people go by those

(Mary) Actually, tagging on that, like I didn't think about it and then one day I passed a plaque that was dedicated to the first African American

(Vivian) Vivian Malone

(Mary) Yeah, who came here, and she was shunned.
And then after a while then she came back she was rewarded.¹
And it just kind of hit me that like I look around me,
and when I see someone of different colors,
it doesn't even register.
It's like oh, another person they’re probably on their way to class,
and things like that and all the sudden it does hit me.
Where it's like there was a time where those things were extremely important
where you know these places that were sacred were sacred only to you know a select few people.
And I just perhaps I'm rambling,
but I don't know it kind of hit me too how important that is.
You know, for everybody to realize that regardless of who you are and regardless
of what you look like,
you know,
we're all accepted.
And it didn’t even hit me until I read a plaque that said someone had been hated just because you know, how much melanin they have in their skin.

¹ Again, Mary’s telling here is factually inaccurate in myriad ways. Vivian Malone was symbolically barred entrance on June 11, 1963 by Governor George Wallace along with James Hood, but remained enrolled, and in 1965 was the University of Alabama’s first black graduate when she graduated with her Bachelor of Arts in business management. We might also wonder (as I do on following pages) the factual inaccuracies of the carte blanche “she was rewarded” (in what ways, by whom, what did this reward [graduating with a college degree] cost psychically, emotionally, physically?) and “we are all accepted.”
You know.
[10-second pause]

In the focus group, the pause feels longer than ten seconds, punctuated only by the creaking of chairs and pens, uncomfortable shifting in seats by myself and the other three members of the focus group. Mary’s telling becomes uncomfortable not because she says something overtly offensive, but because of how it grates up against the telling by Annaliese moments before. The creaking of chairs, the uncomfortable silence that followed is uncomfortable because, in relation to other stories shared, this narrative that “we’re all accepted” becomes absurd. Mary’s voice, too, falters, as though there is a wrongness in her telling that she cannot quite place.

The wrongness of Mary’s telling reverberates as though this was a statement said before, in another place where it felt right, it flowed along with other stories told. However, “we’re all accepted” at this moment goes against the flow, comes up against Annaliese saying, “comments were made by my family asking why would you go here,” “it was thrown in my face” “butterfly effect, I would not have been here.” In the particular configuration of materialities and narratives of the focus group, the contradictions of this colorblind narrative “we’re all accepted” “[skin color] doesn’t even register” no longer fit. The configuration of Mary and Annaliese’s stories and the gaps and flows between them make possible a series of questions that trouble Mary’s experience: Who is the “we” that is all accepted, and who is doing the accepting?

The questions that become possible in the configuration of Mary and Annaliese’s stories point to other doings and becomings of materialities. When Leo or Jon and I approached the boulder, we discussed how its existence as a monument dedicated by the Daughters of the Confederacy fifty years after the end of the Civil War is a continuation of the production of inequity on campus. Just because the boulder is seen does not mean it is recognized as mattering in the narratives of race and belonging on campus. However, with Leo and Jon, the encounters
with the boulder make visible a complicated configuration of narratives – the narrative of the lost cause: brave young boys sacrificing their life for the glory of their state and nation; of tradition and honor: co-opted by the university for recruitment; and the reproduction of racism: the boulder commemorates a war fought for the purpose of maintaining racial inequities and oppression.

In configuration with Jon and Leo, the existence of the boulder on campus becomes absurd, and this absurdity becomes productive. The boulder resonates with the present because of its absurdity, it commemorates the young boys who fought off a “veteran federal invading force” as we walk along a pathway marked by flags lauding the out of state enrollment of the university, twenty-five percent of which are from states identified as “the enemy” in the plaque (OIRA, 2017). The boulder in this configuration becomes both absurd and it does not fit, it is a relic, it becomes obsolete. Likewise, in this configuration, the Foster-Hood Memorial that Mary remembers encountering becomes a relic, commemorating what once-was. “And it didn't even hit me until I read a plaque that said someone had been hated just because you know, how much melanin they have in their skin.” These monuments pause the production of time and space, locating the particular moment/encounter/experience in another space and time, somewhere/sometime else.

The pausing of time and space spurred by the monument produces racism as happening in some other time, some place that has moved on and is no longer recognizable in the present. Through this pausing, in this configuration, the monuments become commemorations of past happenings. As a past happening, then, it becomes unimaginable that today, Kay Ivey\(^2\) could stand on the steps of a building on campus and bar entry to students because of the color of their

---

\(^2\) The governor of Alabama at the time of this dissertation writing.
skin. So, therefore, a slippage becomes possible, the assumption that if that could not occur, then racism must not exist on campus. Discrimination must not exist. The narrative is interrupted by the material, even as the material and the narrative are not separate. This narrative becomes believable through the material-discursive encounter with the monument, even as in the focus groups there are signs that we do not believe it [chairs creaking, a muffled cough, uncomfortably looking around the room]. The narrative that we have moved on, that racism no longer exists on campus becomes sayable, even as just three years before students had very publicly been barred access to institutions on campus because of their skin color (Crain & Ford, 2013). Even as, three months after this focus group, a student would record a video with repeated racial slurs posted on a public social media forum and say “I don't care if it's Martin Luther King Day. I'm in the South now (expletive) so everybody can (expletive) off. I'm from New Jersey so I can say (n-word) as much as I want³” (Robinson, 2018). Even as, shortly after this focus group, I would march on campus with other faculty, students, and staff during lunch, in protest of a national ban on immigration from predominately Muslim countries, a piece of legislation that was discriminatory on axis of race, religion, and country of origin (Enoch, 2017; Liptak & Shear, 2018). So, the monuments simultaneously disrupt and reproduce, marking the challenges of exploring the production and navigations of race on campus.

Yet, as the discrepancy between Annaliese’s and Mary’s stories illustrate, there are vastly asymmetrical starting locations that these maps are drawn from. The monuments are not in themselves a disruption, but only become a disruption because of the particular configuration of materialities, including the bodies and experiences of the students that encounter them. These moments of recognition happen in particular configurations of space and time. The boulder as a

---

³ mapping back to Annaliese’s reflection about Harley Barber earlier.
moment of recognition comes in and out of view from the specificity of the configuration of place: student’s orientation to campus before arriving, the courses they take, the organizations they become involved with. We might imagine a student for whom the boulder never becomes visible, never matters in their navigations of campus, even as it exists in their geography of campus, even as they walk by it hundreds of times. For this reason, in the following section, I turn to student’s discussions of the Machine, an organization that has come in and out of view until this point in this project. The Machine, a voting bloc of “old row” fraternities and sororities, was a materiality that was pointed to during focus groups and individual interviews as mattering in the production of place. For example, Clark described it as “the most invisible successful story on this campus,” or Elizabeth (who was in a Panhellenic sorority at the time of the study), “the Machine is crazy like if you ask some ‘oh, have you heard of our secret society that controls everything?’ (laughter from the rest of the group).” In the following section, then, I look at how the Machine, an organization that was widely recognized by the majority of students on campus as influencing the production of place and being connected to race and persistent campus inequities, is produced and negotiated.

4 Researching the meaning of “old row” for this footnote took me down a rabbit hole of comments and posts on Greekrank.com, a website dedicated to debating, discussing, and establishing the rank of fraternities and sororities on individual campuses. A thread on the site asks about what “old row” means. A response which received 34 upvotes (the most of any reply although the thread has been viewed upwards of 15,000 times, stated “It absolutely also pertains to sororities. It started with six original fraternities that were on "Old fraternity Row" before they started building houses up Jefferson. Those six fraternities (SN, SAE, KA, PGD, PDT, DKE) picked their six favorite sororities to join them in their annual "Old Row" party and become the sorority component of the Old Row group. The Old Row sororities are: KD, XO, KKG, DDD, AGD and AXO. PM was extended a sympathy invitation to join after the Machine did them wrong back in the 90s, but most do not consider PM full-fledged embers of Old Row.” (notquite, 2017). The comment thread then devolves into a discussion of the Machine, who is a member, and the attack on the PM (Phi Mu) sorority member in the 1990s who went against the voting bloc during an SGA election. Additionally, the users of GreekRank point to a video about the Machine on youtube by a “GovWallace” (GovWallace, 2016).
Before delving into the ways that students’ negotiated the Machine on campus and the ways that this produced The University of Alabama, I want to take a brief pause to give some context both about why this became particularly relevant during the time of this study. As has been alluded to in other sections, the Machine is a voting bloc of “old row” fraternities and sororities on campus, also known as Theta Nu Epsilon. Fraternities and sororities in the Machine elect or choose members of their organizations as “Machine representatives” and together, they make decisions such as who to support for homecoming queen, and SGA president.\(^1\) The Machine, then, as a conglomeration of “old row” fraternities and sororities – organizations that until recently, were entirely segregated by race, becomes productive of White supremacy on campus, even as its produced and made possible by White supremacist processes. In other words, the Machine exists because of White supremacy – founded from a desire to consolidate power on campus among the elite and wealthy and White organizations.

At the same time, the Machine reproduces White supremacy on campus, through its historical backing of White, male candidates in student government, and subsequent intimidation of candidates of color, through its tight control of student socialization (e.g. determining which

---

\(^1\) These are the most widely known/accepted decisions made by the Machine, but was this a dissertation on this organization specifically, other practices and processes produced or productive of the Machine might become visible: block seating for football games, distribution of funds for student organizations, local political moves and elections. This might spiral out further, considering that Machine fraternities and sororities frequently “swap” with each other, and that Machine affiliated organizations frequently recruit from wealthy Southern families, patterns of power and privilege in the state reproduce through the processes of the Machine.
fraternities and sororities can socialize), and through the control of student organization funding. Through these reproductions of White supremacy, there is slippage, like that mapped in an earlier section between the South and The University of Alabama. There is a slippage between the Machine and White supremacy, a slippage between fraternity and sorority life and the Machine, slippage between the Machine and the University of Alabama. The Machine comes to stand in for White supremacy on campus and becomes entwined with the production of the place of the University of Alabama.

Specifically, the Machine becomes imbricated, or sticky1 to the place of campus in particular and specific ways. One goal of this project is to explore the question of belongingness from a focus on processes and systems, the ways that spaces and places are produced and reproduced as racist, and this specific context of the Machine becomes a sticky process, a materiality that matters in the configuration of race and the place of the University of Alabama, and particularly in the configuration of space and time that I was conducting this study. The Machine, like the boulder, pulled and stuck to other stories, and at the same time was a granular, specific production of the place of The University of Alabama.2 The Machine became something that stood in for racism and White supremacy for some students, something to point to. Racism as located in the Machine, even as by pointing at it (because it was not a physical presence) it

---

1 I am thinking about sticky as shifting in scales and temporalities. Stickiness as a material-discursive affect that congeals, pulling you toward it, pushing away. Sticky as the tackiness on the bottom of your shoe as you walk, a residue that doesn’t fade. Sticky as the small bit in your shoe that continues to worry at your foot and that you cannot shake out. Sticky becomes difficult to parse out in its specificity, through the congealing of forces and flows into a deceptively static congealing, or through its the elusive persistence.

