Apprentices & Worker Bees:

Discursive Constructions of Youth's Work Identity

by

Amy K. Way

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2012 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Angela Trethewey, Chair
Sarah J. Tracy
Marcy Karin

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2012

ABSTRACT

More than simply a source of income, work has become a central source of identity (Beder, 2000; Ciulla, 2000; Clair, McConnell, Bell, Hackbarth & Mathes, 2008; Muirhead, 2004). motivating scholars to engage in a plethora of studies examining the impact of work as a way of defining ourselves, ranging from identification with the organization (Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998) to the influence of work on non-work lives (Kirby, Wieland & McBride, 2006). And yet, in such volatile political and economic times, individual's identities as worker are threatened, spurring questions about how to decenter the meaning of work in our lives (Rushkoff, 2011).

Despite young people's roles as organizational members, few communication scholars have considered the organizational experiences of youth as a productive area for research and theory (for exception see Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). I adopt a discursive approach to unpack the multiple ways that discourses, at interpersonal, organizational and social levels, impact and influence youths' identity construction process (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004; Fairhust & Putnam, 2004). I empirically demonstrate how discourses of work operate simultaneously at multiple levels, interacting and overlapping to position youth as workers.

Analysis is based on interviews with youth, ages 12 to 21, participating in a popular national nonprofit organization that serves over four million youth each year. In addition to 49 one-on-one formal interviews, I observed 50 hours of a worker preparation program, which serves as an important context for priming participants and situating our conversations about work.

Practically, this project illustrates the influence of organizations to mediate the relationship between discourse and identity. Methodologically, I further clarify discursive analysis as a method by explicitly articulating a concrete framework by which to identify micro-, meso-, and macro-levels of discourse. I also present a qualitative instrument for interviewing youth. Theoretically, this research offers an innovative and necessary expansion to the scope of organizational research by highlighting youth as current and future workers, pointing to the ways they are already engaged in work-life negotiation practices and considering how their micro-discursive practices serve to decenter the organization and make work and family meaningful.

DEDICATION

To my Mom and Dad who have supported me in countless ways through this entire journey. It is only in the process of writing that I have come realize the important ways you have helped to make meaning of work and family for me. Not only have you both modeled what it looks like to be hard working and excel in your jobs, but you managed to be at every swim meet, soccer game, and volleyball match (and there were a LOT of them). I only now fully understand what type of love and commitment that takes.

Mom – because of you I am a critical, feminist scholar and perhaps one day a working mother as well. I've learned that I can do both. Dad – from you I have learned the importance and joy of work as a space to build relationships and connect with people. The best part about my work is the chance it gives me to connect with all kinds of people and to listen to and learn from each of them. It's what I love most about my work.

Also for my sister, Erin. I am so grateful to have someone who knows exactly what it took to get here and to support me through the process. I am lucky to have you as a sounding board and as a sister. Thank you for always leading the way and never complaining when I took the same path.

To Jay. We may come from different places, but I am so grateful for your open-mindedness and willingness to challenge and support me. You are the one person with whom I have processed every single day of this journey. I am so proud of you for finding work you love and having the courage to pursue it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I appreciate the support, encouragement, and feedback from my dissertation committee. My dissertation is stronger because of your willingness to push and challenge me to make it better. I am so fortunate to have three strong, intelligent, warm, funny and fascinating women as my mentors and friends. I have learned so much from you and I continue to rely on each of you as models for my career. I would especially like to thank Angela Trethewey who has not only been my advisor and mentor but one of my best friends. Thank you for taking me on as an advisee at such a busy time in your life and opening your home and your family to me.

I owe unending thanks to Rosemary Carpenter, Heather Freireich, Karen Hays, Lynne MacDonald & Sue Wurster for taking care of me and keeping me in good spirits. I greatly appreciated the technical assistance of Shawna Malvini Redden, as well as Allycea Brooks, Tara Kerege, and Anna Stough my research assistants. I am grateful to the Graduate College for the Dissertation Completion Fellowship and to the Graduate and Professional Student Association for funding from the Graduate Support Research Program.

Finally, thank you to all of the clubs, community members and young people who participated in my research for their willingness to be a part of this project and their openness. Their stories are what make this project and my job so important and interesting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER

1 PROBLEM STATEMENT 1

Discursive Constructions of Work and Worker 1

Protestant Work Ethic 2

Organizational Perspectives of the Worker 5

Youth as Objects of Discourses about Work 7

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 9

Identity in Organizations 9

Discursive Approach to Organizing 10

Micro-discourses 16

Meso-discourses 21

Macro-discourses 28

3 METHODS 37

Organization and Participants 37

Organization 37

Participants 41

Data Collection 43

Interviews 43

Youth Characterizations of Work 46

Observing YOC 50

CHAPTER Page

Analysis Procedures 52

Discourse Tracing 53

Complex Nature of a Discursive Approach 54

Micro-discursive Analysis 56

Meso-discursive Analysis 57

Macro-discursive Analysis 59

Analysis of Findings 62

YL Program as Discursive Resource 63

Discourses of Work and Family 65

Early Work-Life Experiences 67

4 YL PROGRAM AS DISCURSIVE RESOURCE 69

Discursive Resources for Constructing a Worker Identity 70

YL as a Discursive Resource 72

Dress 86

Youth Appropriation of Discursive Resources 96

Reasons for Participation 96

Dress 106

Notions of Success 109

Implications: Organizations as Discursive Agents 132

5 Discourses of Work and Family 139

Youth's Micro-discursive Practices that Give Work Meaning 140

Macro-level Discourse: Family Gives Meaning to Work 141

CHAPTER Page

Meso-level Discourses: Family as Transcendent of Work 148

Micro-level Discourses 152

Work brings meaning to family 153

Work as a way of doing family 156

Implications 160

Macro-level 160

Meso-level 162

Micro-level 163

6 EXPERIENCES OF WORK-LIFE NEGOTIATION FOR YOUTH 169

Theoretical Framework 169

Practices of Work-Life Negotiation among Youth 172

Negotiating Family 180

Future Expectations for Work-Life Negotiation 188

Implications 197

Creating Flexibility at Work 198

Discursive Openings and Flickers of Transformation 200

7 CONCLUSION 203

Summary of Findings 203

Embracing Complexity: Findings from a Multi-level Analysis 212

Interviews as a Space for Discursive Opening 213

Youth Constructions of Care 216

Co-constitution of Work and Family 218

CHAPTER Page

Early Work-Life Experiences 223

Doing Discursive Research: Methodological Implications 227

Navigating Multiple Discourses: Practical Implications 228

Programmatic Implications 229

Policy Implications 233

Limitations and Future Directions 234

References 240

Appendix

A INTERVIEW GUIDE 260

B YOUTH CHARACTERIZATIONS OF WORK INSTRUMENT 263

C IRB APPROVAL FORM 266

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Skills and Desired Outcomes of Job Skills Program	40
2	Summary of Data Collected	52
3	Discursive Approach to Data Analysis	62
4	Program Characteristics	72

Chapter 1

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Work has become one of the foremost influences structuring the way Westerners live our lives. And the increasing prominence of work, has provided the impetus for scholars to engage in a plethora of studies examining the impact of work as a way of defining ourselves, ranging from our identification with organizations (Kuhn, 2006; Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998) to the influence of work on our non-work lives (see Kirby, Wieland & McBride, 2006 for a review). But the process of learning about work and making choices about how to engage in work begins long before individuals are hired into their first job. Children and young adults listen, watch, and process all kinds of information about work from parents, teachers, friends and the media (Erikson, 1968; Jablin, 2000; Levine & Hoffner, 2005), with the explicit goal of constructing a socially acceptable and meaningful worker identity. And despite young people's role as organizational members -- as students, athletes, members of teams and volunteers -- few scholars (even fewer in communication) have considered the organizational experiences that may shape the future identities of youth as a productive area for research and theory. In the present the qualitative research project, I engage in a multi-level discursive analysis to consider the experiences of youth as organizational subjects actively engaged in the process of learning about work.

Discursive Constructions of Work and Worker

This project assumes that identities are discursive constructions and that contemporary organizations are a central location of identity construction. The

primacy of work-based identities is evident by the fact that often the first question people ask of one another upon meeting, "what do you do?" is an attempt to characterize a person in terms of her/his role as a paid laborer (Muirhead, 2004). Few roles are more central in our lives as Westerners than our identities as workers (Beder, 2000) and the ideologies that shape how we work structure our non-work lives as well. Western capitalist society has matured into a place of entrepreneurialism and individualism, based on a relentless work ethic that has resulted in a gap between the wealthy and the poor larger than any other nation in the world and more significant than at any other time in our history (Schor, 2010; Smeeding, 2005). More than simply a social practice, engaging in work has become a central source of identity and a moral issue by which to judge a person's value to a society; work results from a demand for reciprocity (Muirhead, 2004) and provides a way to show "you are carrying your share of the social burden (Gutmann & Thompson, 1996, p. 239). Beder (2000) explains, "To be a worthwhile person one must do one's share, and little besides paid work counts anymore" (p. 125). Display of a strong work ethic is not only seen as virtuous, but understood as a responsibility to family and state and perhaps the primary requirement for citizenship.

Protestant Work Ethic

Despite early notions of work as a punishment or at the very least as a fate to be avoided (Beder, 2000; Ciulla, 2000; Clair, McConnell, Bell, Hackbarth & Mathes, 2008), work has gradually and with great force become a modern day basis for judgments regarding one's virtue as a person. In the earliest known Greek, Roman, Mexican and South American societies, work was portrayed as vile and was relegated

to the lowliest members of society (Beder, 2000). Ancient Greek philosophers, who believed the material world to lack permanence, valued intellectual contributions over material ones and thus thought "contact with the material world through work was a humiliating necessity" (Ciulla, 2000, p.37). Ancient Asian societies also believed in the impermanence of the material world, but this view did not lead to a similar disgust of work, only a preference for intellectual or spiritual pursuits. Ancient Christians and Jews held Old Testament beliefs that leisure was to be valued, while work was a punishment from God in response to original sin.

With the Reformation, however, came new views about work as something to be valued and held in high regard, a way for individuals to contribute to society (Ciulla, 2000; Muirhead, 2004; Clair et al., 2008). "At the heart of the work ethic is the idea that work is worthwhile for reasons other than the rewards it brings in terms of pay, products and profit. The work ethic gives work an intrinsic value" (Beder, 2000, p. 10). The idea of a work ethic served as a way of connecting the mundane and sometimes undesirable work of this world with divine works, in many ways a path for transcendence. Rather than functioning as a practice for accumulating wealth, work was understood to signal one's divine worth, "independent of the material needs for which it provides" (Muirhead, 2004, p. 104). As it became an expected and valued activity for all members of society, work was elevated to a public demonstration of one's chosen or blessed status and in some Christian denominations, a means to salvation. Those who could not or chose not to work were held up as examples of people who had not been elected by God for salvation. Eventually, perceptions of work as a calling, moved away from the monastery and

into popular discourses of work. Viewing work as a calling, personalized work in some ways, connecting work to the worker and "[making] labor a duty instead of a curse" (Muirhead, 2004, p. 106).

As the wealthy members of capitalist society became wealthier, opportunities for work (and subsequently the acquisition of wealth) were assumed to be based on merit and the individualist notion that anyone who was willing to work hard was of good character and deserving of the financial rewards that accompanied hard work (Beder, 2000; Clair et al., 2008). Thus, work became a source of social mobility and acceptance in Western society. Once such a work ethic became the norm, religion eventually occupied less of an explicit driving force while individuals and state policies began to reify the expectation of work as a central source of meaning in individual lives.

Rather than having some essential or real meaning "which precedes or evades its dominant discursive articulation in any historical or cultural context" work gathers meaning from the particular economic, political and historical context in which it is constructed (du Gay, 1996, p. 5). Work is a shifting phenomenon, too vast to even ponder its limits, "on the one hand, it reflects a historically contingent division of labor, while on the other, its every instance suggests the infinite expanse of the human mind and spirit" (Muirhead, 2004, p. 4). In just the last three years, our country has seen an historic shift in work. With the 2008 economic crash, eight million jobs were lost, causing work to become scarce for many, which has provided the impetus for scholars and laypeople alike to rethink their relationship to work

(Harvey, 2010; Robinson, Schor, 2010) and even take to the streets demanding a change in business as usual (OccupyWallStreet, 2011; We Are the 99%, 2011).