2 Even as during the fall of generating data for this project, I visited a very small liberal arts college in Kentucky to lead a workshop on conflict and dialogue, and after spending two days with the students, that the Machine existed on their campus too – by another name, but in parallel ways, producing parallel effects (elections, sorority integration/segregation, homecoming queen elections, local elections). The Machine is specific to The University of Alabama, but what produces it and how it is produced by the configuration of local and global spaces and places is not singular. I am thinking of Annaliese’s reflection: “yeah there's history of Alabama, but there's also the history of Auburn and there's also the history of every other school in this country.”
slipped and shifted. By pointing at the Machine, it became hard to locate, it became less real. In the following section, I start with student’s recollections of their first memories of becoming aware of the Machine and then move outward to map how the Machine as a particular process and configuration interacts with and matters differently in student’s navigations of place.

The Machine matters in how students navigate campus, and the production of race and racism on campus, even as it is not an object that can be photographed or captured. Instead, the Machine is produced as a materiality through a conglomeration of forces and symbols and encounters including student government and homecoming queen elections, the ubiquitous uniform of sorority women, newspaper articles, and university policies. The Machine acts with agency differently than the boulder, even as it folds into the narrative of the South and the slippages between racism, the South, and the University of Alabama. The Machine cannot be nailed down like the boulder, and yet, it can be pointed to. As hooks (2013) noted, “one of the awesome aspects of white supremacist logic has been its fluidity, its ability to adjust and change according to need and circumstance” (p. 5). Following around the Machine and how students interact with it, how they resist, reproduce, ignore, or move against the Machine begins to move us towards how the place of campus is shifted, resisted, and remade broadly. In addition, mapping how the Machine shifts between a secret and not a secret, how it falls apart and reforms, how it exists on the periphery, begins to illustrate why lists of best practices or things to improve remain unsuccessful in intervening in White supremacy.

---

5 The uniform (an oversized t-shirt, usually with Greek letters, and running shorts or leggings, with tennis shoes) was something that came up multiple times in focus groups as I asked students to “draw, write, or visually describe the place of campus” – indeed, three of the thirteen students drew women with oversized shirts on their collaged maps of campus, and several others talked about the “pressure to conform” or the pervasiveness of money and status and image on campus.
Like the boulder, students remembered specific moments of “recognizing” the Machine, moments where it became visible to them. Again, these recognitions did not happen through official campus channels – campus tours, university websites, or university statements. Instead, students point to SGA elections “it was a huge deal” or professors who “went off”, or newspaper articles.

I think I found out about it around SGA elections my freshman year. I was just kind of out of tune because my freshman year was when Elliot was [elected] and he was like the first non-Machine candidate in like forever and that was a huge deal and ever since then, I've just known about it.
(Kate)

I learned about the Machine in Women Studies. [My instructor] [...] went off on the Machine one day just told us like everything about it. And we were like “What! Oh my gosh!” We were just like these freshmen. We were just like, “Oh my god, the Machine! Oh, that's evil.” But yeah that's definitely where I-I had definitely heard of the Machine before, because I remember freshman year, the Crimson White came out with some article about the Machine. I think that was the first mention of the Machine that I had heard, but then it got elaborated on in Women's Studies
(Clark)

The specific configuration of the space and time of this study mattered in how students negotiated and interacted with the Machine, and how it affected their negotiations and belonging. Kate and Clark both point to specific encounters where the Machine became a talked-about-materiality on campus, where it became sticky, connecting to other campus events. For example, Kate situates the election of Elliot Spillers as the first non-Machine backed candidate since the 1970s, an event which followed a semester of protests and activism on campus following a 2013 student newspaper article that was picked up by national news organizations (Crain & Ford,
This article detailed a systemic, pervasive, and insidious history of barring students of color from Panhellenic sororities, a system that was produced through a configuration of alumni, University policies, the South, and current and prospective students. This article and the following protests, conversations, and interventions on campus produced the Machine as sticky in relation to other materialities, sticking to the production of place. In other words, the Machine shifted from being perceived as a secret and insidious organization that controlled student governance on campus, rippling out, pulling strings to influence local and state governance, to a no less insidious but no longer secret organization.

Five years before writing this dissertation, I had been part of the protests on campus where students organized in response to the article in the student newspaper. These protests included a symbolic walk from the steps of Gorgas (the main library) to the administration building (a walk following the “straight line” of the university that Leo mapped in his individual interview). This protest sparked a series of other events that kept the Machine in the consciousness of the campus, connected to the reproduction of place. This stickiness of the Machine, the way it shifted from “a secret” to “not a secret” mattered in the ways that students negotiated campus, reorienting the configurations of campus in particular and specific ways. For example, Leo reflected on Jared Hunter’s campaign, where Jared, a Black man, claimed Machine backing during his campaign:

*the Machine like being*
*the best worst-kept secret since 1960-whatever.*
*Definitely, since I’ve been here and seen people just outright name and say like:*
*“yeah, my fraternity or my sorority is Machine-affiliated,”*
*or I mean outright having our now SGA president*
*like blatantly address it.*
*And say like*
*“yeah I was Machine-backed” or*
*“I am Machine-backed”*
and you know I'm not going to denounce that either so that in itself is a huge change of. and I mean it has been happening forever you know, but it's not a secret anymore and honestly, I’d say it never really has been a secret. Just do you talk about it? and now we're to the point where we actually talk about it. (Leo)

The production of the Machine from “a secret” to “not a secret” that Leo maps are fluid and shifting in configuration with other encounters and happenings. Leo maps a shift over time from “the best worst-kept secret” to “it’s not a secret anymore” – even as he acknowledges that “it never really has been a secret.” These configurations are shifting in simultaneity, pivoting around the axis of encounters. The Machine as an agentic conglomeration of power sticking to particular fraternities and sororities was never really a secret, but now it is talked about – students encounter it differently, it is now “not a secret” in that it is talked about casually and matter-of-factly in newspapers and SGA elections and debates, named by students who casually mention “yeah, my sorority is Machine affiliated.” When before it was still “not a secret,” but it mattered and became different in configuration with the place of campus.

Specifically, the movement of the Machine from “a secret” to “not a secret” produces the Machine as something that students can come up against, resist, and disrupt. It becomes part of the university in an inescapable way, visible and encounterable in ways that the boulder is not. Students cannot walk by the Machine (even as they can pretend it does not exist), the Machine becomes as “not a secret” part of the fabric of the university. Something that is “not a secret” can be resisted (such as through the candidacy of Lillian Roth, Gene Fulmer, and others), written against, debated against, even as it continues to have power and agency in the production of the institution. Leo describes this tension between resistance and the (re)production of power, and he reflects:
(Maureen) he wrote an article in the Crimson White, right?

(Leo) A full article and even discussed it at the debates, and yet he was still elected too. [and] at that moment so many people had so much hope that maybe this is a turning point to where you know, he's blatantly saying this. And people know what the Machine represents, maybe people won't elect him because of this. But it kind of was a slap in the face when he was still elected with such a huge margin, because it was like even at this moment when we feel super hopeful, and like trying to change the tides, it just shows you how much power really is behind that. I mean honestly, I don't really care too much about SGA presidents, and like what do they really do? Like you know it's a thing that they can make change on our campus, but I don't really think in my experience I've ever seen an SGA president make a huge change on campus that affects me you know? But it's important though, kind of like we were saying, it's a title but it's the act of electing someone. Especially who openly says “I am Machine” that that's what I think is the bigger deal not like who is the president you know?

Through the act of claiming “I am Machine” by an SGA candidate, the Machine becomes visible, it becomes a materiality that sticks to other spaces, that must be negotiated and navigated by students. Like with the boulder, the slippage of the Machine from “a secret” to “not a secret” is not literal in the sense that it was not there and suddenly it was there. The Machine was always already a part of the production of the campus space, of The University of Alabama. Rather, the movement between “a secret” and “not a secret” produces the Machine as mattering differently in configuration with other materialities, making other materialities and processes visible. This echoes the pull of the boulder. Pausing at the boulder, seeing the boulder, pulls other bodies toward it, make the boulder visible in other configurations.

Similarly, the claiming of the Machine by a Black candidate for SGA president makes visible other processes. There is an element of the absurd in here, echoing the absurdity of the
boulder. “I am Machine,” from a Black candidate matters differently, becomes differently than that same statement uttered by a White candidate. Through this claiming, the Machine as racism and White supremacy, the Machine as the power of the institution, becomes with a Black body. This becomes both absurd and disorienting. “people know what the Machine represents,” Leo says. The claiming of the Machine by a Black candidate does not disrupt the status quo, interrupting or intervening in White supremacy on campus, or even shaking the lines connecting the Machine to White supremacy. In other words, “the addition of difference does not alter the construction of the center” (hooks, 2013, p. 27). Instead, it serves to reify and emphasize the continued production of White supremacy and racism on campus, “it just shows you how much power is really behind that.”

In the movement of the Machine from “a secret” to “not a secret,” then, other resistances become possible. As Leo reflected, “[M]aybe people won’t elect him because of this.” The Machine as not a secret makes possible the hope that the persistence of the Machine and of the congealing of power around Greek Life on campus is only made possible by its secrecy, that simply by bringing it to light, people will suddenly understand and resist. This belief is echoed in narratives and interventions in diversity education, narratives of raising awareness whereby, simply by bringing light to or making power dynamics “not a secret,” people will make the correct choice and choose otherwise. The shift of the Machine from a secret to not a secret makes visible the power it wields (even as Leo notes the Machine was never a secret), but the claiming of “I am Machine” by Jared Hunter during the campaign does something differently than whispered rumors or the tacit knowledge that a particular candidate is Machine backed by the sorority and fraternity houses that display their name on brightly colored banners hung from balconies. The shift to “not a secret” produces the Machine as something that can be come up
against, and not just by individual students (choosing to vote otherwise) but by the university.

For example, Kate noted,

*I don't know, it really is fascinating,  
and I really do think that the University does nothing to do anything about that.  
I don't know what they can do,  
but I mean, people have acknowledged its existence.  
So, but I don't know if they do anything to like cover it up,  
but they definitely don't like try to act against it very well.  
Like the fact that our current SGA president is a member* (Kate)

The university, by not acting against the Machine, by doing nothing about it, becomes complicit with the Machine, tacitly accepting its continued existence. Jared Hunter, through claiming “I am Machine” in his election, then comes to make possible the university’s acceptance of the Machine and racism/White supremacy, the entanglement of the Machine and the university.

By becoming visible, by becoming “not a secret,” the Machine becomes not only explicitly implicated in the production of place on campus, but becomes a visible and encounterable materiality, something that is talked about and negotiated and discussed openly becomes something to resist and to measure progress against. The Machine’s persistence becomes a measure of racism on campus, a marker that continues to assert the continued existence of White supremacy and racism. The Machine becomes proof, something to point to, a manifestation of the systems and processes of inequity on campus, something to be intervened against. It becomes about the action, “it’s not the title, it’s the act of electing someone” Leo reflected, even as he mapped the ways that the Machine remained (remains) elusive. White supremacy becomes hard to locate, even as it can be pointed to, and as hooks (2013) noted, its existence depends on this fluidity. So, the following section explores moments of “trying to
change the tides” of coming up against the materialities of the Machine/White supremacy/the University.
Figure 36: Leo Memo, October 2017
18. BEFORE

Before the Machine was a secret, but now it is not a secret. This mapping of time, of before is layered and multiplicitous, producing and reproducing spaces and times. Layering space and time, there is always a before that now is speaking to, building from, produced by and from and with. These movements of before and then do something to place and how the university is understood and negotiated.

“But like, what was it before?...” (Leo)

“the year before the sororities got in major trouble...” (Kate)

“Even though I’d lived in Alabama before...” (Annaliese)

Before is a marking of a then that is different than now. Before is a situating. Before points to changes, to shifts in time and space. Even as before is slippery and elusive. Before is produced in memory and nostalgia, before is produced through now, through present constructions and configurations of place. Before exists in relation to the now. So, rather than charting what the specificities of a before were (as in, when was before, what were the specific material configurations of the before, measuring before in a linear pattern by, say – counting how many times the Machine is mentioned in the student newspaper over time), I am becoming interested, instead, in what before does to the present. Before the Machine was not talked about, but now it is. It has always and never been a secret, but before that secret/not secret was differently manifested. Mattered differently. The Machine, as a particular configuration is both a secret and not-a-secret. The Machine slips and slides, even as we point to it. White supremacy
slips and slides, even as it is pointed to. White supremacy is not located in the Machine, and yet, it is sticky, it remains. It is convenient, a secret (not secret) society that sponges up blame and racism. I am wondering how the Machine as an enactment of “before” acts similarly to how Moore and Bell (2017) described institutional responses to overt acts of racism. How by locating White supremacy and racism in the Machine, other moments, practices, movements become obscured. White supremacy becomes located in the Machine even as the Machine slips away. How this relationship reproduces White supremacy, becomes convenient for the institution (and how this same locating/shifting/slipping becomes located in other spaces/places: Greek Life, the boulder, Nott Hall etc.) How when White supremacy becomes located somewhere, there becomes a rhetorical situating, a distancing. Before. A pointing to something in the distance, something you are not a part of, not implicated in.
19. INTERVENTIONS,¹ BECOMING HERE

In the previous section, Leo noted that the Machine persisted, even despite its movement from a secret to not a secret. The Machine became possible to come up against in ways that were not possible before, it became possible to choose, consciously and viscerally, to vote for a candidate in opposition to the Machine. I want to continue to explore how coming up against the university becomes possible, the ways that students described this, the encounters where it occurred. But first, I turn to Bruce, who, when I asked him about changes to the campus, responded,

> It's kind of like the idea that people have about the university is running like a river and there's always going to be the instances that like shake things up and create a splash but in the general sense of things it just keeps going and there are so many people here that it's very rare for like an event to really affect people's lives on a mass scale and I think it might be affected to some degree by the way that things here are so old like does taking a certain action change the course of history for the things that we're surrounded by that have been here for 200 years and will be here for 200 more years? like that's a something that you can genuinely say changes the course of the way things are is gotta be a pretty hecking huge thing.

(Bruce)

¹ Reading through the transcripts, during the initial analysis (sorting, cutting, overlapping), I marked/labeled/compiled these moments as “interventions.” I still use this term, because I think about it as an intervention as a moment of agency (not solely located in the human body, but rather, as a moment of consciousness on the part of the student or human to do something, to move or navigate differently). An intervention, then, is distinct or different than a disruption or interruption as it marks this agency – even as, following Braidotti, I recognize that this agency is diffuse and conglomerate, it is spread across materialities and bodies and spaces and times.
Returning back to the ways that the University is produced, how the narratives of the South and the University coalesce and congeal, Bruce’s description of, “it just keeps going” even as there are instances where things are “shooken up” (or shook, as Leo described finding the monument) or “creat[ing] a splash” (as Bruce alluded to student newspaper articles about the Machine). This reproduction, as Bruce noted, is inherently, integrally entangled with “the things we’re surrounded by” the buildings and monuments and materialities of the University that have a weight to them of having always been there even though plaques and trees and the ever-constant thrum of construction belies that this is not the case.

There is something that happens here with this already-been-there-ness that loops back to the South and the production of the University, how those narratives congeal through the construction and “Old-Southness” of the buildings. Listening through interviews, to the sounds that interrupt and impede our talk, and what those sounds are doing/do in the production of place – the talk of groundskeepers, who uproot and replant the flower beds that freshly dot the campus every six weeks, the sound of leaf blowers running constantly through the months of October and November (Cladius had remarked, “they even have to control the leaves here”), of construction renovating and creating new buildings but always matching and mirroring the same style. They have always been there.

But those buildings have not always been there. Walking through Shelby Quad (a part of campus developed in the last ten years where engineering and biology departments are housed) with Clark, where she had imagined walking through the space years later and how the trees would grow up around the buildings. The trees, recently planted saplings, are dwarfed by the immensity of the buildings, and give away the newness of the space. Otherwise, the buildings on this side of campus mirrored the columns and redbrick and staircases of the main quad, buildings
that in some cases had stood for a hundred years (or had been, in the case of Woods Hall, rebuilt from the bricks of buildings burned during the Civil War). The buildings, then, through mirroring other parts of campus, (re)produce the histories of campus even as those histories are blurred over, neutralized through the mirroring.

Thus far, I have mapped the slippages in the production of place on campus, and how students navigate the socio-historical context of race, looking specifically to the boulder and the Machine as sticky materialities, objects that come to stand in for the University and White supremacy, that our material-discursive navigations (walking tours and conversations) congealed around as students talk about race on campus. In this final section, I map outward from these sticky materialities, exploring the complicated and nuanced ways that students intervene in and re-make the place of campus. Earlier, I noted that “to belong” on campus holds multiple and layered meanings, belonging acts as a feeling, a desire, and a force. Belonging operates and orients differently in space and time. To belong, or to seek belonging, is haecceity, you are here, and you are part of it, even as you are making sense of it. Belonging as haecceity produces narratives that are complicated and contradictory, narratives that exceed analysis, that always becomes more than. To belong to a place becomes slippery when put in relation to theory. Massey (2005) described place-making as joining up with narratives-so-far, of navigating the throwntogetherness of place, negotiating the here and now. Before you belonged to this place and then you did not, before you did not belong and then you did. You belong here but not there, you belonged here and then there. You never belonged, you always belonged. Belonging is always in relation to place, even when it is not about belonging. What I mean by this is that we are always already a part of places, part of the spatial narratives that produce place. This being a part is about belonging, even if we do not “belong.” Following this, students are always already a
part of the place of campus by being (becoming) there. Their movements and navigations from off-campus apartments and dorm rooms to academic and social spaces, to sorority and fraternity houses and dining halls, to campus events and conversations with friends, assignments completed (or not), social media posted – all of this is producing the specific configuration of place that is the University of Alabama. By joining up with these flows and processes, students become a part of the production of place, even as they are produced by it; however, it does not follow that to be a part of the production of place is to experience belonging as a desire or a force. Indeed, joining up with spatial narratives can in fact work against belonging, when one’s subjectivities, experiences, or navigations bring them up against the flow of place. Leo, discussing his advocacy work on campus, echoed Ahmed as he described his work as “going up against a wall”:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{When I was working at the [diversity center]} & \\
\text{it always felt like resistance} & \\
\text{it was just like I’m trying to make a difference on this campus} & \\
\text{and then resistance} & \\
\text{I feel like the biggest resistance} & \\
\text{came from people on campus just kind of letting it be there to die} & \\
\text{and not showing up.} & \\
\text{When you’re trying to actively make change} & \\
\text{and people don’t seem to really care that much} & \\
\text{it feels like you’re just always going up against a wall of;} & \\
\text{“okay,” we talk about “we care about diversity,”} & \\
\text{we talk about, “we want to move forward in making our space feel more} & \\
\text{inclusive,”} & \\
\text{but when we have those moments of trying to do it, you know,} & \\
\text{who is really showing up and like filling the seats?} & \\
\text{and so, in those moments I definitely felt like I was just kind of} & \\
\text{butting my head against the same like,} & \\
\text{“yeah have your events, but real institutional change?... ehhh maybe later”} & \\
\text{(Leo)} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Even as the campus moves on, “like a river,” as Bruce described, or forms barriers “a wall” for Leo, there are shifts and changes to the production of place. These slippages are
happening, happen, on multiple spatial and temporal scales. Coming up against the university has material implications for student’s navigations in space and place, and as the literature on higher education maps, this is always already racialized. Leo’s shookness, for example, ripples out and affects how he views and encounters the boulder in the future. Another previously mapped example to return to is how the ways that the University of Alabama has changed its recruiting practices to attract high-achieving out of state students. This practice (re)produced/(re)produces narratives of the South. Students’ expectations, produced in configuration with recruiting practices, produce and are productive of how they engage with place (for example, Harley Barber saying “I can do this because I’m in the South”), at the same time as the university is produced and productive in relation to the students (building styles, sweet tea). In other words, this recruitment strategy makes possible different configurations, variations on the productions of place that entangle with the socio-historical context of race. I return to this example to emphasize that to explore the navigations of race and place on campus is not as simple as saying that there is a direct line between out of state recruitment and a reduction of racism on campus or an increase in belonging for students of color. Rather, the ways that campus is reproduced becomes differently, the possibilities for this production change, and this matters for the reproduction of Whiteness and racism in institutional spaces.