By examining the historical fluctuations in the meaning of work, we are better able to envision the process by which our understanding of work has come to be discursively constructed. And yet, "as a fundamental human category, work is represented not only as livelihood, but also as a stable, consistent source of self-identity" (du Gay, 1996, p. 9). In other words, we often experience our connection to and identification with work as natural, when in fact there is nothing natural about it at all; rather it is a particular historical, social and ideological construction.

Organizational Perspectives of the Worker

Contemporary organizations serve as a powerful force driving the assumed centrality of work in individuals' lives. The importance of work may never have waned from an organizational perspective, but the means by which organizations have motivated workers has certainly undergone a metamorphosis over time. At the turn of the 21st century, Scientific Management or "Taylorism", named for pioneer Frederick Taylor, became popular for its focus on efficiency and productivity. To counter what he saw as workers inherent tendency to engaging in "systematic soldiering" or the purposeful exertion of less than optimal effort, Taylor conducted empirical research to determine the most efficient methods of engaging in manual labor (Clair et al., 2008). In response, organizations paid workers on a piece rate system that rewarded productivity, rather than time spent on the job. Such work arrangements called for strict supervision of workers and placed any thinking on the shoulders of managers and out of the hands of workers themselves (Beder, 2000).

The widespread adoption of Taylorism and the subsequent popularization of the assembly line, created by Henry Ford, created a culture of mistrust of workers and eliminated any element of craft or skill from jobs.

But change was on the horizon. Workers became dissatisfied with the lack skill and responsibility in their work and theories of scientific management began to highlight the importance (and utility) of the human element in their organizations. Eventually, psychologists argued for a human relations approach which emphasized worker satisfaction in productivity. Simply by paying attention to workers' needs and preferences, companies like Kodak, Sears Roebuck, and Goodyear were able to create buy-in from employees and increase their motivation to produce (Beder, 2000). But, like scientific management, the human relations approach was also the target of criticism for only paying lip service to workers needs and desires for the benefit of the organization without actually making working environments more supportive of workers.

Thus, during World War II, organizations like Shell Oil began to implement programs to foster employee identification with the organization. By offering them a stake in the organization's success, workers became motivated to promote the organization and identify with corporate norms and values. The internalization of company values, or the idea that what is good for the organization is good for the individual, began to operate as a largely unarticulated, but powerful means of motivation for workers to adopt a managerial perspective to their work and their lives in general. As such, views of workers have moved from requiring strict supervision, to organizational advocates who willingly act in the best interest of the

organization (Barker & Cheney, 1994; Clair, 1993; Scott, Corman & Cheney, 1998). And so as individuals we begin to construct identities around organizational and managerialistic discourses. But, the prominence of work in constructing one's identity is not limited to adult organizational members. The purpose of this project is to illustrate that the ways youth are implicated in the ways we organize as well.

Youth as Objects of Discourses about Work

A driving force behind the following project is to highlight youth as subjects and/or agents in the process of organizational identity construction. Youth are all but left out of organizational analyses (see Berkelaar, Buzzanell, Kisselburgh, Tan & Shen, 2012; Buzzanell, Berkelaar, Kisselburgh, 2011; Myers, Jahn, Gailliard & Stoltzfus, 2011; Sass & Mattson, 1999; Way, 2012; Way, forthcoming for exception). What little research does exist, demonstrates the influence of communication on youth's career perceptions and choices. Findings indicate that children have formulated strong ideas about the types of work that will allow them the status and lifestyle they hope to have as adults (Berkelaar, et al., 2012, Myers, et al., 2011) and that as youth are already learning to perform their identities in ways that serve to constrain them as adult women in organizations (Way, 2012). And each of these studies call for additional research on youth including research exploring "message sources in order to examine the discursive and material resources available to children" (Berkelaar, 2012, p. 110). Thus, it is my goal to demonstrate the importance of youth as the focus of organizational communication as adults.

> As people come of age, they begin to imagine futures for themselves. This imagining, however, is never a strictly personal process. Rather,

> how we imagine our futures assumes a context, that is, a set of discourses that enable our imaginings and that, in fact, render some imaginings more attractive and more plausible than others" (Wood, 2010, p. 103).

The goal of this research is to gain an understanding of how youth conceive of work and what resources guide the construction of their identities as workers.

As organizational scholars, we tend to limit our research to adult organizational members, but the truth is that young people are organizational members and are often the targets of explicit programs to assist in the process of identity construction. The discourses that organize youth experiences provide important insight into the ways they will organize as adults and help us locate the structural conditions that perpetuate inequality (Way, 2012). Because adolescence marks a specific time in young people's lives when they are actively engaged in the process of identity exploration and construction (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1994), research on children and young adults may reveal important information regarding expectations about what it means to do work and construct worker identities prior to engaging in paid labor. A discursive approach points to the myriad micro-, meso- and macro-discourses that serve to shape youth's identities and expectations around work. Considering how youth are implicated in work-life negotiations is one important way that organizational communication might increase its relevance and impact and if nothing else, pushes the field of organizational communication in a new direction.

Chapter 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Identity in Organizations

Following the "increasing commotion over identity" in organizational scholarship (Alvesson, Ashcraft & Thomas, 2008, p. 5), this research is an exploration of the process of identity construction in youth, specifically around worker identities. Identity is an often theorized and rarely agreed upon framework for organizational research. For this project, it is best understood as "subjective meanings and experience, to our ongoing efforts to address the twin questions, 'Who am I' and -- by implication -- 'how should I act?'" (Alvesson et al., 2008, p. 6). In the scope of organizational research, identity has been theorized in a number of ways (Alvesson, 2010; Alvesson, Ashcraft & Thomas, 2008), each of which carries with it important implications for individual agency and stability, two of the major areas of debate in identity research.

Here, identity construction is a simultaneous and iterative process whereby individuals navigate between their own sense of agency and the power of larger social discourses. This conceptualization stems from an unwillingness to turn such a process over solely to individual agency or structural constraint. With respect to the stability of individual identity, perspectives range from identity as fluid, conflicted and/or constantly changing sense of self to a more integrated and permanent point of reference for subjectivity.

The popularity and diversity of identity as a framework for organizational research has led some to question the impact and utility of such a perspective.

Nonetheless, I use an identity frame because it helps explain organizational processes and outcomes. An identity framework may be "a source of revitalization for existing research areas" causing me to examine old problems from a fresh perspective (Alvesson, Ashcraft & Thomas, 2008, p.6).

Additionally, I aim to further stimulate the process by applying identity research in a new context by focusing on identity development in youth. Dozens of communication scholars have undertaken research considering the construction of organizational identities; few have considered this process as it takes place in childhood and young adulthood (see Jablin, 2000, and Myers, in press for exceptions). Examining the identity processes that take place prior to assuming an adult role in organizations offers the opportunity to learn about the process of constructing identities as well as to find ways to productively intervene in that process, but requires an approach that can adequately capture the myriad factors in such a process. In the following section, I argue that a discursive approach to identity construction allows for the complexity that characterizes such a process in a way that has the potential for meaningful contribution to organizational theory and practice.

Discursive Approach to Organizing

Discursive approaches have become a staple of organizational research, a common framework for scholars to account for the related processes of organizing and identity construction (e.g. Edley, 2000; Fairhurst, 2008; Gordon & Stewart, 2009; Kuhn, 2006; Real & Putnam, 2005; Sillince, 2007; Thackaberry, 2004; Tracy, 2000). Part of the popularity of a discursive approach lies in its ability to "represent a

constellation of perspectives united by the view that language does not mirror reality, but constitutes it" (Fairhurst, 2009, p. 1608). Though not without its faults, a discursive approach boasts a number of strengths, including the way it "emphasizes the communicative character of human interaction, captures vital aspects of dominant organizational activity, is useful for empirical analysis, and allows for a critical performative view on organizations" which likely account for its popularity among organizational scholars (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2011, p. 1123-4). Additionally, I argue that the main strength of a discursive approach lies in its ability to account for the complexities of human organizing at the interpersonal, organizational, and social level. Despite the potential of discursive analyses, more often than not discursive approaches fail to engage in the multi-layered and complex nature of such an approach that makes it so rich. In the discussion that follows, I reflect on the uses of a discursive approach to organizational studies and present an argument for using a discursive framework to structure my research.

The terms "discourse" and "communication" are bound up in one another, but for the purposes of this project, I identify discourse as something that extends beyond communication. One might take an additive approach in considering discourse as communication with the addition of cultural assumptions or communication plus context. In this way, discourse "embodies cultural meanings that enable the social and communicative" (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004, p. 7). Communication is a practice of social interaction while discourse can be viewed as "a medium for social interaction" (p. 7). Discourse is what allows our communication to have particular meanings in a specific time and place because communication

takes place within particular discourses. Discourse is defined by the way it carries with it the social and cultural assumptions that contextualize communication.

Though its manifestations can be quite broad, discourse is used in a number of different ways in communication theory and research, each of which has important consequences for how one approaches research and for the conclusions one can draw. The scope and assumptions underlying each use of discourse can vary widely as discourse seems to be characterized by "no agreed-upon definition, and confusingly many uses" (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000, p. 1127).

The following theoretical framework for the exploration of adolescents' emerging worker identities borrows from Ashcraft & Mumby's (2004) feminist communicology, in which the authors articulate four "frames" for understanding the organization, discourse-identity relationship, specific to gender identities. The first frame focuses on micropractices, assuming gender as "a defining element of human identity" (p. 3) to explore how gender identity shapes communication behaviors and interactions. From this perspective, gender differences in communication styles are learned, but rooted in biological sex and the assumption that males and females are essentially different. Ashcraft & Mumby point to research on men's and women's different leadership styles (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Johnson, 1990) as an example of a frame one approach.

In keeping a focus on micro-level interactions, the second frame considers how micro-discursive practices maintain or disrupted performances of identity. This second frame points to the "unfolding process of mundane interaction, *not* to the entrenched dispositions people bring to that process" (p. 9). Thus, the difference

between the first and second frames lies in the assumption of gender difference in the first frame and the agency of the individual to reproduce or resist those assumptions in the second frame. Examples of the "ongoing and interactive effort to secure elusive gender identities through discourse" (p. 10) that characterize frame two include that highlight the (re)production and resistance of gender in organization through talk and practice (Edley, 2000; Kondo, 1999; Trethewey, 1999, 2001; West & Zimmerman, 1987).

In the third frame, the processes of organizing are foregrounded to consider how the organization is "a dynamic entity that actively (en)genders subjects" (p. 13). In other words, the third frame demonstrates the implications of how we organize to shape individuals' lives in a gendered way. Acker's (1990) explanation of the organization as an inherently gendered phenomenon and Mumby & Putnam's (1992) proposition of bounded emotionality as a response to the assumed rationalization of the organization are examples of frame three research.

Finally, the fourth frame moves outside the wall of the organization to consider how social discourses organize identity in other contexts. Instead of the organization as the site where gendered identities are constructed, frame four offers *organizing* as a process by which gendered identities are constructed in larger society. Media and popular culture become the site of organizing gender and point to "public discourse as it shapes available institutions" (p. 19). Examples of a frame four approach include Holmer Nadesan & Trethewey's (2000) analysis of self-help literature for discourses of professionalism for women and Ashcraft & Flores' (2003)

analysis of contemporary films for discourses regarding professional masculinity in crisis.

Ashcraft & Mumby's frames productively map onto various levels of discourse processes. This model helps move across the communicative processes through which identities are created at the micro-, meso- and macro-levels of discourse. Specifically, their model guides my explanation of the study of communication from each of the three levels of discourse: micro-discourses, meso-discourses, and macro-discourses. I take each level of discourse in turn, articulating the boundaries, providing examples of representative research and discuss the functions and contributions of each frame.

What these frameworks reveal is the complex and overlapping nature of a discursive approach as well as the limited understanding of the process of identity construction that comes with holding each level of discourse in isolation. As they operate to construct our social reality, each level of discourse is not independent or exclusive of the others, but deeply intertwined. In the following section I take examples from the organizational literature that contribute to the larger issue of organizational identity and demonstrate how each important and impactful piece of research is largely situated at one level of discourse – shedding light on one piece of the more complicated, larger puzzle of identity construction. The importance and impact of the findings is undeniable, and yet it becomes clear that the overwhelming majority of research is situated within one level of discourse. And this is no accident. The complexity of a multi-level discursive analysis challenges the resources typically available to scholars and the style in which we produce academic reports.

However, the daunting truth is that while each level of discourse provides important insight into the larger picture of why society is organized in particular ways, approaching a problem at only one level of discourse will have limited impact because discourses inform one another at every level. If our goal is to have an impact then we must consider the larger picture and begin theorizing in ways that account for the complex whole. This observation is not meant to diminish the quality or importance of these projects, but instead to emphasize the difficulty of conducting research that addresses all level of discourse simultaneously. And yet in order to develop theory and practice that is relevant and useful, we must begin to do more consider the ways discourse at one level is impacted and implicated at all levels of discourse. With that, I make an important contribution with this project to empirically demonstrate the ways that discourses of work operate at every level of discourse, interacting and overlapping to socialize youth into worker identities.

Thus, in the following project, I take the important step to engage in an empirical analysis where I consider the impact of discourse at every level. First, for the purposes of analysis I temporarily focus on each level of discourse (though it quickly becomes apparent how messy such a project can be) and provide tools for other researchers to do the same. I acknowledge that this is a messy and somewhat misleading step, but one that is necessary to engage in any type of rigorous discursive analysis. I articulate parameters and boundaries for analysis at each level with the understanding that in practice these boundaries are always and already overlapped and blurred. I consider the goals and contributions of research at each level of discourse, micro, meso and macro. Finally, I draw on work-life research as an

example of one discourse that permeates the organizational communication literature and employ it as an example illustrating how organizational research is most often conducted at one discursive level, but that in practice each level informs the others.

The work-life literature is timely and popular and is itself framed and bound by the larger organizational communication literature. Work-life research has become a lever of change and so it has been taken up but only in the context of the other organizational communication research that has been done. Thus, this literature in particular lends itself to making empirical connections across organizational research every level of discourse. And so, in order to articulate my own framework and approach, I cite examples of the work-life literature as one discourse that has have been taken up by organizational communication scholars. I consider each level of discourse in turn and argue that it is only when we consider each level as it works in conversation with the others that we may truly understand the complex issue of work-life, or any other organizational discourse.

Micro-discourses

Micro-discursive practices are the everyday performances that result from local and interactional accomplishment where language becomes a tool for organizing in particular ways. Fairhurst & Putnam (2004) demarcate discourse at the micro-level as discourse (with a lower case d) and define it as "the study of talk and text in social practice" (p.7). Micro-discourses occur in our daily talk and social practices and are primarily accomplished through interpersonal and social interaction. Ashcraft & Mumby (2004) explain that micro-discursive practices refer to the "unfolding processes of mundane interaction, *not* to the entrenched

dispositions people bring to that process" (p.9). The way individuals talk and negotiate meaning in their daily lives are performances and these performances form patterns of meaning which are constitutive of individual identity.

Micro-level analyses of discourses regarding work focus on the individual and interpersonal interactions regarding work. One such discourse, frequently drawn upon in the popular discourse as well as among scholarly investigations of work is the focus on meaningful work. Lair, Shenoy, McClellan & McGuire (2008) draw a distinction between meaningful work or "the culturally privileged qualities of work itself" and explain that this is often understood in terms of the way work is able to contribute to "Maslowian notions of self-actualization in work" (p. 173) and the meaning of work which refers to "the significance and/or purpose of work, as attributed by the worker herself or himself" (p. 173). And though, in the organizational communication literature the discussion of meaningful work is noticeably underdeveloped and limited in scope (Lair, Shenoy, McClellen & McGuire, 2008; Zorn & Townsley, 2008), the area of research points to an important micro-level approach to discourses about work

Another example of organizational research approaches the meaning of work from a micro-level approach by examining how individuals make meaning of their work as either jobs (primarily motivated by financial necessity), careers (characterized by status and achievement) or callings (where work is intrinsically motivating) (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler & Tipton, 1985; Schwartz, 1986, 1994; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin & Schwartz, 1997 and more recently Wrzesniewski, 2003) depending on the meaning that their work holds in their lives and as a part of

their identities. According to this line of research, a person who experiences their work as a job approaches work as a means to an end, a way to make money to support or enrich other areas of her/his life. Work can be described as a career when the individual is motivated by advancement within the role or organization. A person who relates to their work as a career will likely be motivated by the power, status and self-esteem that results from success in their work. Finally, a calling can be characterized by feeling an intense passion for and connection to the work that is done, despite the salary or status attached to the work. One who experiences their work as a calling understands work as an end in itself, rather than a means to other outcomes and resources. Even within one line of work (such as healthcare) or across a particular role (e.g. administrative assistants), all three categorizations are equally well represented, indicating perceptions of job, career and calling are unique to individual, rather than the occupation or role. This line of research, drawn from the positive organizational scholarship is not typically cited in the larger work-life literature, but provides an important micro-level approach to understanding how work is integrated into one's identity and other demands in one's life.

As scholars and policymakers become more engaged in the investigation of work, organizational scholars cannot help but acknowledge the influence of work in our non-work lives, and vice versa. With the realization that work and family are increasingly interconnected, comes research into the impact and outcomes for work, family on the individuals who occupy these roles. Research that considers the outcomes of worker identities typically takes a micro-discursive approach by focusing their research on the individual or interpersonal interactions that create

particular outcomes. The scholarly discussion of outcomes of this interconnectedness between work and family has, for the most part, pointed to negative experiences for individuals. Most commonly studied are effects including: spillover (Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton, 2000; Crouter, 1984; Krouse & Afifi, 2007; Roehling, Roehling, & Moen, 2001), compensation (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Champoux, 1978; Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1992), segmentation (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1992), resource drain (Eckenrode & Gore, 1990; Piotrkowski, 1979; Small & Riley, 1990; Staines, 1980; Tenbrunsel, Brett, Maoz, Stroh, & Reilly, 1995), congruence (Morf, 1989; Zedeck, 1992), and work-family conflict (Burke & Greenglass, 1987; Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Additionally, family is somewhat marginalized in such research as discourses of family occupy a secondary role relative to discourses of work.

Critics of the narrow view that the intersection of work and family can only be described as negative (including those involved in the positive psychology and positive organizational scholarship movements), point to other outcomes, such as positive spillover (Grzywacz, 2000, Grzywacz, Almeida & McDonald, 2002; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000a, b; Sumer & Knight, 2001), where the bleeding over of work and family actually play an improving or enhancing role in individuals' lives. Other positive outcomes including enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Rothbard, 2001), enhancement (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer & King, 2002), and facilitation (Frone, 2003; Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson, 2004) have all been the focus of recent research to expand the way that scholars understand the micro-level discourses of work and family on one another. In this line of research, the

interconnectedness of work and family positively impact individuals by generally enhancing one's overall wellbeing, by buffering individuals from negative occurrences in one realm or the other, or by transference of positive outcomes from one area to the other (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Finally, boundary theory (Ashforth, Kreiner & Fugate, 2000) and work-family border theory (Clark, 2000) are perhaps the most popular ways to account for how individuals experience the incorporation and movement between work and family identities and are two more examples of micro-level research regarding worker identities. Boundary theory, the broader of the two, accounts for the ways that individuals identify with multiple roles in their lives and transition among them (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nipper-Eng, 1996). Work-family border theory, limits the focus of multiple roles to those specific to work and family (Clark, 2000). Together, these theories point to the individual level strategies and outcomes of negotiating multiple roles and posit that both through integration and separation of work and family roles, individuals manage the tensions that arise from the increasing overlap of work and family demands.

The value in a micro-discursive frame is the way it clearly points to individual's daily lived experiences as both powerful producers and products of discourse. With such a perspective, the ways identities are constructed again and again through mundane interaction becomes evident. With everything we say, we are constantly positioning and repositioning ourselves as individuals in the world and constructing a plethora of functional identities (e.g. female, mother, student, friend, worker.) based on "situated social scripts to which we hold one another accountable"

(Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004, p. 12). Each small decision, whether conscious or not, requires us to make sense of the world in particular and meaningful ways and beg others to do the same. These accounts always serve to either reinforce or disrupt the dominant ideology. Additionally, a micro frame easily points to the ways that discourses serve as a resource that are simultaneously enabling and constraining. Think of how a parent's warning to find a job you love both provides the space for children to spend time searching for what they truly love (enabling), but also works as a sort of pressure not to take an ordinary or undesirable job (constraining). Micro-discourses provide tools for action as well as boundaries of available action.

Given this understanding of micro-discursive practices, I pose this research question:

> RQ_1: How do youth perform, describe and enact meanings of work in everyday micropractices? What do those meanings reveal about youth's the construction of current and future work(er) identities?

Meso-discourses

Construction of individual identity is more complex than simply the everyday talk and social practices in which individuals engage. Meso-level discourses operate at the organizational level to structure our day to day talk and exert a powerful influence on what discourse are even available for us to make sense of. Institutions and organizations (like school, work and church, to name a few) constitute our lived reality, and thus, "our senses of self are inevitably fashioned in the context of organizational memberships and the multiple, even competing collective identities they entail" (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004, p. 13).

Holstein & Gubrium (2000) explain that our lives are "continually mediated by the increasingly disciplined, institutionalized circumstances of contemporary life" (p. 153). Within organizations there are institutionalized rules and expectations that change the way individuals engage in talk. As organizational members we do not talk completely freely, without constraint. Rather, organizations enable us to talk about certain topics from a particular, organizationally defined, point of view. Organizations provide "a distinctive conversational environment – a set of methods and constraints – that circumstantially shape storytelling and self constructions" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000, p. 154). And in official organizational communication, such as educational materials and policies, we find an important and somewhat official source of information for individuals interacting in the world.

Organizational culture functions to both enable and constrain the way that individuals may act within the organization. Rather than acting as "a set of prescriptions or rules for interpretation and action," organizational culture functions instead as a resource or "constellation of more or less regularized, localized, ways of understanding and representing things and actions, of assigning meaning to lives" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000, p. 161). In some ways organizational culture acts as a sort of heuristic to quickly and easily assist individuals in making decisions about who they are and how they will act in the world. Holstein and Gubrium (2000) point to the importance of institutional talk as a resource in shaping our identities. As originally articulated by Drew and Heritage (1992), institutional talk is characterized by: 1) the way it is informed by organizational tasks and functions, 2) the constraints or restrictions on what counts as a relevant contribution to the conversation, and 3)

adherence to organizational frameworks and procedures. Institutional talk is in many ways shaped according to the local culture of the organization – the environment in which organizational members make meaning of events.

Holstein & Gubrium explain that each of us is driven by a desire for our identity not to be called into question; one easy way to avoid such questioning is to craft selves out of "the mundane resources proximately available to us" (p. 168). Official organizational communication serves as one such resource that is readily available and particularly influential as it has "a cultural mandate over and above what we would expect in less formal settings" (p. 167). Still, these meso-level discourses are but one of the myriad discourses that shape individual identity. While they may "incite particular interpretations and supply the vocabulary" for individuals, they "neither dictate nor determine" how individuals will engage with these discourses and incorporate them into their own constructions of self (p.162). For this reason, as organizational members draw on official organizational discourses, they simultaneously act on these discourses, shaping and transforming them as they put them into practice.

Examples of meso-level discourses about work include research on socialization into work as well as the institutionalized discourses that characterize the workplace. Kuhn (2006) argues that we cannot understand the process of identity construction simply by examining individuals' efforts, but equally highlights the role of the organization, specifically "the organizational and social discourses that proffer particular models of self in relation to work" (p. 1340). Kuhn offers an approach that considers both the organizational discourses, what he calls identity regulation and the

individual efforts or identity work to construct a coherent identity. In his focus on the organization, he takes a meso-level discursive approach and points to the importance of multiple levels of discourse to construct individual identity and social reality.