Ahmed (2012) wrote about doing diversity work as coming up against the flow of institutional spaces. To intervene in space is experienced as going against the flow because it disrupts the material-discursive productions, the slippages that connect and produce a place as specific. These interventions, Ahmed noted, are not always actions or movements, rather, one

---

1 Especially when we remember/return to that the majority of the out of state recruitment is of White, high SES students.
can come up against the flow simply by joining into the production of place. Being there/becoming with a place can be experienced as coming up against or going against the flow. Especially when one inhabits subjectivities that are marked as not belonging, as we explored earlier with Leo and Angela protesting at the football games. This maps back to the earlier braiding together of literature on belonging and the persistence of racism and White supremacy in higher education. In past sections, I have illustrated how White supremacy and racism become part of the flow of the university, the ways that they are re-inscribed through material-discursive processes: the boulder, campus tours, the military history, and the Machine. Thus, following Ahmed’s rejoinder that to become part of space can shift the production of space, can be a coming up against the flow, I begin by exploring moments of being/becoming-there followed by intentional interventions in the space of campus. These explorations of moments that intervened in, disrupted or resisted the dominant narratives of campus then lead into considerations of implications for methodology and practitioners.

**Being/Becoming There**

To seek belonging, to join into the space of campus can be a disruption of spatial narratives and the production of place if those narratives did not include you before. Therefore, to seek to belong for students of color can be experienced as going up against the flow in an institution that is produced as White. One way that space was remade and intervened in was simply through being there. Annaliese, reflecting, “where it just hit me that I might not have been here if things if one thing butterfly effect if one thing had changed. that I that I might not have been able to see this,” or Clark, reflecting on the president’s mansion, and noting, “I'm a Black student getting my education in a place where like historically I'm not supposed to be and that's you know, gratifying that's like empowering in a way.” Methodologically, as I embarked
on walking interviews with students, these reflections often became possible in configuration with objects and materials on campus. Objects and materialities hold historical significance, which is communicated through their structures and architecture. Objects held material-discursive stories of belonging or not-belonging and made possible reclamations of space. For example, Leo and I, during our walk, paused at the Malone-Hood Plaza, a site on campus commemorating the actions of James Hood and Vivian Malone who were the first students of color to attend the university. Sitting there, Leo reflected,

*It never really hit home that this is the same place.*
*You know it's not one of those things that's in the movies and the history books, it's a real place.*
*It's right here that you know, there used to be people gathered here.*
*And there used to be real oppression happening just in front of that door.*
*Not allowing someone who is also a person of color to enroll here.*
*For me to even be here.*
*You know this was the site that made, a huge difference to even allowing me to be here.*
*I don't know, every time I come here I just feel really grateful, and it gives me a lot of peace in this area.*
*(Leo)*

By being on campus, “for me to even be here” then, becomes an intervention, taking up and claiming the space of the institution. This is not to say that university campuses can be re-made as anti-racist through simply admitting more students of color. Even as this is/can/should be part of it (see research by Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, et al., 2015a; W. Smith, et al., 2009). In particular, Smith and colleagues (2009) identify a primary feature of a positive campus racial environment as the “inclusion of students, faculty, and administrators of color” (p. 662) and that a feature of genuine racial diversity is “underrepresented racial and ethnic groups being physically present and treated as equals on the college campus” (p. 664). Indeed, one aim of this project is to attend to the complex and multiplicitous ways in which race and racism are
produced through processes and the production of place, and how those processes influence belonging. However, I include Leo’s narrative to highlight that being-there does something, that students are viscerally aware of the production of belonging or not belonging on campus. Who campus is “for” is communicated not just through institutional messaging, but through the very fabric of the institution, the buildings, the histories, the structures. Leo continued in our conversation to illustrate this,

"I feel like a lot of times in spaces on campus, there's this air of there's so many people around. And they are always constantly looking, even if they're not really looking at you, you just feel the eyes of the universe on you. But for me personally, like right here just doesn't feel that way. And it might be because of where it is it's kind of off center, it's just kind of like off the grid. So, there aren't there literally aren't that many people who are over here. But at the same time having this towering this clock tower just above you, and you know people who look like me on a plaque in front of me. The whole place whether I realize it or not just gives me comfort. And I didn't even realize honestly the extent, because I don't really sit over here much, but whenever I am over here, I definitely walk away feeling better than I did when I came. (Leo)"

Belonging is felt, an affective and visceral force, “they are always constantly looking, even if they’re not really looking at you.” Belongingness as haecceity, a sum total of forces and lines that exceed definition, that manifests as fleeting affects. Research on students of color at predominately White institutions highlights feelings of hypervisibility or tokenism that students of color experience on White campuses (e.g. Haynes, Stewart, & Allen, 2016; W. Smith, Mustaffa, Jones, Curry, & Allen, 2016; Wilkins-Yel, Hyman, & Zounlome, 2018). “You just feel the eyes of the universe on you,” Leo says. Sitting at this marker, which commemorates the first students to attend the university zigzags Leo and me through time and space, putting us in
relation to other students who may have felt the same way. Vivian Malone and James Hood, feeling the eyes of the nation on them as they walked the same path and were denied entry, walked the same path escorted by a contingent of the National Guard, walked the same path and were told by the governor of the state that they did not belong. This nomadic movement does something, “it just gives me comfort” Leo says, “I walk away feeling better than I did when I came.” The marker makes possible a both/and of visibility – Leo feels momentarily comforted and seen by, “people who look like me on a plaque in front of me” at the same time as it is a reminder of the oppression and marginalization still experienced on campus “this is the same place.” The marker and Leo become in relation to each other, an intervention in the production of place.

Considering the marker and Leo in relation makes possible the working of the both/and between them, a more complicated telling of race and belonging on campus. Leo does not simply belong or not belong, and the history of the campus does not cleanly and neatly factor into his belonging (or not belonging), a percentage that can be measured. Rather, they are produced in relation. Leo both feels empowered by the marker and reminded of his current struggles as a student on campus, the marker both pauses time and space (a marker of “real oppression”) a reminder of before that continues to be produced in the future. Before there was real oppression and now… I trail off here because we cannot say there is not oppression, but before operates as a marker in time, a pausing, now and then. The marker makes possible a reading of “it has gotten better” even as it reminds us that things have stayed the same.

Reclaiming Space

Reading Leo and my pausing at the Malone-Hood Plaza nomadically, the materiality of this moment also points to a reclaiming of space. Space marked by the clocktower with
“people... that look like me,” a visible marker and reminder, a ripple of possibility. Just as Leo noted earlier that the boulder becomes sticky in the production of space on campus because of its weight, because of its material presence as something immovable, monumental, the monument marks and reclaims space through its materiality. Yet students also described re clamations of space in less overt ways. For example, Sierra, who is Muslim, described her use of the prayer room located in the student union on campus,

_I don't go to the prayer room anymore because I live on campus,
So, I can just go home to pray if I need to,
But when I do go there,
I go there pretty early,
So, like um I don't know,
I just feel like it's nice having no one know I'm there,
but just like I am there on campus._

(Sierra)

Sierra’s use of the prayer room as an intervention in the production of place was not about a visible taking up space in the sense that it was about others seeing and acknowledging her use of the space. Rather, Sierra using the prayer room, her being/becoming with the prayer room, reclaims the space, “no one know[s] I’m there, but just like, I am there on campus.” Massey (2005) described space as being produced through everyday movements, repeated practices that happen in simultaneity and multiplicity to produce the provisional and partial boundaries through which we define place. The everydayness of the prayer room then, its existence in the everyday fabric of Sierra’s navigations of campus, make possible an interruption in the production of campus (a campus that Sierra anticipated being “with camouflage clothes and confederate flags and stuff like that”). “Just being there” in its everydayness, its mundanity, becomes an act of reclaiming the space of the institution, of remaking the place of campus for Sierra. This, even as Sierra is hesitant (afraid? unsure?) to associate herself with the prayer room, to be seen there.
Like the Machine, the prayer room slips and slides between secret and not a secret. The prayer room remains hidden, even as it is claimed. This hiddenness simultaneously stutters the production of White supremacy (its existence, taking up physical space in the student union, the signs that point to it), even as it reinforces White supremacy through the desire to remain hidden, through location in a back hallway.

Individual reclamations of space zigzag outward to relations and networks, relationalities that become with and in resistance to the space of campus. Higher education literature has described these networks as “counterspaces” (Grier-Reed, 2010; Hoffman, Rodriguez, Yang, & Ropers-Huilman, 2018; Jackson & Hui, 2017), informal and formal spaces that exist in relation to the institution. Counterspaces provide sanctuary from the hostility and microaggressions experienced on predominately White campuses, (even as they draw attention to them, for example by going into the prayer room Sierra has to out herself as needing a prayer room), while also providing space for activism, resilience, and resistance to dominant narratives. In this way, like the not a secret/secret slippage mapped in the prayer room, counterspaces work a both and – resisting White supremacy, existing because of White supremacy, reaffirming White supremacy through their continued existence as “counter.” Angela explained one such counterspace following the 2016 U.S. presidential election,

*I knew it the day after the election,*
*When I walked in and I was like okay,*
*it was like confirming that this is where I was meant to be,*
*and this is where I kind of felt comfortable being me.*
*Surrounding yourself with the good people that are important to you.*
*And you know, don't hate you for who you are or whatever is important.*
*I had one of my friends,*
*she came over to me when I was like sitting at the table,*
*and I was like voicing like I'm scared for myself,*
*and my friends and people of color, and people of different religions,*
*and she came over*
and she hugged me, 
and she was like, 
“I will always love you,” 
and I was like “oh my god!”

Moments like that I know that there are good pockets of people on this campus, 
and it’s not all racist, 
and it’s important not to paint it with a broad brush by saying all of Alabama is racist, 
because it’s not. 

(Angela)

The counterspace, then, is produced through both the physical space (the location of a student organization) and the relations with “good people [...] who don’t hate you for who you are.”

Angela describes the moment of walking into the student organization space following the election, crossing the boundary, feeling “okay, this is where I was meant to be.” The boundary of the counterspace is produced not just through the physical location of the building of the student organization, but the connections with other students. As a queer student, this space where Angela’s “chosen family” gathers makes possible reclamation of the space of campus. Her relationships of the counterspace leak beyond the physical boundaries, connecting to and producing the space of the institution, as Angela notes, “moments like that... I know... it’s not all racist.”

Considering the ways that counterspaces slip and slide, simultaneously resisting and reaffirming White supremacy, thinking with Angela’s description of the group of students, her good pocket, I am wondering how “counter” can become an affirmative resistance. “Counter” as an enactment of positive difference, as becoming, as conspiratorial positive difference, as defined not through negation (what they are not), but through what they are. Affirmative and additive reimaginings.
Intervention²

Following Sierra and Angela around as nomadic subjects becoming with the place of campus, their reclaims (remakings) of space through being there and counterspaces circulate at the individual level. Sierra’s use of the prayer room is a local reclamation, it does not ostensibly ripple out to the space of campus, affecting other students’ navigations of campus. However, thinking space nomadically, Sierra’s navigations become in relation to other interventions in the production of place. Massey (2005) described place as produced on many scales, from the global to the local, with all of it mattering. Simultaneously, following this, Sierra’s use of the prayer room may immediately only matter for her, but this use makes possible her connection to other Muslim students, makes possible the creation of counterspaces like the ones that Angela describes, chosen families that produce space on multiple scales, from the individual relation between Angela and her friend to the remaking of other spaces of campus “good pockets of people on campus.” Good pockets of people, counterspaces that are formed in classrooms, clubs, and organizations, and residence halls. Counterspaces then make possible nomadic movements that intervene in the production of place still further. Again, returning to the time surrounding the 2016 U.S. presidential election, Leo describes the “chalking wars³” that occurred on campus leading up to the election.