A great deal of empirical and theoretical work in organizational communication has examined the process by which individuals learn about and engage with organizational environments. Perhaps the most ubiquitous of these stage models, developed by Fredric Jablin (originally 1982 and revised in 1987, 2000), conceptualized organizational socialization as a three stage process. The first stage, anticipatory socialization, references the process whereby individuals form expectations about the job and consider what life might be like in a particular organization. In the second stage, organizational entry and assimilation, individuals engage in an overt process of meaning making as they begin to compare preconceptions about job expectations and environment with the reality they are faced with. Finally, the last stage is characterized by disengagement and eventually exit, which describes the process by which organizational members leave organizations. Though I will demonstrate through this project that socialization is actually a complex process undertaken at every level of discourse, Jablin's approach to organizational socialization is an example of a meso-level approach in the way that it focuses on the organization as a mediating force.

Recent organizational socialization research, extends beyond the task-related aspects of a job to other types of socialization such as emotional socialization (Scott & Myers, 2005; Way, 2012). This research points to the ways that new members

engage in their own proactive forms of socialization (Scott & Myers, 2005) as well as the role of incidental learning of implicit messages that indoctrinate new members into organizational norms and expectations (Way, forthcoming). Additionally, new developments in socialization research have shown that socializing messages from family about work are often ambiguous and contradictory, rather than straightforward and clear (Lucas, 2011). Finally, socialization researchers have called for revised articulations of the socialization process that incorporate the ways established and new organizational members exert "reciprocal, albeit asymmetrical, influence over one another into the process of organizational socialization" (Scott & Myers, 2010, p. 80). Each of these more recent examples of organizational research are also examples of meso-level approaches to organizational research in that they explore the context of institutions of work, family as well as community organizations as sites of discourse. Though they are not strictly work-life research, they serve to inform the work-life discussion by considering the role of organizations and families in the construction of worker identities and expectations.

In the same way that work is constructed through discourse, so too is family. Research and theory that attempt to define family or come to know how it has meaning is another example of meso-level organizational research, which is obviously drawn upon and implicated in the work-life discourse as well. Throughout society, and organizational policy and practice, we face difficulty in defining how exactly a family is defined. This difficulty certainly points to the contextual notion of family as an accomplishment that is constantly in flux. While conventional notions of family refer to it as a real and static thing, social constructionist scholars challenge

us to take a discursive approach to challenge this static and functional view of families (Holstein & Gubrium, 1999). A meso-level discursive approach allows us to see the ways that family is not something that exists independently of practice; family, like organizing, is not something that *is*, it is something that is *done*. Holstein & Gubrium explain, "The objective is to understand *how* family meanings are assembled and *used* in any site or social location, and *how* this situated process of interpretation gets transmuted into concrete domestic life" (p. 5). By taking such an approach, we can focus on the ways that family is done differently across different social contexts and cultures and how these different ways of responding and assigning meaning also shape other discourses such as those around work.

Finally, in the previous section, I included boundary theory and work-family border theory as examples of micro-level discourses because of their focus on individual and interpersonal strategies for boundary or border crossing, the mundane daily accomplishments that allow individuals to enact multiple roles. While the individual and interpersonal approach to role transitions does illustrate a micro-level approach, such theories provide an important space to acknowledge the messiness of a discursive analysis. The work and family contexts in which these individual negotiations take place – the sites that create such boundaries – are meso-level discursive constructions.

Meso-discursive practices are valuable in the way they illuminate the highly contextualized nature of discourse. This discursive frame points to a physical site where work and its attendant identity construction is carried out. In these physical sites, we are able to observe the ways that discourses come to have material

consequences and outcomes for organizational members, some of whom benefit from particular institutionalized discourse and others who are left at a disadvantage or even whose voices are rendered silent. Through this process of privileging certain narratives while marginalizing others, discourses serve to construct certain types of persons and "among its chief 'products' are ideologies that normalize particular relations of power" (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004, p. 17). From discourses emerge constructions of leader, follower, worker, entrepreneur, mother, just to name a few, all which bring with them a specific value and place in the hierarchical order. The value of a meso-discursive frame is in the way it highlights discourse as the reason for such distinctions, rather than some natural human order. In this way, understanding of organizations moves from an *a priori* explanation of organizational structure, to a view of discourse as organizing (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004).

Like micro-discourses, meso-level discourses are also simultaneously producers and products of social reality. Organizational discourses are indicative of the taken-for-granted assumptions or the existing social order that is reproduced through communication. Through repeated social practice we begin to see how discourses become sedimented and instituted as organizational practice or official organizational policy. But meso-level discourses are not fixed; they change over time, if slowly. Finally, meso-discursive practices are useful in the way they show the limited utility of individual or organizational efforts at change until larger ideological structures are first disrupted.

With an eye toward meso-level discourse, my second research question asks:

RQ_2: How do meso-level discourses serve as resources for youth to form expectations about work in the construction of work(er) identities?

Macro-discourses

Finally, macro-level discourse refers to larger, historically situated social accomplishments that come to constitute human subjectivity. This broader sense of discourse (distinguished by Fairhurst & Putnam as Discourse with a capital "D"), references "general and enduring systems of thought" (p. 7). In such a frame, the focus of our attention is no longer the organization as a physical location, but larger processes of organizing that occur through social norms and expectations. Ashcraft & Mumby explain a macro-discursive approach moves from a focus on communication *in* organizations to communication *about* organizations, as macro-discourses expose systems of representation, " which offer predictable, yet elastic, lucid yet contradictory images of possible subjectivities, relations among them, and attendant disciplinary practices" (p. 18). Though often the subject of critical examination, the influence of macro-discourses are easily overlooked by individuals in the process of daily interaction as their influence is most often exerted through the naturalization of the social world.

Macro-discourses about work include the acceptance of an ideal-worker norm, division of public and private spheres, and discourses of consumption and mananagerialism. In Western society the ideal worker norm convinces individuals "that serious professionals are dedicated to their careers, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, for periods of years and even decades at a stretch" (Drago, 2007, p. 8). The

norm of the ideal worker is based on a male worker (Acker, 1990) who is supported by a wife who will take care of domestic duties for little or no pay. In the absence of measureable deliverables, workers perform symbolic indicators of their fitness in order receive rewards such as pay and promotion. These performances of the ideal worker often involve a high degree of face time, sometimes at the expense of actual productivity.

Legal scholar Joan Williams (2000) critiques the ideal-worker norm explaining that women and caregivers also fall victim to our collective commitment to the identity of the ideal-worker. The ideal-worker norm only places value on paid work, erasing the work that (typically) women do as caregivers, which systematically excludes them from the performance of an ideal worker. Because women do not typically "enjoy access to a flow of family work from a spouse" that men do, women are systematically eliminated from systems that rely on the performance of ideal worker through symbolic enactments such as face time (Williams, 2000, p. 66). And yet, with the rise of feminism, work is often sold as a form of liberation for women from the ties that bind them to the domestic sphere (Freidan, 1963). This liberation into the world of work actually ends up costing women leisure time as they take on paid labor outside the home and then are held responsible for a "second shift" of domestic labor when they return home (Hochschild, 2003).

Managerialism is another such macro-level discourse that has given rise to the performance of ideal worker and continues to dominate experiences of work. Managerialism privileges organizational discourses, such as efficiency, linearity (Tyler, 2004), rationalization, commitment and performativity (Costea, Crump & Amiridis,

2008) as hallmarks of not only good organizations, but good employees. Discourses of managerialism offer work, "as a particular form through which human 'selves' ought to express their inner potentialities" (Costea, Crump, Amiridis, 2008, p. 662). Drawing upon a discourse of managerialism, individuals increasingly value managerial goals (or those that benefit the organization) as hallmarks of success and work to shape their actions and identities according to such goals. Tyler (2004) claims that as individuals we have bought in to the idea that, "the conflation of self and career" is desirable and as such are willing to organize nearly every aspect of our lives (both inside and outside the organization) around managerial goals.

In combination with discourses of managerialism, are discourses of entrepreneurialism popularized by the ideals of individualism, meritocracy and opportunity that shape our notions of the American Dream. Entrepreneurialist discourses function to place the individual as "the locus of her own problems and solutions" (Trethewey, 2001, p. 184). Discourses of entrepreneurialism function such that, "distinctions between production and consumption, between the 'inside' and 'outside' of formal organizations and crucially, between 'work-' and 'non-work-based' identities are progressively blurred" (du Gay & Salaman, 1992, p. 629). Individuals become the source of their own disciplinary regimes and internal states of being are colonized by the organization.

Deetz (1992) argues that more important than the completion of work tasks, is the performance of that "entails a set of routine practices, real structures of rewards, and a code of representation. It is a way of doing and being in corporations that partially structures all groups and conflicts with, and at times suppresses, each

group's other modes of thinking" (p. 222). Acknowledgement of the importance of such macro-level discourses in the construction of worker identity has led organizational scholars to debate the authenticity of the selves performed by individuals when in the context of an organizational role. But Tracy & Trethewey (2005) argue that constructing organizational performances as real or fake actually serve the organization by positioning power and control as internalized by organizational members, rather than enacted through more formal power structures. Instead, they offer the metaphor of a "crystallized self" as a way to account for the performances of worker while creating a different and more agentic relationship to the multiple identity roles individuals enact (p. 186).

The burgeoning field of critical management studies (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992) as well as critical organizational scholars (Grey, 1999; Parker, 2002), offer compelling critiques of managerialist discourses, arguing for the dangers of managerialism as an "increasingly universal framework for negotiating the myriad human experiences and interactions" (Hancock & Tyler, 2004, p. 621). The following research demonstrates how these discourses specifically function as a resource for young people working to construct a worker identity. I consider the ways in which these discourses offer potential issues and solutions for workers and how they structure workers discourse about what counts as good work. Together, managerialism and entrepreneurialism, "[provide] us a seemingly real story to tell [and]…constrains alternative explanations or narratives" (Trethewey, 2001, p. 187). Essentially, these discourses work together to shape organizational reality in a narrow way that seems natural and unavoidable.

The consequence, when workers are measured by their performance of work (based on face time) rather than actual productivity, is that efficiency never pays off and thus workers are never rewarded with leisure time (Schor, 1991). Sociologist Juliet Schor (1991) explains that capitalism encourages the acquisition of material goods at the expense of leisure or non-productive time. As work and workers have become more efficient, we have made a conscious choice in our society to make use of that efficiency by accruing material wealth, rather than buying ourselves more leisure time. We work harder in this day and age so that we can produce (and ultimately consume) more, rather than working harder to maximize efficiency and reduce the amount of time we spend at work.

I return to family, an example I took up as a meso-level discourse. Parsing out each of these levels as if they exist independently of the others proves problematic. In the previous section I drew on "family" as an example of a meso-level discursive approach. And though I feel strongly about my characterization of this line of research as a meso-level approach to organizational studies, family is of course implicated by macro-level discourses such as consumption. In many ways, family as a discursive accomplishment is largely constructed according to social class. Scholars point to different "cultural logics" of family such as the "concerted cultivation" of middle class families and "the accomplishments of natural growth" approach seen in working class families, as reflective of the particular social class to which they belong (Lareau, 2002). Each of these cultural logics is rooted in different patterns of consumption which distinguish middle and working class families.

Part of the reason for the importance of consumption as a way of doing family can be attributed to new marketing approaches that place children's consumptive practices as important elements of family development (Cook, 2000). Cook points to the marketing of good to parents as important tools for child development and the marketing of goods directly to children as consumers, as two important methods constructing the family relationship through consumption. And through the process of consumption, social class identification and attendant notions of family are reproduced (Griffith & Smith, 2005; Lareau, 2002; Vincent & Ball, 2007). Middle class children learn particular practices of consumption, such as investing large amounts of temporal and financial resources into their development (Lareau, 2002) and then strive for and engage in the practices in ways that reposition them as middle class, while the same can be said for children in both working class and more affluent families.

Perhaps the most exciting outcome of a macro-discursive approach is the way it has extended the scope and influence of organizational communication from the physical organization to other social institutions. Macro-discursive analyses are important for the way they reveal how discourses (which are merely social constructions) become naturalized and taken for granted in a society, influencing the way we live and what we value. Additionally, the contextual nature of macro-discourses illustrates how social norms change over time. Though change might be slow, the way we define and value phenomena is constantly shifting and macro-discourses can document and account for such shifts.

A focus on macro-discursive practices allows us to consider what is valued in a society (and thus what is not valued). And yet, while attention to macro-discourses, affords scholars the opportunity to explore what is valued and not valued, our analyses often fail to account for and even marginalize the non-dominant voices or perspectives in a society. Discussions of macro-discourses that serve as "a textual guide that directs the formation of identities and organizational forms" (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004, p. 18) are typically limited to those that structure and inform the lives and identities of dominant voices (such as white, middle class, and often male perspectives). When other experiences are considered, perspectives are often only extended to white, middle class women's experiences and never consider the larger discourse that structure the lives of those individuals who do not fit this narrow conceptualization of US or western culture. Though this is a major critique of existing literature, it is also an opportunity for more nuanced and more interesting discursive analyses.

Such an understanding of macro-level discourses informs my final research question:

> RQ_3: What macro-level discourses inform youth's conceptions of work? What is the impact of these discourses on their construction of work(er) identities?

The goal of this research is to gain an understanding of how youth conceive of work and what resources guide the construction of their identities as workers. As organizational scholars, we tend to limit our research to adult organizational members, but young people are also organizational members and often the targets of

explicit programs to assist in the process of identity construction. Because adolescence marks a specific time in young people's lives when they are actively engaged in the process of identity exploration and construction (Marcia, 1994), research on children and young adults may reveal important information regarding expectations about what it means to do work and constructing worker identities prior to engaging in paid labor.

Additionally, it is important to consider the expectations and lived experiences of a range of youth as they engage in the process of identity construction. I anticipate that different elements of youth's identities (such as gender, social class, and family structure) would impact their understandings of work and expectations for what it means to be a worker. This research takes into account a greater range of voices than is typical in current organizational communication scholarship by considering a diverse range of participants from various socioeconomic and family circumstances, a perspective that is needed to advance organizational communication research (Jones, et al. 2004; Way, 2012).

Finally, I engage in this research project as an example of a multi-level empirical discursive analysis to demonstrate how discourses are constructed and operate at every level simultaneously. Any discussion of how to understand or change current structures must attend to all levels and how they interact. Thus, I pose a final research question to interrogate the complex nature of discourse that can only be fully understood by considering how each level is informed and impacted by the others.

RQ_4: How does a multi-level discursive approach inform the process of worker identity construction for youth?

For the purposes of any analysis, my discussion will pull apart each level (temporarily) to examine the processes operating and then return to a final discussion of how they all overlap and intersect and finally must be researched and theorized together as a whole. In order to productively engage with each level of discourse, it is to some extent necessary and yet not sufficient to parse out each level of discourse. As such each analysis chapter focuses on one level of discourse that when read together tell a more complete story of the role of discourse in the process of youth's identity construction around work.

Chapter 3

METHODS

For the purposes of addressing the above research questions, I engaged in a qualitative discursive analysis of communication about work and the process of constructing worker identities directed at youth. A qualitative approach is particularly useful for gathering complex data and accounting for the intricacies and even contradictions (Tracy, forthcoming) in the process of identity construction.

Organization and Participants

My research is first and foremost an interview study with youth, ages 12 to 21, participating in a worker apprentice program, called the Youth Leaders (YL) program, run through the Youth Outreach Club (YOC). In addition to interview data, I have spent time observing the program, and sometimes participating, as it was implemented at each site. Thus, while my research does not claim to be an ethnography of this worker preparation program, the program does serve as an important context for priming participants about work and situating my conversations with participants.

Organization

The context for the interviews is YOC, a national non-profit organization explicitly dedicated to the prosocial development of youth "by instilling a sense of competence, usefulness, belonging and influence." According to their website, the mission of YOC is work with young people to mature and develop in ways that allow them to reach their full potential as community members. As part of the overall goal of providing a safe and educational environment for youth development, YOC

organizes programming around five major areas, including "education and career," all with the goal of having a positive influence on youth's futures. It is this mission of preparing youth for successful futures combined with their explicit focus on careers as one important avenue for such intervention that make YOC an important context for my research.

Two of the programs offered by YOC that are geared toward educating and preparing members as future workers are the Youth Leaders program (YL) and the Job Skills programs, designed for career exploration and experience. The YL program is essentially an apprentice or junior staff program where club members volunteer approximately 40 hours a week with the club, serving as assistants to staff members running summer camp and other regular programs. Though YLs are technically volunteers, in that they are not paid for the work they perform, YLs perform many of the same jobs as paid staff members and once committed to the program they are given shift schedules and expected to be on time and participate as a normal staff member would be. Aside from the benefit of work experience that can be listed on a resume, at many clubs YL's normal camp fees for spending their summers at the club are waived. YLs actually serve as important resources for the clubs, as they provide assistance to the club's programs at no cost to the club. At nearly every club, members must go through an application process which typically includes the completion of an application as well as a face-to-face interview with club staff. However, the number of members accepted into the program is most often determined by staffing and availability of resources.

As YLs, club members have a set schedule for when they must be at the club, along with a dress code and a specific assignment of how and where they spend their time. YLs are assigned to different tasks (e.g. setting up/breaking down breakfast or lunch or helping out in the gym) or to different groups (e.g. young kids) and often rotate assignments through the course of the program. Though the basic tasks required of YLs are the same across the program, there is quite a bit of variability otherwise from one club to the next. For example, YL programs differ in whether or not the YL program is competitive or open to anyone who wishes to participate. What is common across every club in which I participated was for YLs to serve in the program for two or three years and eventually be hired at the club as staff members.

The second program which served as an important context for the participants in my research is the Job Skills program. Sponsored by Gap Inc. since 2002, the Job Skills program is intended to be presented to members in the form of "22 competency based, small group activities," organized into four units including: goal setting, career exploration, job search skills, and keeping the job. The program was originally developed based on 1992 recommendations from the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS), an outgrowth of the Department of Labor. These recommendations "emphasize the development of skills, knowledge and attitudes that prepare future workers to obtain employment and succeed in a job". Table 1 outlines the specific skills identified by the SCANS report and addressed in the Job Skills curriculum "for meaningful and productive work in today's labor market."

Table 1. Skills and Desired Outcomes of Job Skills Program

Job Skills Program Goals and Outcomes	
Skills identified by Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS)	- Making career decisions - Using labor market information - Preparing resumes - Filling out applications - Interviewing - Completing tasks effectively - Being consistently punctual - Maintaining regular attendance - Demonstrating positive attitudes and behaviors - Presenting appropriate appearance - Exhibiting good interpersonal relations
Anticipated Outcomes	- Greater interest and appreciation for the world of work - Knowledge of careers and the role of education in success - Development of career goals - Knowledge of how to conduct college searches, find financial aid - Knowledge of how to find a job, complete an application and resume, development of interviewing skills - Begin to apply for jobs, develop appropriate work habits - Begin the college application process

The Job Skills program is designed as a once a week class where teens come together with their Teen Advisor, a member of the YOC staff whose job is teen programming, to work through lessons and activities that prepare them for their entry into the world of work. Along with group discussions, teens complete short activities that are intended to prepare them for the process of getting a job and expectations for keeping a job. In conducting my research across eight local clubs, I quickly learned that the Job Skills program is run quite differently from one club to the next, when it is formally run at all. Not one of the eight sites ran the program on

a regular schedule following the program materials exactly as they are designed. For some, the program was loosely implemented, covering some lessons and combining others, while for others the lessons were a place from which to start the program, but fell by the wayside once the summer activities got busy.

The Job Skills program is sometimes offered as part of the YL program, as it was at each of the clubs where I conducted my research. YOC clubs across the U.S. apply for funding, specifically to implement the Job Skills program. If the club is awarded a grant for the Job Skills program, the club must offer the Job Skills program and conduct pre- and post-test assessments to measure the outcomes. To my knowledge, only one of the clubs was being funded to run the Job Skills program at the time of my research – and even this club did not strictly adhere to program guidelines. YOC reports that in 2009, more than 54,400 teens participated in the Job Skills program in 1,450 clubs.

Participants

YOC reports that in 2009 it served 4.2 million young people through its programming and outreach at over 4,000 clubs throughout the United States. According to their 2009 Annual Report, the demographics of the youth served by YOC are as follows, though the makeup of each individual club varies by the community in which it is located: 65% are from minority families, 44% are 6-10 years old, 19% are 11-12 years old, 20% are 13-15 years old, 11% are 16-18 years old, 55% are male and 45% are female. Locally, there are three YOC chapters, each of which has between nine and 14 clubs.

One major critique of the existing work-life research is its focus on a narrow sample of individuals of the similar race, class, level of education, who all seem to share similar work-life issues (Özbilgin, Beauregard, Tatli & Bell, 2011). But our theorizing about work life becomes more complex and interesting when we consider the diversity of work-life issues that impact people's lives. Specifically, it was my intention to gather interview data from youth from a range of socio-economic statuses, ethnicities, and family backgrounds. Investigating how work(er) identities are constructed across such a range of family circumstances, provides an opportunity for more complex narratives about what it means to do work in our society. "It is in fact a strength of the interview conversation to capture the multitude of subjects' views of a theme and to picture a manifold and controversial human world" (Kvale, 1996, p.7). But it is only possible to capture a multitude of views by considering a range of subjects with vary subject positions. This is not to say that all middle class or professional people are the same, but instead to say that if we want to theorize in complicated ways, we must begin to complicate the picture, starting with the sample that is the focus of our research.

A key feature of my research was to gather data from a diverse range of individuals. My desire for a diverse group was an important factor in selecting YOC as a site for my research. The participants in my research were from a variety of ethnic and family backgrounds. Though I never directly asked, for fear of making them uncomfortable; I observed the members and made a guess about their ethnicity. Based on my own observations, the approximate ethnic breakdown is as follows: 2% Asian, 16% Black, 37% Hispanic, 10% Native American, and 35%

White (though participants might very well have identified themselves differently if asked directly). I was able to collect limited demographic information throughout the course of the interview by asking participants who they live with, their parents' level of education, and parents' occupation.

Technically the YL and Job Skills programs, which served as the context for my interview research, are designed for club members age 12-18, but after observing a number of local clubs, I soon realized that each program is implemented based on the needs of each individual club. Thus, while most of the YLs did fall within the 12 -18 year old range, exceptions were made with individual members or with entire clubs that had an arrangement with the local community. In collecting interview participants, I extended invitations for interviews to anyone participating in one of these two programs and as a result the participants in my research ranged from 12 to 21 years old.

Data Collection

Interviews

Formal interviews make up the largest segment of my data set. Interviews lend themselves to a discursive analysis by allowing one to "draw out the individual, interpersonal, or cultural logics that people employ in their communicative performances" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 174) and emphasizing the "constructive nature of knowledge created through interaction" (Kvale, 1996, p. 11). "Interviews, therefore, can be variously read as a source of information about individual and organizational sense-making as well as a stimulus for identity work" (Alvesson, et al.,

2008). Through interviews, participants have directly contributed to the process of meaning making about work by explaining the intentions behind their practices.

Over the three months of data collection, I conducted 49 semi structured respondent interviews with members of YOC participating in the YL and Job Skills programs in order to explore the ways that they construct the role of work in their lives. At each club where I collected data, I first approached the Teen Advisor as a gate keeper about conducting interviews with the members. Obtaining the Teen Advisor's permission was never a problem; in fact most were excited to have me conduct the interviews and said that it would be valuable to the members. Though I explained (both to the Teen Advisors and the members) that the interviews were completely voluntary, the Teen Advisors always strongly encouraged the YLs to participate in the interviews. At each club I was invited to take a few minutes in their weekly meetings to introduce myself and explain my research before asking the members if they would like to participate by doing a one-on- one interview. At each club I gave every member involved in the YL or Job Skills program a consent form and explained that they needed permission from a parent or guardian before participating. I also explained that if they were not interested in participating in an interview it was not required and it would not impact their participation in the YL and Job Skills programs. I interviewed every member who expressed interest and returned a consent form. There were three or four individuals who returned a consent form, but dropped out of the program before I could schedule an interview and one individual who returned a consent form indicating his willingness to participate, but refused to participate after several attempts on my part.