It was around the time of the election I know, and there was I think it was kind of a fuel off of um 45⁴ being elected. And around that time, like building off of fuel of that. And we saw a lot of people feeling very anxious

---

² I also use intervention word intentionally as an audience for this work is higher education practitioners, and this idea of intervention, or of doings, while not situatable as “best practices” or copy paste functions for other campuses, can be considered as cases or considerations of what can or could be done/do – a beginning or openings.
³ See Guyotte and Flint (in press) for an exploration of the relationship between this incident, also known as “The Chalkening” and campus space.
⁴ 45 refers to Donald Trump as the 45th elected president of the United States.
and like honestly terrified for their safety.
Fueled of seeing very visual representations on like you're walking to class, and it would be like “go home” blah blah blah or whatever and,
“you're not wanted’.
Or just in general kind of bashing a lot of identities, And it was very directed like it couldn't be misconstrued.
and I think that was a moment where people realized that chalking could have such a huge impact on the campus.
It's a very casual thing, but it can be so powerful in the same sense because one, chalking isn't regulated very much and then two, when it is put down it's kind of left to the weather to take it away.
[chalk] has this very long-lasting effect on the space.

Leo described his realization that chalk had a “long-lasting effect on the space,” going on later to note that “it’s not about the chalk, it’s about what is behind the chalk.” Chalk becomes more than the ground up particles of limestone and dye, more than the messages of “go home,” it affects the place of campus. Leo further describes “when I do walk through areas where I know there has been chalk, I'm kind of a little bit more aware and just think back to that incident [...] knowing that people are on this campus who physically went down and wrote that.” Ephemeral markings of chalk make visible the reproduction of race and racism, the culture of White supremacy on campus, even after the markings have washed away (Guyotte & Flint, in press).5

Following this realization of the possibility of chalk to produce and claim the space of campus, Leo then elaborated how, following the election, his class took up chalk to draw attention to the slave cemetery on campus:

*I was in an African American Lit class,*
*and it was near the end of the semester,*
*but it was also around the time of 45 being elected [...]*
*it was like the week [after] the election results*
*we all felt like we all wanted to do something with action.*

---

5 This article, which takes up #TheChalkening, the event that Leo describes here, explores and unpacks the possibilities of chalk as visual activism, how chalk operates as a material-discursive force in higher education.
We didn't just want to sit there and talk about it and feel it.
Like what can we do?
and so, [my professor] said,
‘we can either sit here,
or we can spend the class today and we can go out and mark
[and] draw attention to history on our own campus that kind of gets overlooked.
[We] can draw attention to the ways that you know,
how have we gotten to where we are?
and what does this mean now moving forward?
Having this as a president?
Do you think
if he was to come here,
and you pointed out,
‘Hey! this is [the slave cemetery],’
what would he remark to that, and how would he feel?
and others who probably feel similarly on our campus,
what would be the reaction?
To looking down and seeing ‘slave graves’?”
[So] the whole class came, and we just had chalk,
and she said,
“let’s draw attention to them,”
you know it didn't have to be just at the site,
like it could have been all the way down the street,
because you know might catch the people walking there,
but if you want to catch somebody way down the street that can be just as effective,
you know
“Oh! where?”
(Leo)

Marking the slave cemetery with chalk then becomes an intervention that zigzags between local
and global spaces, produced through counterspaces and relationships (Leo’s class, his professor),
in response to national spaces (presidential elections, national conversations of Black Lives
Matter), in response to local spaces (the chalkings leading up to the election, the invisibility of
the slave cemetery on campus). Leo’s class marking with chalk becomes, thought nomadically
and with a spatial perspective, a resistance and a remaking/reclaiming of the space of campus.
Marking with chalk to do something, an active intervention into the narratives of campus, a
manifestation of counterspaces, the chosen family that Angela described. The chalk markings as
opening a conversation.
Illustration 12
20. IMPLICATIONS

Ahmed (2012) argued that “when diversity becomes a conversation, a space is opened up” (p. 16). This dissertation has been a journey to create conversations between the experiences and navigations of students and the productions of place and space and race in higher education. Thus far, we\(^1\) have moved between slippages in discourses between the South and Alabama, how the South is produced as racist, and how racism and White supremacy produce the South. Then, we explored disruptions in these slippages, moments where these slippages became visible, even absurd, and the possibility for conspiratorial resistance through the example of Leo, the president’s mansion, and his freshman seminar class. Through this conspiratorial resistance, we moved into narratives of becoming visible, becoming hidden, where the productions of campus became recognized, disrupting space and time. This led us down the trail of the Machine, as a specific congealing of spaces and times to disrupt and pull apart as a materiality that students encountered in their navigations of campus. The movements of the Machine from “a secret” to “not a secret,” and how students came up against these discourses then led to other interventions, of being/becoming with the space of campus and reclaiming spaces of campus through counterspaces and acts of resistance with chalk. In this section, I map more explicitly the implications of this journey, considering both how this research can be applied and taken up by methodologists and practitioners.

\(^1\) I say “we” here, (and not “I”) intentionally – we, as in you, the reader, we as in the participants and myself, we as in the conglomeration of forces and flows that have produced this dissertation.
Following how perceptions and expectations of campus are produced and the multiplicitous materialities that produce them can make possible relocations from the general to specific and accountable locations. Through this dissertation, I have come to understand belongingness differently. Before I wanted to trouble belongingness, to set it up as something to take down, to critique to pull apart and expose. Instead, I have come through this research and writing to consider belongingness as a rich multitude of flows and becomings and possibilities. I have thought belongingness outside the confines of the university and as a production that occurs in relation to broader discourses and spaces. Belongingness as a desiring force that operates contradictorily and simultaneously and is always already there even in its absence. And even as I write this, I come back into this before, the before of critique. I have written the words “practitioners need to critically consider the difference between pandering to an image or stereotype and confronting and grappling with that history.” Even as I believe this, and I think that it is important, I also want to resist this fixing, this easy answer, this implication that says, now this, this is how we need to think about belonging. Instead, in the following sections, I move through nomadic shifts, “combining a strong historical memory with consciousness and the desire for resistance… in favour of a production of joyful acts of transformation” (Braidotti, 2013, p. 256).

**Nomadic Shifts**

An initial implication of this mapping is the recognition that students are aware of the history of place before ever arriving on campus. Even if they are not aware of the specificity of the history, in the sense that they cannot chart specific dates and or events that took place on campus, they do not enter campus as a neutral space. This echoes scholarship by Wilder (2013) which argued that college campuses are imbued with materials, artifacts, and symbols marking
the racialized history of higher education. Moreover, as hooks (2013) described, “imprinted on the consciousness of every white child at birth, reinforced by the culture, white supremacist thinking tends to function unconsciously. This is the primary reason it is so difficult to challenge and change” (p. 3). Indeed, as chapters 10 and 12 mapped, universities are produced as White supremacist spaces through a congealing of discourses from global and local scales, and these understandings of place influence students’ initial navigations of campus.

However, uncritical use of these narratives has implications for the continued production of White supremacist and racist spaces on campus. Colleges and universities ostensibly are aware of the power of these narratives and capitalize on them. One example of the capitalization of a narrative is the use of marketing campaigns which take up narratives of the South to recruit students from the North and West with the financial resources to pay out of state tuition with little financial aid. In order to consider the implications of these recruitment techniques, I turn to cite again at length from an article written by a university student in the Crimson White1 in the Fall of 2016, in response to a New York Times article which discussed the growing recruitment efforts of the University of Alabama on the national stage (Pappano, 2016).

In the context of perhaps the most polarizing election since the 19th century, the manner in which a leading Southern university defines itself has far-reaching implications. After clinging for a century and a half to a failed rebellion, the South stands to benefit from some rebranding. UA can accomplish just that if it leverages its newfound spot in the limelight to deepen the national conversation about this region. It is the brand of the University that attracts out-of-state students in one way or another – and a superficial brand appeals to superficial interests. Our branding should invite high school students to an academic environment that confronts “the Southern thing” instead of pandering to it. We should continue to embrace our Southern character in our recruiting, but UA should replace its traditional notions of itself and of the South with more robust representations of the diversity, achievement, and beauty in our nationwide university community. Surely this would fall in line with the UA Strategic Plan, one objective of which being to “[s]trengthen the recruitment, matriculation, retention, and graduation of diverse

1 Student newspaper
students.” The University of Alabama has a chance – an obligation – to act as a steward of the South’s image and the nation’s understanding of the South. As we celebrate the recognition we duly receive, let’s use it to its maximum benefit. (Rogers, 2016)

As Rogers articulated, defining the University through the narrative of the South is not in itself wrong or bad, but it has dangerous implications and should be taken up critically if the university leadership wants to seriously intervene in the reproduction of White supremacy and racism on campus. Institutions and administrators genuinely seeking to promote racial diversity and inclusion should as Rogers (2016) noted, confront histories of inequity and seek robust representations of the campus experience rather than deflecting. Or, rather, we might collectively wonder and imagine what would it do, and how would it look to confront these histories. These wonderings are an enactment of countermemories, of forgetting to forget, moving against the hegemonic structures of the institution. I think with the science fiction author, N.K. Jemisin, who wrote in the introduction to her collection of short stories, *How Long ’til Black Future Month?* (2017) that her growth as a writer has come through reflexively examining internal and externalized racism to “spin the futures I want to see… [and] talk back at the classics of the genre” (p. 2). Jemisin spins through her fiction and fantasy futures with black and brown and queer and fluid characters, enacting countermemories in her tellings.

This process of reflexivity, of seeking accountability to the socialization of white supremacy, how white supremacist thinking covertly operates irrespective of skin color (hooks, 2013), might be taken up by practitioners in higher education. For example, Okun (n.d.) articulated a list of characteristics espoused by and valued by White supremacist culture. These characteristics include perfectionism, a sense of urgency, either/or thinking, fear of open conflict, individualism, progress, objectivity, and the right to comfort. Considering how these values intersect and permeate campus processes, from recruitment to admission, expectations of student
involvement and classroom engagement, to graduation, might make possible specific and localized interventions in the reproduction of White supremacy on campus. Specifically considering belonging as constructed through a White supremacist culture (to belong/not belong, belonging as bounded, belonging as White) is to enact what hooks (2013) described as the foundational system of White supremacy. Specifically, hooks (2013) noted “as long as this [dualistic] thinking serves as the foundation for how most people think about life (in neat binaries) then it will be impossible to eradicate racism” (p. 177). This dissertation has been a project of creatively imagining belonging in flows and becomings.