Respondent interviews are useful in eliciting open-ended responses, "to understand the interpretations that people attribute to their motivations to act," in this case, regarding work (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 178). Interviews ranged from 28 to 86 minutes long, with an average of 58 minutes. Through these interviews, participants helped me to understand their constructions of work by explaining how they understand work in their lives, what counts as work, and what they anticipate their lives as adult workers will be like (for a complete list of questions, see Appendix 1). Sample questions included why their family member work and "grand tour" question about what a normal work day looks like for them as participants in the YL program (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Since youth may not have much (or any) work experience of their own, and one of the most influential sources of information about work are the experiences of their families, I asked them about those experiences through questions like "What type of job does your mom/dad/grandmother/aunt have?" "Why does s/he work?" and "Do you think you will have a similar job? Why or Why not?"

In addition to general questions about work, I also asked youth to directly reflect on the Job Skills and YL programs. I asked their motivation for participating in the program(s), what skills they have learned that will help them as adult workers, how their work experience as an YL has been different than they anticipated and how this program has impacted the way they think about work.

Interviews provide a unique space for meaning creation as over time and through talk they allow participants to be reflexive about situations or meanings that are often taken for granted. Given this direct questioning about the meaning of

work, something many participants have never before considered, I suspect that through the process of an interview, participants themselves may find themselves in a process of ongoing revision about the ways that they conceptualize work (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

Youth Characterizations of Work. The final piece of the interview was to ask each participant to complete a Youth Characterizations of Work (YCW) instrument comprised of three activities including an assessment of evaluating tasks as work, sentence completion regarding goals/expectations for work, and two tables asking them to prioritize work and other activities in their lives. The YCW instrument was designed specifically for this project with the idea that younger participants may have shorter attention spans and respond more positively when they have a variety of tasks as well as a space to think on their own time without the pressure of a direct question and response format of an interview setting. I found that when participants were tiring of the questions I had for them, the instrument worked well to redirect their attention and signal that our interview was nearly over. I knew that my sample would include youth of quite a wide range of ages (12 to 21) and needed to create a resource that would work equally well for every participant. Each of the three activities is meant to bridge participants' micro-discourses with prevailing macro-level discourses as they are asked to account for the meaning and value of work. The activities are yet another source of data exploring youth's process of making sense of around work-life issues raised in RQ_3.

Participants were given as much time as they needed to complete the YCW instrument on their own; on average it took participants approximately nine minutes

to complete. When originally crafting the YCW instrument, I thought the instrument could perhaps stand on their own and be completed in a large group setting or in participants' own time, in the case that a one-on-one interview was not possible. Though, this may still be an option for how the instrument might function as a data source, I found I had plenty of time to incorporate the instrument into the one-on-one interviews where they served as a prompt for further discussion. Once participants indicated that they had completed the instrument on their own, we continued the interview by going over their written responses together. Though this is not an absolutely necessary step, I found that our review of their answers served to clarify any confusion in the instructions as well as allow them to work through more nuanced responses. In many cases, by talking through their answers, participants changed their responses from what they had originally indicated or a talked through a more conditional response.

The first activity consisted of a table with a list of 17 activities that individuals might engage in (such as physical labor, intellectual labor, care work, entrepreneurial pursuits, community involvement, volunteering, and leisure activities), to consider whether or not participants consider each activity as a type of work. This activity was designed to force participants to make a choice about what they consider work or not in a Likert-type answer format. Paired with their explanations, participants selected "always," "sometimes," or "never", this activity revealed macro-discourses about gender, work and public versus private spheres. Additionally, it allowed in very real and concrete way that seemed more accessible to youth than just a general question about what counts as work. Witnessing their

process of considering specific tasks that they or others in their lives are already doing, allowed me to access the assumptions and values that inform their meaning making about work.

The second exercise entailed a list of eight sentence completion type questions to access what youth see as the key features of work. Examples include, "When choosing a job, the most important thing to consider is …," "In order to get the job I want, I will have to…", "I would never work at a job that required…", and "I will be happy with any job as long as…". This section was designed to examine participants' micro-discursive practices as it provided space for them to explicitly articulate their expectations for their own work lives. This section was designed with the specific goal of having comparable answers across participants. Providing participants with the same "stem" allows for comparison across participants, while the openness of the question allows for a number of interpretations which highlight the differences in participants' discursive resources.

Finally, for the third exercise, participants were asked to complete two additional tables – each containing the very same list of 11 general commitments or obligations including: caring for family, church or community, commuting, eating, exercising, house/yard work, playing/leisure, relaxing, sleeping, volunteering, and working. Participants were first asked to consider a normal work day and rank their top three priorities among the options listed. In the second table, participants were asked to consider a normal non-work day and again list their top three priorities. The original idea for this activity was for participants to list in greater detail how they anticipated spending their 168 hours a week, breaking it down by activity, but based

on participants' response to a similar activity in the Job Skills curriculum I determined this to be too difficult for some of the younger participants. Rather than having participants get caught up in calculating the number of hours spent on particular tasks, I felt that ranking their top three priorities captured similar data that was less confusing and just as meaningful. This activity was designed to access participants thinking about work-life issues and consider the place of work as one element in their lives.

The YCW instrument proved to be a useful qualitative resource for interviewing quite a diverse sample of youth. The instrument did not appear to be either overly complex or simplistic for participants of any age and the open ended nature allowed for a wide variety of responses and applications. Qualitative researchers do not often draw upon standardized activities or short answer instruments like the YCW instrument described here. But my experience with the YCW instrument demonstrates the utility of such a tool for interviewing youth as well as the nuances that can be captured through a standardized short answer format, when followed up in the appropriate way. Such an instrument may be useful for both researchers and practitioners working with youth in regard to work and could easily be adapted for adults or other investigations assessing participants' future expectations in any area of their life or identities.

The major limitation to the instrument was some lack of clarity in instructions for the first and third activities. It seemed that a number of participants had some confusion about the first task which was to indicate for each activity whether it "always, "sometimes," or "never" would be considered work. In some

cases, during our review of their answers, participants would indicate to me that they interpreted the instructions as asking for something different (perhaps how often they engage in each task), which may have resulted from their failure to read the instructions, rather than any confusion in the instructions. In the third exercise, though participants were instructed to only indicate their top three priorities (of the 11 listed) there were a few that ranked every activity listed. Again, through the open ended review of their answers, participants were given the opportunity to reconsider their answers given the correct explanation of the activity. In either case, this will need to be revised in subsequent implementations to provide a more intuitive process. Still, the YCW instrument provided useful data for comparison and is a significant methodological contribution of this research.

Observing YOC

A second element of my data collection involved the direct observation of the Job Skills and YL programs carried out at YOC. As an observer of the program, I had not intended to directly participate in the implementation of the curriculum, but instead had the space to openly "adopt a stance of curiosity and openness to the unexpected" as well as direct "patient attention to the routine features of social interaction" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 133). For the most part, I was simply an observer, but there were times when the Teen Advisors running the program asked me if I would like to add to a particular discussion or times when I was directly asked to assist with a lesson. When asked if I had anything to add to the lessons, I typically thanked the leader and refrained from saying anything, but the instances in which I was asked to participate in the implementation of the overall program or take the

lead on a lesson, I always accepted. At one club, my participation was arranged during my negotiation for access to the site. In exchange for my observations of the program, the Teen Advisor at the club asked that I participate weekly as a guest judge for their competitions. At another club, my participation was much more impromptu. One day I showed up for my regular observation of the Job Skills lesson, the Club Director, who was temporarily filling in as Teen Advisor until a new one was hired, asked if I could help out as the activity for the day was for YLs to create resumes. After indicating that I would be glad to help, it became apparent that I was not helping, so much as running the entire lesson while the Club Director retreated to his office to take care of other business. In these cases it seemed as though my assistance was somewhat of a resource for the club staff and I was glad to be able to help out in any way I could as a demonstration of my gratitude for allowing me to conduct my research.

I used the time spent observing to take field notes and record my observations of the messages communicated by program staff and volunteers and the responses of the youth participating, but also included any feelings or notions I had as an outside observer. Kvale (1996) explains, "if the research topic concerns more implicit meanings and tacit understandings, like the taken-for-granted assumptions of a group or a culture, then participant observation and field studies of actual behavior supplemented by informal interviews may give more valid information" (Kvale, 1996, p. 104). While a great deal of insider knowledge can be gained from serving as a participant in the program under study, the benefit of

observing the program as an outsider is the detachment that comes with remaining outside of the organization.

Over the course of the summer, I collected data at eight local YOC clubs. All of the clubs where I collected data are a part of one chapter of the Youth Enrichment Organization of the East Valley chapter, except one, which was a part of another, neighboring chapter. It is important to note, however that these programs have extremely high turnover rates. No matter how many youth start off the summer participating, by the end of the summer, the rate of attrition is at least 30%, if not higher. In two of the clubs there was nearly 100% turnover from the first day of the program to the last.

Table 2. Summary of Data Collected

Type of Data	**Amount**
Interviews (average length 58 minutes)	49
Observation of Job Skills Program	50 hours
Job Skills Organizational Materials & Website	100+ pages

Analysis Procedures

My intention in examining a worker preparation program for youth was to access the explicit and organizationally sanctioned messages directly communicated about work as well as youth's sense making in relation to these messages. Though the Job Skills/YL programs are only one source of information available to youth about what a good worker is, how to prepare for work, and what is valued in today's workplace (among countless mediated messages, memorable messages from parents, and observation of individuals working in the world) it is an important source of information to examine because of the intentional and explicit nature of these

messages. Additionally, by interviewing participants directly about their experiences in the YL programs and their impressions about work in general, I was able to access youth's expectations about work and the impact of those expectations on their emerging worker identities. Though my project takes a largely emic approach (Tracy, forthcoming), I entered my research with anticipatory socialization (Jablin, 2000), work-life balance, work-life wellness, and identity work (Alvesson, Ashcraft & Thomas, 2008; Kuhn, 2006) as sensitizing concepts.

Discourse Tracing

A discursive approach has become a common analytical choice in communication, but without much consensus about what such an approach entails. As a response, LeGreco & Tracy (2009) outline a specific methodology, called discourse tracing, designed for the purposes of conducting a critical, discursive study of organizational texts, in order to answer Foucault's call "to consider the ways that discourse makes a practice appear routine and how it gives rise to possibilities for change" (p. 1519). While other frameworks such as post-structural or structurational approaches, can (and have) been used to conduct discursive analyses, the advantage of discourse tracing is in the way it articulates "a systematic data analysis process that is accessible and transparent" (p. 1519). From such an approach, one can gather data from any number of sources to conduct an analysis of discourse across micro-, meso- and macro-levels.

Discourse tracing follows a four phase approach that foregrounds the "formation, interpretation, and appropriation of discursive practices" in an organization (p. 1523). In the first phase, Research Design, researchers define a case

and review the relevant literature. The second phase, Data Management, consists of gathering data spanning the micro (talk), meso (organizational) and macro (social norms) levels of organizing and ordering it chronologically. In the third phase, Data Analysis, the researcher draws comparisons across time and context to consider the ways that organizational discourses are shaped and formed by the choices made at each analytical level. At this point the researcher writes a case study of the organization and its practices. The fourth and final stage, Evaluation, provides an opportunity for researchers to consider the implications of such a case and draw conclusions about the impact of this research on similar cases.

In the following project, I draw on elements of discourse tracing to engage in an analysis of interviews, and observations, which work together to inform an analysis spanning the micro-, meso-, and macro-levels of discourse that inform youth's constructions of worker identity. In the paragraphs below I articulate a framework for identifying each level of discourse in my own work, which I hope will serve as a useful extension to the discourse tracing approach and other discursive frameworks (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004) which eschew specific descriptions of the methodological moves and assumptions made in translating field research into analytical claims.

Complex Nature of a Discursive Approach

An initial extension of the discourse tracing approach I suggest is a move away from the focus on organizational change or rupture as a starting point for analysis. LeGreco & Tracy recommend discursive scholars begin with "significant events or changes that signal moments of discursive organization or reorganization"

(p.1524). While this is certainly a fruitful area for research, discursive approaches (and even discourse tracing) are not only useful for analysis of ruptures or organizational changes, but can simply account for the interaction among individuals, organizations and society. For example, I found the method useful to structure my analysis of discursive resources available to youth in the YL program across several sites, which had not undergone any recent change or rupture.