Movements to creatively reimagine how spaces can be otherwise are ethical nomadic shifts disidentifying from the logic of conventions (Braidotti, 2011). Throughout this project, I wondered and questioned my complicity and co-implicated-ness with the very structures I was trying to resist. Moments of silence and creaking chairs, moments when I should have intervened, moments when I was desperate to prove that I was not like the others. These moments have left marks on this data, and as I have sought to stay “critically vigilant” of them, I have troubled and retraced and redrawn the lines and connections I have made through this dissertation (hooks, 2013, p. 149). I say this to note that even as practitioners might take up these nomadic shifts, disidentifying from the logic of White supremacy, these systems simultaneously reinscribe themselves on our ways of doing and being. I do not mean to say that we should not undertake these movements, but rather, that to take up a nomadic ethics is also to take up a responsibility and accountability to our co-implicatedness, to exercise critical vigilance, to be accountable for the choices and cuts we make. To seek becoming, accountable to our embedded and embodied locations.
Dirty Secrets

To explore this project of becoming accountable, I turn to the installation of a new marker on the University of Alabama campus that occurred during the course of the study, commemorating Autherine Lucy Foster, the first African American student to enroll at the University of Alabama. The marker, which was emplaced outside Graves Hall, the Education building, was a site that several students gravitated toward on their guided walk and became a symbol for the possibilities of changing space. Leo described the power of the marker as follows:

when I think about the new marker,  
the Autherine Lucy Foster marker,  
and you know physical space changing,  
I've seen a lot of people posting on social media  
like how big of a deal it is even been for them personally.  
And I think that's really awesome,  
it just shows the power of simply a marker,  
and how when you when you add historical context to a space too,  
that people kind of get to decide on their own how they feel about it.  
At least when you know a good amount of the story,  
you might not ever know the whole story,  
but if you feel like you're being told the story of the campus  
or the story of this site,  
you know, you might be more inclined to be connected to that place.  
Or at least trust it, or not distrust it.  
And feel like, oh I know there's always going to be some other part of it that I'm not hearing,  
so, I'm not going to care that much because by caring that's how I get hurt.  
because I found out all the dirty secrets in the end you know?  
(Leo)

Here, Leo talked about the power of the marker to add historical context to space, to communicate belonging, to stand in tension with the history of the space and to mark a shift. Significantly in terms of implications for higher education practitioners, Leo’s description of the marker noted the importance of acknowledging the historical context of a space. “You might be more inclined to be connected to that place,” he said, “if you know a good amount of the story.”
This reflection maps onto the stories of disruption told by many students throughout the project, moments of recognition and disruption where the machinery of the White supremacist structures of place became visible. “I found out all the dirty secrets in the end you know?” Many of the students in the study noted finding out about histories of campus from other students, in a class, from a professor that “went off.” Encountered in this way, the racialized histories of campus are produced as illicit, as something secret, and stand in contrast to the narratives of the university told by campus tours and university brochures. As Wilder (2013) noted, it is not that these histories are hidden, they are always-already there, but as this project explored, the ways that the socio-historical context of race is encountered by students matters. When we consider belonging as a process, as a desire and a feeling, Leo’s reflection “by caring, that’s how I get hurt, because I found out all the dirty secrets in the end” reverberates with his experiences of belonging and his navigations on campus. Institutions hiding or ignoring their histories mean that students feel betrayed, let down, and hurt. Reaffirming and reproducing the feeling that the institution was not meant for them. Returning to Okun’s (n.d.) characteristics of White supremacy, this fear of open conflict and the right to comfort are manifestations of White supremacist culture. By not grappling with their socio-historical contexts of race (and other inequities) institutions persist in reproducing White supremacist spaces. It is not simply enough to say that “it has gotten better” or “we have this history, this happened here,” but to consider history in relation to the present, to consider the ways that we intervene in and recognize the sociohistorical context of the university as both reflective of and acknowledging the history, while also understanding history as dynamic and contributing to the present.

We might wonder how, instead of ignoring or hiding from histories, institutions might stand in solidarity with students, seeking radical relationality (Braidotti, 2011). I am thinking
about a conversation I had recently with a student I once supervised who was removed from working an event because their identity was one that caused the group hosting the event to be uncomfortable. The removal of the student was coded by the supervisors as being “for their safety.” I am thinking about how this same practice was repeated in other spaces, students who requested moves from dorm rooms because their roommate’s identity made them uncomfortable, students placed in particular areas of campus so that they would not make others uncomfortable. How might these encounters become differently, resisted the reproduction of White supremacy, had, for example, the supervisor stood with the student at the event, had scheduled more students to work with the student, had asked the student how they would have liked to handle the situation, as opposed to removing them, covering their eyes, it never happened. It wasn’t a contract.

Thinking with radical relationality enacts nomadic shifts in time and space and memory, forgetting to forget. Locations become embedded and embodied memories, enacting before “countermemories, which are activated by the resisting thinkers against the grain of the dominant social representations of subjectivity (Braidotti, 2013, p. 358). This is not easy work, as has been demonstrated over and over again by other campuses and communities seeking conversations about monuments and histories in their spaces, but it means asking critical questions about what materialities do to spaces and how they work. What does a monument or a materiality do to space and how does it matter and to whom? Who does it serve? For example, a timeline that was put up in the student union on campus the summer before the writing of this dissertation (and still exists at the time of this writing). The timeline shows the history of enrollment on campus from the founding of the institution in 1831 to the present, along with significant events that occurred on campus at the same time. The timeline skips between 1851 – 1891 with no mention
of the Civil War or this history of slavery on campus. What does this skip do, and what does it do to not mention either the war or slavery? These questions, enacted as countermemories and resistances are asked not to have answers, but rather to produce proliferation and possibilities, transformative potential to imagine our relations in place differently.

**Institutional Flows**

If we think of the discourses of the university as a river, interventions of conspiratorial connection (Leo telling his students about the slave cemetery on campus), of disruption (encountering the boulder, the Machine), and of resistance (chalking, using the prayer room) are ripples and eddies, places where a chunk falls off into the river. A student joining up with the university brings a configuration of discourses and materialities and subjectivities into the assemblage of the institution. This joining up is not about choosing to belong or not belong, but about being swept up into a configuration, a river that is moving in a direction. Students are already part of and produced by the place of the university, and so belongingness becomes not just about inviting students into the river, but about asking how the flow is functioning for them. The production of the place of the institution has different material-discursive effects on bodies. Intersectionality matters (Crenshaw, 1989; 1991). Intersectionality which resists moves to categorize students as identity + identity, additive and comparative, but rather, intersectionality as shifting in salience and resonance, as always already there.\(^2\) The disruptions and interventions mapped through this project are not enough, as Bruce reflected, to disrupt the flow, the university keeps on going. However, what these disruptions do is make differently visible the feeling of

---

\(^2\) Which is how Crenshaw described intersectionality, critiquing “how dominant conceptions of discrimination condition us to think about subordination as disadvantage occurring along a single categorical axis” (p. 140), but is not how intersectionality is always invoked or taken up in literature or research.
being against the flow. For many of the students in this project, this feeling of not being with the flow, of coming up against the university, becomes repetitive. This repetition matters for student’s experiences. For Leo, the repetition of coming up against the university produced his experience as “a struggle,” exhausting and frustrating, for Annaliese, this same repetition produced a desiring and seeking recognition by the institution through scholarships and academics, for Angela, this coming up against produced counterspaces that then make possible her understanding of the university as “home.”

Through repetition, students feel the effects of not being with the flow. Disruptions ripple, and this is why I continue to find my way back to belongingness. These disruptions are a pause, not necessarily changing how the university is produced, it does not suddenly make the institution inclusive or not racist, but it starts to bring into visibility how things have been produced as invisible as visible. Before the Machine was a secret, and now it is not, even as the Machine has never been a secret. How students come up against this material-discursive flow is an example of how space is reproduced as well as how we can intervene. So, then, I suggest that we need to move away from responding to belongingness as though we need to toss students a life preserver, a raft, and a paddle, to help them move along with the flow of the institution better. Rather, we might ask, how do students come up against discourses, how are they already in them? Within this framework then, we cannot wash our hands of the broader implications or environment, excuse reproductions of White supremacy as “the way it is” or “tradition.” We also need to question what is produced as visible and invisible to students, to highlight that the truths\(^3\) of campus are produced and productive beyond the space of the university and that the university

\(^3\) I say truths here not as a positivist big T truth, but truth as embedded and embodied, truth as the “racial realities” (Patton et. al, 2007) that students navigate, truth as the effects of material-discursive encounters.
is producing truths that students are trying to negotiate. Thus, the ways that students align (or not) and make sense (or not) with the institutional narratives become important for intervening in the production of the river, it becomes not just about supporting students, but about examining the ways the river is shifted or come up against, making possible future entries into the river that are more smooth. How might we produce and support narratives of place that are contradictory to place? This is an embedded and embodied enactment of a both/and, of nomadic ethics in practice.

Imagining Belonging Differently

As I advocate for grappling with the messiness of the sociohistorical contexts of race in practitioner and policy spaces, there are also methodological implications for this grappling. Specifically, taking up the production of race and racism as processes illustrates that these productions are not simply a one-way narrative of institutions becoming raced/racist or becoming inclusive, but rather a dynamic and always-productive becoming of both in excess and entangled with each other. We might take up the example of resistance through being/becoming there. Students presence on campus is a coming-up-against the institution, a disruption in the production of place, even as they experience the production of place as flowing around them. Students can simultaneously feel empowered by being-there that they desire to belong, that they do belong, at the same time as they do not feel that they belong. This means that we cannot continue to conceive of belonging as a static state of being that can be achieved or reached, and we need methodological imagination and creativity to explore the ways that belonging becomes

---

4 Green’s alternative tours become a good example of this. These tours shift the production of place and work against the productions of campus in multiplicitous ways – they physically take bodies off the track of the university discourse, at the same time as they become part of the institution. They work against the institution at the same time as they are a part of it, making possible a slowing down, pausing of the production of place.
as flows and intensities in relation to other spaces and places. Belonging as a binary of either or, belonging or not belonging, then, is creatively reimagined through the recognition of multiple belongness, “recognition of the ways in which otherness prompts, mobilises and engenders actualisation of virtual potentials.” (Braidotti, 2013, p. 355). As I have moved through this dissertation, I have moved forward and backward from belonging, leaving it behind and taking it back up again. Belonging has come in and out of view throughout various iterations of this document and this project becoming sticky again. In this stickiness, belongingness becomes not as something to achieve, but rather becomes as connection, belonging as an enactment of nomadic ethics, of radical relationality and interconnection with spaces and places and materialities and stories. Belonging becomes seeking stories that tell of empathetic proximity, encounters that emphasize our interconnectedness with the world. Belonging becomes a process of becoming-with.