This small clarification aside, a methodological contribution of this research is to describe a specific methodology for identifying micro-, meso- and macro-level discourses and distinguishing them from one another in a novel way. Communication researchers have taken important steps to define each level of discourse (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004; Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004) and to articulate a methodology for conducting research within and across these frames (LeGreco & Tracy, 2009), but none of these important pieces have laid out specific guidelines for identifying micro-, meso- and macro-level discourses and defining the boundaries for the messy distinctions among them. Thus, in the analysis below, I attempt to clearly define a methodology for identifying each level of discourse for analysis. As a point of clarification, I reiterate that in practice, levels of discourse do not operate in a vacuum or separate from one another, but are highly dependent upon one another and deeply intertwined. A discursive analysis broken down by levels of discourses is somewhat arbitrary and messy at best. Having said that, I attempt to create a well-defined methodology for disentangling each level of discourse so that scholars can temporarily hold these levels separately for the purposes of analysis.

Micro-discursive Analysis

Micro-level discourses, generally defined by their use in daily talk and social practice, are local and fleeting constructions or performances. In order to locate micro-discourses in one's data researchers should look to instances of interpersonal interaction. Individuals' daily talk and mundane interactions with family, friends, colleagues, and even strangers are examples of micro-level discourses. As such, micro-level discourses can be located for analysis from two primary sources: observational and interview data.

Observational data is a rich source for locating micro-level discourses as researchers can observe interaction between participants, or as a participant observer, the researcher is often involved in the interaction itself. In the case of participant observation where the researcher is involved in the interaction, the words and actions of the researcher are also micro-discursive practices that position the researcher and serve as a resource for participants. Thus, analyzing discursive data as a participant observer requires a certain amount of self-reflexivity. Micro-discourses are the very process of meaning making in action, so answers to questions point to micro-discourses, as well as individuals' declarative statements and even silences or choices about not speaking up.

In addition to observational data, interviews also serve as a rich context for micro-discursive data. Simply by conversing with the researcher, participants engage in their own micro-discursive practices of constructing identities for themselves. In many cases, interviews provide an opportunity to come to know or form an opinion a subject which participants have not previously considered. Participants often draw

upon larger, social norms (or macro-level discourses) in their interpersonal interactions and by referencing them in micro-level talk, individuals either reinforce or resist macro-level discourses.

Micro-discourses can generally be identified by their fleeting nature – meaning that though these conversations and interactions may be referenced in later or future interactions, they are not formalized into policy or practice (and when they are, they become meso-level discourses) and so their existence is in the moment or in the memory of individuals. Thus, micro-level discourses are not institutionalized or given any broader discursive power beyond that of the individuals involved in the original instance of communication. Micro-discourses are easily mutable, meaning a person could (and people often do) alter their talk or practice from one moment to the next.

Meso-discursive Analysis

At first glance, meso-level texts appear to be the most clearly defined and most easily located elements of a discursive analysis. In their formulation of the discourse tracing method, LeGreco & Tracy (2009) identify meso-level texts as organizational policies which "connect practices across contexts" (p. 1526). In identifying data sources for meso-level texts, LeGreco and Tracy (2009), offer state and national level documented policies as examples of meso-level texts for analysis. Local or district level policies are not included as meso-level texts, but are grouped as part of the data for micro-level texts. This very distinction is where we begin to see just how messy a discursive analysis can truly be. I argue for a slightly different characterization of meso-level discourses, based on Holstein & Gubrium's (2000)

idea of "disciplined and institutionalized circumstances of contemporary life" (p. 153), described earlier in the paper. Thus, I describe a method for identifying meso-level discourses through either formal or informal policies and practices that serve to organize individuals.

One way to identify meso-level texts is by their documentation into formal, defined organizational policy, the standard LeGreco & Tracy have drawn upon. An easy way to locate these meso-level discourses is in locating what has been formally documented in the way of written bylaws, policy, curricula, training manuals or other practices such as guides or handbooks. But written guidelines are not the only way to identify meso-level texts. My case for an expanded understanding of meso-level texts also includes informal policies and practices that organize, but may not always be formally documented or even officially sanctioned. In this understanding of meso-discourses, family or organizational norms can act as meso-level discourses. For example, in the case of a family there may exist a strong norm or expectation that everyone wakes up for church on Sunday mornings or that the older children look after younger children when parents are gone. In an organization, there may be no formal policy for dressing down on Fridays, taking hour lunches or for requesting time off, but if there are tacit understandings about the acceptability of these behaviors, then these are also meso-level discourses. What's more is that there may actually be formal policies for dictating all of these behaviors, but informal practices and expectations may be what actually determines how the solutions are enacted (see Kirby & Krone, 2002 for example). Thus, these informal policies and practices serve as meso-level discourses that discipline individual behavior in important ways.

Expanding our understanding of what counts as meso begs the question, how does one identify informal policies and practices that constitute meso-level discourses? The answer may not be as simple or clean as limiting analyses to formal organizational policies, but certain guidelines are helpful. First, we must begin to think of meso-level discourses as patterned behavior defined by an identifiable level of authority. Authority can be the result of legitimate or formal power, such as rules, bylaws, regulations and guidelines, or it can result from more informal means such as consensus, coercion, or expertise. In this instance, authority simply recognizes some sort of barrier to doing otherwise, not that doing otherwise is impossible.

Macro-discursive Analysis

Despite the great deal of agreement among communication researchers in regard to what is meant by macro-discourse, this level of discourse is perhaps the most difficult to point to and analyze in qualitative data. Macro-level discourses which take the form of cultural norms are highly powerful sources of influence and yet they are most often taken-for-granted, complicating our ability to easily point to them. As LeGreco & Tracy (2009) note, in order to find them we must look to "the ideologies that are hidden in organizational discourses" (p. 1519). Often, artifacts from popular culture are data sources for macro-discourses – films, television shows, websites and trends are evidence are evidence of larger cultural norms, but qualitative scholars do not always collect this type of data.

More importantly, macro-discourses are (re)produced in our everyday talk and practices and it is important to articulate a method for locating and analyzing macro-discourses that impact our mundane daily behaviors and practices. Aside

from cultural artifacts, macro-level discourses can also be found in observational and interview data as well as organizational policies and practices. Here, we see an important overlap in micro-, meso-, and macro-level data, which necessitates the important clarification that one piece of data can serve as evidence for multiple levels of discourse. This point has perhaps been glossed over by other scholars, but it is a point worth making. Macro-level discourses can be drawn from interpersonal interaction as well as formal and informal policy and practice. This raises the question of how to distinguish among micro- and macro- or meso- and macro-levels of discourse.

In order to identify and conduct an analysis of macro-discourses, to distinguish between micro-, meso- and macro-level discourses, one must move beyond the surface level content and ask particular questions of the data. In any given conversation, text or practice, the answer to two questions can point to macro-discourses: "what is valued?" and "what is assumed?" Macro-discourses organize thinking; they can be the justification or the "why?" behind specific policies, practices and reasoning. For example, in the course of an interview when a young girl explains that when she has children she will have to begin cooking and cleaning and "doing motherly things" or when a young man says that he expects his wife will stay home to care for children, but that he never would, these are examples of micro-discursive practices. Similarly, an organization that readily grants maternity leave, but seldom grants paternity leave demonstrates meso-level discourses. And yet, by asking what is assumed in each of these statements or situations, or what is valued and why, we can access the macro-level discourses.

The overlap of micro-, meso-, and macro-discourses points to an important methodological clarification that bears repeating. As was previously discussed, making distinctions between micro-, meso- and macro-levels of discourse is somewhat artificial as these levels greatly overlap and influence one another. The nature of discourse is that it is simultaneously acting at every level to construct reality. Thus, separating the data by micro-, meso- and macro-level discourses is not only challenging, but somewhat misleading in the way it portrays each of these levels as separate. Still, clearly defined boundaries and techniques for locating each level of discourses is an important tool for clarifying a discursive methodology (see Table 1). While drawing on these distinctions to articulate a clear and replicable methodology, we must understand that each level of discourse works in conjunction with the others and that treating them as somewhat discrete entities is simply a tool for analysis. As a result, one piece of data (e.g. a conversation or an organizational policy) may serve as evidence for more than one level of discourse.

Table 3. Discursive Approach to Data Analysis

Level of Discourse	**Description**	**Data Collected/Analyzed**
Micro (discourses) Fairhurst & Putnam (2004)	• "The study of talk and text in social practice" (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004, p. 7). • A local and interactional accomplishment where the focus is on language as a tool for organizing in particular ways	• Interviews with youth • Observation of youth
Meso (organizational discourses) Holstein & Gubrium (2000)	• "A distinctive conversational environment – a set of methods and constraints – that circumstantially shapes storytelling and self constructions" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000, p. 154). • Institutionalized rules and expectations that change the way individuals engage in talk	• Job Skills Program Materials • Observation of Job Skills Program
Macro (Discourses) Fairhurst & Putnam (2004)	• "General and enduring systems of thought" (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004, p. 7) • Larger, historically situated social accomplishments that come to constitute human subjectivity	• Literature • Interviews with youth

Analysis of Findings

As interviews were transcribed and field notes collected, I began my analysis of the data with the help of NVivo qualitative analysis software, which is a system for organizing and sorting data and codes. The analytic process for this project began descriptive line by line coding of 15 interviews that were selected for requisite variety (Weick, 1976). I initially selected interviews for detailed coding based on their demographic differences, such as representation from all clubs, ethnic groups, males and females, ages, differences in parents' education and jobs, different goals for

future work, etc. In each section below, I break down my analytic methods specific to each chapter in order to provide insight into my process of analysis and transparency about my analytic procedures.

YL Program as Discursive Resource. From my initial contacts with each club, the differences in approach to the YL program became apparent – differences which showed up quite explicitly in the initial line by line coding. As a result, in a second phase of analysis, I moved to analytic coding, grouping constellations of descriptive codes into higher order themes based on the way each program was implemented. Examples of these higher order themes include: "external validation," "embodying club identity," "internal validation," and "ruptures in performance." In this second phase I returned to my field notes from each club, noting how staff and Teen Advisors differently talked about the program as well as my observations of each club. I immediately noticed that the majority of my observations for one club involved games and team challenges, whereas the observations at other clubs talk focused more on the completion of tasks and the rules for the program. For example at one club, talk about "winning" and "being fired" dominated whereas YLs at other clubs talked more about specific problems that day or fairness in the implementation of the rules.

For this chapter, a third phase of analysis was needed in order to move back from my field notes and participants' talk about the job requirements to the section of my interview that asked participants to talk about work more generally (not as they experienced it in the YL program). In moving away from participants' specific talk about the YL program to their talk about work, I began to see how participants'

experiences in these very different programs provided them with discursive resources to differently frame their talk about work in general.

Rather than highlighting the differences across each club individually, it became apparent that there were characteristics of clubs that could be organized into categories or "types." These defining characteristics centered on how the program was implemented as well as the discursive resources they provided YLs in terms of thinking about work. For example I attended to the ways that YLs described their jobs as well as how success was defined by YLs in each program. Because there were several clubs that aligned with one another in their basic approach to the program, it made sense for me to analyze these clubs in terms of a specific type, rather than by individual club.

Though the realization of similar approaches across clubs came quite easily, determining the characteristics and boundaries for each type was more challenging. My first inclination was to group clubs according to the socioeconomic status of the club members, based on participants' reports of their parents' work. Further analysis revealed that social class was just a superficial distinction that was hiding something else. I also thought that whether or not YLs were involved in weekly Job Skills classes was an important distinction across programs. To examine this, I made the Job Skills program an attribute in NVivo by which to compared participants responses regarding motivation for work and definitions of success. Upon further analysis, however, inclusion of the classes did not seem to change participants' micro-discursive practices. Participants seemed to take more from the practices of the club and the YL program than the explicit lessons that were taught. One club's

approach to training young workers, based largely on the popular television program, *The Apprentice,* was unique enough to garner its distinction as one "type" of club. The specificity of this approach and the impact it has on the way YLs talk make sense of work is too significant to ignore or lump with other approaches.

Discourses of Work and Family. The process of analysis for this theme started during the course of the interviews themselves. I was struck by the frequency with which participants responded to part three of the YCW instrument (see Appendix 2) by prioritizing "care for family" on both work and nonwork days and made an analytic memo about the importance of family to participants. Fifty seven percent of participants selected "care for family" as their number one priority on workdays and 59% selected it first for nonwork days, while 77% listed it as one of their top three priorities on workdays and 76% listed it in their top three priorities on a nonwork day.