Implications for turning to place, through this research study, suggests a contemporaneity that is missing in higher education research, a focus on the importance of the here-and-now, a politics of location that keeps in tension national and global spaces. This inquiry suggests possibilities for higher education practitioners to consider the specifics of place, the context of our coeval becomings, even as we understand and take the global in perspective to inform how we make the place of higher education differently (Somerville, 2010). Building from research on race in higher education, this research approaches the place of the campus as always-already racialized, as imbued with histories and stories and encounters of race and racism. Following higher education research on belongingness and campus climate, I am interested in how these concepts can be built from and woven together with critical materialist and spatial philosophies that make possible dynamic and in-process explorations of students navigations of the socio-
historical context – suggesting implications for belonging and climate that are situated and relevant to place, that are built from the complicated and messy and layered encounters of embodied and embedded subjectivities of college students. A goal that I had for this research is to work the tensions between the disconnect I experienced as a student affairs administrator between what was said about belongingness and place, and what was done: how higher education attends to some practices and not others, producing place in multiplicitous ways that often are contradictory to the intent of student affairs practice. An implication of this simultaneity then situates us as ethically responsible for the construction of place. As Massey (2005) reminded us: “in understanding how our past continues in our present we understand also the demands of responsibility for the past we carry with us, the past in which our identities are formed” (p. 192).

Thus, I reiterate that the purpose of this research has both implications for methodology and practice. As higher education professionals, we have turned too long to the general and global, tracing and tracking students down pre-determined maps of development, building models that prescribe and predict retention, limiting how we define success to checkboxes of organizations, involvement, and GPA (Schmidt, 2016). We have made decisions based on models that are uninformed by place, that scaled down, lead to us making the same decisions, answering the same questions time and again (O’Neil, 2016). Turning to place is a pedagogical and political move to produce a space/place that is ethically and relationally accountable through awareness and connection to other bodies and materials (human and nonhuman/material and nonmaterial) in higher education and beyond (Braidotti, 2006). A cartography of place offers opportunities to map differently how we respond to, support, and make change on our campuses, taking into consideration the pervasive, and embedded histories of race and racism and the ways
they come to bear on student’s navigations of place. This thinking/consideration/dissertation
points to new becomings that fold the local and relational nature of higher education
simultaneously with an awareness of our global contemporaneity, possibility to escape the trace.
21. CODA

As Leo and I stood by the rock, we were joined by a University faculty member and two visiting historians. “I wanted to make sure they saw this, it doesn’t get much attention I think on campus with all the controversy about Confederate monuments, but here it is, right?” she said.

As we stood next to the boulder, sharing how we had each become aware of it, Leo asked the historian, “could you tell me a little bit more of the history I guess, if you have a minute, because I know about it, but I don’t really.” The historian replied:

You know the celebrated story is that this campus was a military academy during the Civil War -- but [by] time of the late part of the Civil War, you know most able-bodied White men who were fighting [had already been] in the draft. They had to fight, or they [had already] volunteered to fight.

And so, Sherman was coming making his way through Georgia. Do you know about that? And then this contingency of cavalry made its way here into Alabama and directly targeted this campus because of its military connection. And the cadets that were here, I guess there were like 13 to 14 years old, and they basically ran away.

So, the cavalry unit, they burned down the campus and, in their mind, rightfully so because again, what it stood for.

Then there were just a couple buildings that you've probably heard about that were saved and then in the following years to come you had this sort of lost cause and this refiguring, a repurposing of history, you get this sort of celebration of anything Confederate and really no... you know, these kids trade a volley and run, but in this depiction [gesturing to the boulder] the bravely hold forth and you know, do what uh good young 13-year old soldiers are supposed to do. And it’s clean of a discussion of slavery and the fact that there were slaves on this campus, even when it burned. It is just a lily-white story of brave people who are doing their duty washed entirely clean of what the cause was, what the objective was.

As the historian talked, a family approached the boulder, pausing to take a picture of it. Was it our bodies that pulled them towards it? This pausing of the five of us, marking the boulder at that
moment as something to be seen. Our pausing, remaking the space of the campus (even if momentarily), bringing the boulder to the fore, weaving it into the narrative of place. As Leo and I continued to walk, after leaving the historians, we wondered about the picture, now on the phone of one of the visitors. What story would they tell, flipping through the images on their phone of their visit to campus? Would they pause at the boulder, zoom in to read the placard? Would the story told by the boulder push up against or entangle with their other readings of campus?

We wondered this, and as we walked along the path away from the boulder and to the eastern edge of the quad, two campus tour guides walked toward us. “I might ask them if they ever, ever take people to the rock,” Leo remarked, as we came closer to the guides. As we intercepted paths, Leo recognized one of the guides, greeting him by name, and asking,

**Leo**

*Can I ask a quick question?*

*About your tours, do you ever take people to the rock? Is that a part of the tour?*

**Tour Guides**

yeah!

*What rock? Oh, that rock?*

Yeah, right there

We definitely walk past it. It's kind of individualized up to each student, a lot of our Capstone Men and Women like to make their tours really personalized but a lot of people do like to touch on that and use it as a landmark

**Gotcha, so whoever is leading the tour can take people over to see it if they want to and see it or talk about it or...**
Leo

definitely, a lot of people haven't even stopped and read what that memorial is about before so yeah

what story do you tell about the rock?

well, it's a Confederate monument

erected by the Daughters of the Confederacy in 1914

Tour Guides

Yeah, well a lot of our tours will either end at [the Student Union] or in Lloyd\(^1\) so when we end in Lloyd we'll often take this sidewalk.

So, you'll walk right past it when you talk about Gorgas

or you'll go straight past it.

Either way, you go past it

So, it's really up to personal preference and the time constraint whether you hit on everything on the quad or not.

There's just a lot of times where we have so much information in such a short amount of time, so sometimes we don't get to touch about it

I try to touch on just about everything I can.

Like the mound.

I have yet to be able to talk about the rock yet

oh really?

Yeah, that's an awesome question to ask.

Did we answer...?

I haven't had to,

I haven't gotten the chance to.

We're new members,

I've only given five tours,

Do you have any advice on a story we should tell?

yeah

uhuh

\(^1\) an academic building off the main quad
Leo
um Lost Cause era tells a story of uh cadets staying and defending the campus against the invading forces

the Union Troops, yeah

Tour Guides

the Union troops

We do talk about that when we talk about the president’s mansion and Woods Quad. We talk about April 4, 1865, when they came in and burned down the whole campus, and we talk about the four antebellum structures that are still on campus today, like the president’s mansion and things of that nature too.

Well I appreciate that input I'll be sure to start incorporating it from now on

As Leo and I continued on, we paused, turning to watch as the campus tour guides also continued along the path, stopping in front of the boulder to read the inscription. Leo laughed,

wow.
even just merely talking about it
in that interaction can get someone interested enough to stop and read and see what's around.
Illustration 13
22. UN/FAITHFUL, NOT/ENOUGH

I have wondered, as I have written, created, revised, and drafted, if I have done enough. If I have been faithful to the stories that I have been told, the paths I have walked, the moments encountered. My fingerprints smear this document, sticking together sections and thoughts, tracing lines and paths. Fingerprints that comprise this project, even as they layer and blur and overlap to such an extent that my prints are no longer visible.

As I format this defended dissertation to submit, I am struggling to keep these prints visible, even as they blur and fade into margins and typesetting and style. Keeping these fingerprints visible, even as I think about my fallibility in this project. Keeping fingerprints as I wonder if I have done enough. Have I done justice to the stories and lives and experiences of the thirteen students in this study? Is it possible to tell their stories fully, or will I always be stretching for enough? I have written about becoming theoretically faithful, and I wonder about faithfulness as a desire that is only realized in its failings. Have I been faithful, have I done enough?

I think about the stories not told, the lines not followed. White supremacy is not just about race, but about the hegemony of Whiteness, masculinity, and maleness, heterosexism, Christianity, cisgenderism, and I have told many stories and not others. I have left off or truncated the wholeness of the students in many ways. Cladius who told me he experiences his queerness before his Blackness, Elizabeth’s struggles to conform to the expectations of femininity in her sorority, Sierra’s experiences as a Muslim woman following the 2016 U.S.
presidential election. I think about other paradigms and methodological orientations, about Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot (2005) who wrote of her methodology of portraiture, “I wanted the subject to feel ‘seen’ […] fully attended to, recognized, appreciated, respected and scrutinized. I wanted them to feel both the discovery and generosity of the process as well as the penetrating and careful investigation” (p. 6). Or Beuthin (2014) who reflected on “a pang of guilt that I may have come out further ahead; that I have ‘taken’ something from the participant” (p. 130). Have I, by seeking my own theoretical faithfulness, become unfaithful to the stories of the students? In speaking from my own embodied and embedded location (even as that location is often unmarked, my Whiteness and womanhood and cisgenderedness have left their own fingerprints on this project), have I flattened their stories? Are the students unrecognizable?

And simultaneously, I think about Elizabeth, who emailed me before my defense to ask me what stories I had included of her. Responding to her email, remembering her discomfort with some of the stories that she had told, her concern with the way she would be represented. In my email back to her, I sent her this document and reminded her of her pseudonym to search for mentions of her stories, encouraging her to offer any suggestions, offering to meet her for coffee if she wanted to talk through anything. Upon pressing send, even as I felt the story I told about her was faithful, I worried that she would feel that I had misrepresented her, nervous about speaking for her.

Or, I think about Clark, who came to the exhibition before my defense, who exclaimed in excitement upon finding the fabric panel with her narratives transferred on it, posting it on her social media pages. Or Cladius, who also attended the installation, and who paused at the final piece where I had written in the description,
Throughout this project, I wondered and questioned my complicity and co-implicatedness with the very structures I was trying to resist… To take up a nomadic ethics is also to take up a responsibility and accountability to our co-implicatedness, to exercise critical vigilance, to be accountable for the choices and cuts we make (Dissertation Installation Handout, 2019)

He paused, and turned to me, and said, “this piece resonates with me,” and I knew that he was talking about my complicity in White supremacy in this project, and his own experiences in other spaces that we were both a part of where White supremacy shifted and slipped and was reproduced even as the spaces were created to intervene in those very structures.

I have sought throughout this project to enact an ethic of faithfulness, not as a dogmatic, rigid verisimilitude of morality, but a creative and imaginative relational orientation to the world. An ontological orientation to a world that is always becoming. Through this project, I have sought theories and theorists that I can live with, that I can become with. I have sought a faithfulness that extends beyond methodology and theory to my own embedded and embodied location – the scholar and human and subjectivity I want to/am becoming in the world. A becoming in the world that is unstable and shifting, seeking an affirmative ethics that embraces relationality and process. As I think about faithfulness and enough, I am thinking about the simultaneous affirmation of the instability of un/faithfulness and not/Enough. Affirming moments of un/faithfulness and moments where I have not done enough. Moments when the slash/ becomes resonant. When I have been, could be, desire un/faithfulness, when not/Enough is joyful, fearful, affirmative, creative, stuttering. I embrace these failings not with an ambivalence to not doing enough or an acceptance of unfaithfulness, but rather as an embrace of the affirmative potential of these failings.
So, lingering in the final moments of this project, I am hopeful. My un/faithfulness has provoked other movements and orientations – methodologically, ethically, relationally, theoretically that extend and spiral beyond this project. I joyfully embrace that this project will be not/enough, and this holds potential for the future. There is joyfulness in the space between un/faithful, between not/enough. The potential to become otherwise, to re-create, to re-imagine. You are here, and you are part of it, even as you are making sense of it.
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## APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Dissertation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early September 2017</td>
<td>Hang Flyers in campus buildings, (ten Hoor, Graves, Maxwell Hall, Crossroads office, Reese Phifer, Carmichael)</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-September 2017</td>
<td>Purposefully reach out to specific students who have identities/experiences that are not included in current participant group.</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late September/Early October 2017</td>
<td>Schedule focus groups with participants: (September 29th, October 1st, October 4th); Complete visual memos, journal entries for focus groups</td>
<td>Data generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer to schedule individual interviews with students who missed or were not able to make focus groups.</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>Follow up with participants after focus groups, invite to participate in walking interviews</td>
<td>Participant Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcribe Focus Groups</td>
<td>Analysis –inform walking interview questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-October – Mid November 2017</td>
<td>Conduct walking interviews and individual interviews; Complete visual memos, journal entries for individual interviews</td>
<td>Data generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Touch base with participants, let them know that I will reach out in the spring for a second interview</td>
<td>Participant Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017 – December 2018</td>
<td>Transcribe walking interviews and individual interviews</td>
<td>Analysis – use to inform questions for spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Timeline (Example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>Touch base with participants with updates on the project; Share with participants who were included: paper written from one focus group; audio compilation; Share timeline for spring: Reaching out in mid-February for interviews</td>
<td>Participant Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Reach out to participants for a second interview; participants who participated in individual interview – invite for walking interview</td>
<td>Participant Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>Prospectus Meeting</td>
<td>Dissertation Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018 – April 2018</td>
<td>Conduct individual and walking interviews with current participants; Create visual memos and journal entries</td>
<td>Data generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2018 - May 2018</td>
<td>Transcribe Walking Interviews; Continue to create visual memos as transcribing</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4th-15th, 2018</td>
<td>Dinah Washington Gallery Show (with Creative Campus) – exhibit with initial sound map, audio portraits of Clark and Kate, visual memos (see Appendix C)</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Proposal Defense</td>
<td>Dissertation Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018 – December 2018</td>
<td>Listen and write with data, create sound compilations; Continue to create visual memos as transcribing</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Dissertation Defense</td>
<td>Dissertation Timeline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Flyer for Student Recruitment

Receive a $5 Publix or Starbucks giftcard for your participation!

STUDENT RESEARCH VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

FOR PARTICIPATION IN A STUDY ON HOW STUDENT'S DEVELOP A SENSE OF PLACE ON CAMPUS.

Who can participate: Any current student
What do you have to do: Participate in a 60 minute focus group

e-mail maflint@crimson.ua.edu if you would like to participate.

UA IRB Approved Document
Approval date: 8-21-17
Expiration date: 8-21-18
Appendix C: May 2018 Gallery Installation

Figure 37: Layout for Gallery Installation. May 2018

Image 38: Layout from Front for Gallery Installation. May 2018
Figure 39: Picture from Gallery Installation. May 2018
Figure 40: Image from Gallery Installation. May 2018
Appendix D: IRB Approval

August 22, 2017

Maureen Flint
ESPRMC
College of Education
Box 870231

Re: IRB # 17-OR-281, “Cartographies of place: Mapping sense of place on campus”

Dear Ms. Flint:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on August 21, 2018. If your research will continue beyond this date, please complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, please complete the Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent forms and recruitment flyer.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Carpanato, T., Myler, MSM, CFM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance

358 Rose Administration Building | Box 870127 | Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127
205-348-8461 | Fax 205-348-7189 | Toll free 1-877-826-3066
Appendix E: Consent Form

AAHRPP DOCUMENT #193
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM
CONSENT FORM FOR NONMEDICAL INTERVIEW STUDY
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Individual’s Consent to be in a Research Study

You are being asked to be in a research study. This study is called “Cartographies of place: Mapping sense of place on campus”. This study is being done by Maureen Flint. She is a PhD student in the Educational Research Department at the University of Alabama.

What is this study about?
This study asks, how do students spatially understand and describe their sense of place on campus? What are the interactions between students and the space of a college campus that contribute to a student’s sense of place? This study seeks to complicate the narrative of sense of belonging on college campuses through a consideration of space, and arts based research design, which looks to expressive forms of description and storytelling.

Why is this study important—What good will the results do?
The results of this study will help student affairs practitioners and college administrators as they develop practices to impact students sense of belonging on campus, and through that, students’ retention. This will provide insight into and the development of new theories regarding students’ sense of place on campus, and theories of retention and belonging.

Why have I been asked to take part in this study?
You have been asked to be in this study because you are a student over the age of 18 years, a faculty, or staff member at the University of Alabama.

How many other people will be in this study?
The investigator hopes to include the responses of approximately 15 students in this study, as well as 6 faculty or staff members.

What will I be asked to do in this study?
If you are a student participant, you will be asked to participate in a focus group with other students. This focus group will include creating maps of campus and discussing sense of belonging with other students. You will be asked to come to the focus group with a picture, image, or object of something that represents your connection to the place of campus. The focus group will be audio and video recorded. After the focus group, you will also be invited to participate in two walking interviews with the researcher, in the fall and spring semester, where you will take a walk around campus, discussing your experience as a student on campus. The walking interview will be audio and video recorded as well. During the walking interview, you will be invited to take pictures or video the spaces/places we are walking through. The focus group, and the walking interviews will both take place on campus, at a time convenient to your schedule. You may decline to be a part of either without penalty.

If you are a faculty or staff participant, you will be asked to participate in a walking interview

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
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EXPIRATION DATE: 8-21-18
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with the researcher, where you will take a walk around campus, discussing your connection to the place of the university. This will take place on campus, at a time convenient to your schedule, and will be audio and video recorded.

**How much time will I spend being in this study?**
Focus groups and walking interviews will each last approximately 60 minutes. The total time you will participate in the study if you choose to participate in all components is 3 hours for students, and one hour for faculty or staff.

**Will being in this study cost me anything?**
The only cost to you from this study is your time.

**Will I be compensated for being in this study?**
You will be provided a $5 Starbucks or Publix gift card for each aspect of the study you participate in. This will be provided at the end of the Focus Group or Walking Interview.

**What are the risks (problems or dangers) from being in this study?**
Minimal risks are expected from participation in this research. The primary risk associated with this study is that participants may find the discussion of their experiences to be stressful or challenging. If you choose to participate in this study, you have the option of opting out of the study, or choosing not to tell the researcher things you find to be stressful or challenging.

**What are the benefits of being in this study?**
There are no direct benefits to this study. You may gain some satisfaction or personal enjoyment from reflecting on your experience on campus.

**How will my privacy be protected?**
You are free to decide to participate in the focus group or walking interview. The focus group will take place in a conference room on campus, where you can talk without being overheard.

**How will my confidentiality be protected?**
Signed consent forms will be separated from data and kept in locked filing cabinets or in an encrypted digital file. Additionally, all written reflections, visual data, focus group notes, focus group audio/video, and walking interview audio/video will be kept in encrypted digital files and stored on a password protected UA Box folder. When we record the focus group, we will not use your name. You may ask not to be included in the video of the focus group, in which case we will situate the camera in a location where you will not be included in the frame. You may also refuse to be audiotaped, in which case the interviewer will take handwritten notes. Audio or video clips from this study may be shared in educational settings or in an artwork or installation. You may also refuse to have your voice, image, or images you produce shared.

**What are the alternatives to being in this study?**
The only alternative is not to participate.

**What are my rights as a participant?**
Being in this study is totally voluntary. It is your free choice. You may choose not to be in it.
at all. If you start the study, you can refuse to participate or stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board is a committee that looks out for the ethical treatment of people in research studies. They may review the study records if they wish. This is to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

**Who do I call if I have questions or problems?**
If you have questions about this study right now, please ask them. If you have questions later on, please call Maureen Flint at (607) 346-1087 or Dr. Kelly Guyotte at 205-348-6878. If you have questions or complaints about your rights as a research participant, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877- 820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make a suggestion, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at [http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html](http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html).

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants on the website [http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html](http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html), or you may ask Maureen Flint for a copy of it. You may also e-mail us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

**Subject Statement of Voluntary Consent**
When signing this form I am agreeing to voluntarily enter this study. I have had a chance to read this consent form, and it was explained to me in a language which I use and understand. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have received satisfactory answers. I understand that I can withdraw at any time. A copy of this signed Informed Consent Form has been given to me.

☐ I agree to maintain the confidentiality of the information discussed by all participants and researchers during the focus group session.**

**If you cannot agree to the above stipulation please see the researcher(s) as you may be ineligible to participate in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Research Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Investigator</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

☐ I agree to be audio-recorded for this focus group or walking interview

☐ I agree to be video-recorded for this focus group or walking interview

☐ I agree to allow audio of my voice to be shared in results or reports from this study

☐ I agree to allow images I create or produce to be shared in reports or results from this study

[UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB]
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Appendix F: IRB Renewal

July 2, 2018

Maureen Flint
Department of ESPRMC
College of Education
The University of Alabama
Box 870292

Re: IRB # 17-OR-281-R1 “Cartographies of Place: Mapping Sense of Place on Campus”

Dear Ms. Flint:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your renewal application. Your renewal application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on July 1, 2019. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Study Closure Form.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Carpentier T. Myles, MSM, CLS, CIP
Director of Research Compliance
Office for Research Compliance