After the first stage of descriptive coding, I began to realize that when asked about why their parents work, every single participant said in some way or another that their parents work to support their families. Thus, the second stage of analysis was in the focused, coding of the initial theme of "family" where I identified four main ways that participants talk about families in the context of work, including: family as giving meaning to work, family obligation as negating work, work as a way to bring meaning to family, and work as a way to spend time with family. In distilling participant's talk into these four areas, I became increasingly aware that participants were talking about work and family as conduits for one another.

Participants were not talking about crossing over from one activity to another, but instead about engaging in work or family because by doing work or family.

After organizing participant's talk about family into these four themes, I conducted a negative case analysis to test my hunch about the co-construction of work and family. I reread the transcripts and tried to consider the ways that children described working with their fathers was potentially not doing family, but just doing work. In re-reading and re-coding the transcripts, youth were obviously working with their fathers, but there was an additional element that went beyond the work. I could not find a way to justify that children were just working side by side with their fathers, instead of actually doing work as a way of doing family. One participant even commented that going to work with his father was his father's idea because they do not know each other very well. And another explained that going to work with her dad was the only time she was able to be alone with him. While I could separately code each of these incidents for work and for family, this left something out. I could not account for the unique ways that work actually allowed for family. And so I moved in to a third phase of analysis.

In this third stage, I wrote a draft, exploring each of the four ways that family was drawn upon, while pulling in data to support my analyses. Data were characterized as macro-level discourses by the degree to which they were indicative of larger assumptions about work, meso by the way they served as a guide for how work was carried out in everyday family and work practice, and micro in the ways that they pointed to a process of making sense of work that individuals engaged in through the course of the interview.

Early Work-Life Experiences. In the original descriptive phase of coding, I established a code called "work-life". In its initial form the "work-life" code marked participants talk about the work-life experiences of their parents, as well as how youth imagined their future work-life challenges – as this was a question I specifically asked them to consider.

In the second phase of coding, participants' explicit use of the word "balance", directed my attention to work-life negotiations as an analytic code that encapsulated more than youth's descriptions of their parents' experiences or their own imagined future experiences. With this in mind, I began to take note of instances where youth were already talking about their own experiences navigating family, work and other obligations, without my prompting. Much of what youth talked about fell into two primary themes – either caring for siblings and other family members or leisure (based on a question of mine about what their interests were outside of school and YOC), but other examples arose as well. I noticed that participants mentioned their volunteer work, school, and other jobs. The result of this second round of focused coding, was 11 subcodes that included: anticipating work-life future, care work, discourses of balance, exercise, housework/chores, leisure, parents' model of work-life negotiation, scheduling, spending time with family, volunteering/community, working as youth.

In a third phase, I returned to the entire dataset and coded all 49 interviews based on the11 work-life subcodes. This yielded important examples of youth's experiences with work-life negotiation, but I was unsure of how I might usefully combine these codes and/or sort them out for an analysis. In thinking about the

micro-, meso-, and macro-levels of discourse that were at play, it became obvious to me that while each level of discourse offers an important insight into this analysis, the most interesting and impactful part of this dataset is where participants engaged in some sort of thinking through or working out of their work-life negotiation and so this became the focus of the final chapter. It is in these spaces that we see the actual process of decision making that is influenced by and constitutive of multiple levels of discourse, and witnessing the process of discursive construction of work and life is the unique and important contribution this chapter makes.

Chapter 4

YL PROGRAM AS DISCURSIVE RESOURCE

This chapter examines the ways that the YL program serves as a discursive resource for the youth who participate. Other scholars who have done discursive analyses recognize that the organization is an important backdrop and feature of discursive analyses (e.g. Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004; Kuhn, 2006). Drawing on this rich tradition I begin with the organization as a useful and logical point of entry for my analysis. The organization is a unique space where micro-, meso-, and macro-level discourse come together to inform worker identities and the only place where I am able to collect data from each of these levels simultaneously. This space of the organization provides a way to access the intersecting discourses that influence participants' process of identity construction.

Through structured lessons or interpersonal interactions, the context of the work that participants do as YLs functions as an important way of learning to be a worker. This chapter shows that though the program is in many ways the same across the clubs, the differences in the way it is implemented create very different conditions under which participants learn to be workers. Thus, this chapter seeks to point to the differences across programs and illustrate the way they differently prepare youth to be workers. It is one example of the way that micro-, meso-, and macro-level discourses come together in the process of constructing a worker identity. In order to best illustrate the complexities of a multi-level discursive approach, I draw upon two "types" of club as case studies to illustrate how the YL program is implemented as a discursive resource for socializing youth into work.

Discursive Resources for Constructing Worker Identities

Summers are an extremely busy time for the clubs, when enrollment increases and youth who are not regular members of the club attend specifically for summer camp. Anyone who can pay the $20/day or $80/week fee is accepted into the summer camp. During the school year most clubs do not open until the afternoons when school lets out (around 2:00 or 3:00pm). In the summer clubs open by 7:00am and stay open all day and offer more structured programming throughout the day including art projects, movies, games, and even field trips. During the school year, activities at the club are more open and flexible with members able to come and go as they please, but because of the influx of youth in the summer daily activities become very structured. From 8:00 a.m. until 5:00p.m. campers move from one area to the next with the rest of their age group at scheduled times to participate in each of the day's activities.

At the majority of clubs I observed, the YL program typically involves some sort of tracking or points system to identify the top performing workers. Along with this distinction comes acknowledgement or recognition of these top performers weekly or biweekly or, for some clubs, at the end of the summer (see Table 4 for details). Typically the youth who have been identified as the top performing YLs are rewarded prizes at the end of the summer ranging from back to school shopping sprees, cash, and even guaranteed jobs at the club). Admittedly, the opportunities for prizes, introduces a small element of competition to the clubs that offer such prizes.

One immediate observation of the YL program across a number of clubs is the different forms the program takes from one club to the next. The flexibility of the program is a result of the combination of the needs of the club, the resources available, and to a large degree how the paid staff, particularly the Teen Advisor chooses to implement the program. Of course, this is no different from the way any policy or program is implemented in different organizations across the country, which depends on the knowledge and interpretation and participation of multiple stakeholders such as human resources departments, managers, and even coworkers (Kirby & Krone, 2002; LeGreco, 2012).

As a part of my analysis, described in detail in chapter three, I grouped the clubs I observed into three "types" based on the way they implemented the YL program. Worker Bees are defined by the role the YL program plays as free labor for clubs to help run their programs during the busiest time of year. Enrichment programs are those for whom the YL program is not as much of a resource for the club, but instead provides programming for teens in the club to gain work experience and knowledge. Finally, the Apprentice type of club is defined by the competition or game type of approach to the YL program. For the purposes of this analysis, I detail two types of club, the Worker Bees and the Apprentice, which as a result of their approach, create different discursive resources for the youth participating in the program (see Table 4 for a full overview of the characteristics of each club).

Table 4. Program Characteristics

Club	Job Skills	# of YLs	"Type" of program	YLs charged summer fees?	Recog-nition for Top Performers	Prize	Shift (hrs.)
1		30	Worker Bees	Yes	End of summer	Paid trip to amusement park	8
2		30	Worker Bees	Yes	Biweekly	$100	5-8
3	✓	15	Worker Bees	Yes	Biweekly	$100 back-to-school shopping spree	8
4	✓	10	Enrichment	Yes	No	N/A	3-5
5	✓	15	Worker Bees	Yes	Weekly	N/A	Min. 7
6	✓	10	Enrichment	No. YLs paid by comm. program	No	N/A	8
7		30	Apprentice	No	End of summer	Paid trip to amusement park & job as staff	6-8
8	✓	5	Worker Bees	Reduced $20/week	Weekly	$100	5

YL as a Discursive Resource

Given the YOC's goal of preparing youth for work, the talk and practices that come to constitute the program serve as an important resource for youth to make sense of their current work in the club and their future work as adults. How the program is communicated to youth either at a micro or meso-discursive level, serves to inform youth about what is expected of and valued in them as workers. Kuhn et al. (2008) explain that discursive resources function as "'tools' that guide interpretations of experience and shape the construction of preferred conceptions of

persons and groups" (p. 163). In this way, the YL program itself (no matter how it is implemented) serves as a resource for YLs to learn about work and construct worker identities. Through their participation in the program youth can familiarize themselves with meso- and macro-level discourses that come to constitute work.

Implementation of the YL Program

Admittedly, there are a number of ways the YL programs can be distinguished from one another or grouped for similarity. Among the more noticeable differences in programs are their size, the hours/shifts YLs work, the inclusion of the Job Skills curriculum, whether or not clubs track points or recognize top performers, and even if there is a hierarchical or flat structure to the YL positions. For the purposes of my analysis, I considered each of these differences and whether or not they seemed to have implications for the discursive resources available to YLs. Where differences became most consequential were in the conceptions of how the YL program would be structured (i.e. after a competition or after the structure of the club) and the purpose of the program to the club (i.e. whether program was designed for fun, for learning or for labor). Thus, the characteristics that became important for determining a particular type of program were the structure and function of the program.

The first type of program that informs this analysis is what I refer to as the "Worker Bees" type program where the youth who participate in the YL program are essentially used as free labor for the clubs during their summer camps. The purpose of the YL program is to benefit youth – to provide them some sort of preparation and experience for the world of work. Along with this experience, many

clubs choose to also provide the Job Skills program, which involves a more explicit approach, laying out specific lessons for youth about work. Specifically, the program claims to, "[build] essential skills in members ages 13 to 18 for exploring careers, making sound educational decisions and finding success in the world of work." The purpose of the lessons is to serve as a guide for youth who are learning about work with a program that "emphasizes the development of skills, knowledge and attitudes that prepare future workers to obtain employment and succeed in a job." While some clubs do teach the Job Skills program (or some loose interpretation of the program) along with the YL program, many do not.

For many clubs, the purpose of the YL program seems to be driven more by the needs of the club than the needs of its youth members. To varying degrees, the free labor supplied by the youth participating in the YL program has come to eclipse what benefits the YLs themselves might take from the program. Programs that I have classified as "worker bees" are those in which the primary function of the YL program is to provide support to the YOC staff during an especially busy time of year. This need for additional (unpaid) resources does not negate the benefits of participating in the YL program for youth. Youth are still engaged in work and learn about what it means to have a job and be a contributing member of an organization, as well as getting volunteer hours and references they can include on a resume or school application.

Being categorized as a Worker Bee program does not mean that clubs do not offer the Job Skills program – in fact many of them do, to varying degrees. Of the eight clubs where I conducted observations, five fall into the "Worker Bee" category,

three of which offered some form of the Job Skills program, typically in the form of structured lessons every few weeks. The topics of the lessons would align with one of the 24 lessons provided in the Job Skills curriculum, but the implementation of each lesson was often a combination of the activities suggested by the program, other program materials from the club, and the ideas of the Teen Advisor. I came to find out that only one of the programs followed a strict weekly meeting schedule where the lessons were conducted as presented in the official Job Skills materials. For the two other Worker Bee clubs that included some element of the Job Skills material in their YL program, several lessons were planned and carried out as outlined in the program materials, but the needs of the club often demanded that the lessons be postponed or cancelled altogether. Many times the staff members and YLs would get busy or be pulled to help out on a field trip and the classes would simply fall by the wayside. In one case, as soon as I arrived for my observations I was told that there would be no Job Skills class because a YL got into a physical altercation with a club member and the Teen Advisor had to discipline her and speak with her case worker.

The contribution that YLs make to YOC (and to the Worker Bee clubs specifically) is an important one. The largest YOC club in the cities where I conducted my research hosted nearly 300 kids who attend summer camp each week and nearly 30 youth participating as YLs. At most clubs, YLs are either assigned to a group which they follow around for the day moving from one activity room to the next, or they are assigned to a particular room (like the gym or art room) where they assist each group as it comes through. At lunch YLs hand out food, help children

with their lunches, clean up afterwards by taking out the trash, wiping down tables and mopping floors. From time to time YLs may be asked to perform an administrative task here or there, but for the most part, the role of a YL is equal parts domestic laborer and care worker.

The YL program is officially designed for 13 to 18 year olds, but every club seems to be flexible about the age requirements – again based on the availability and demands of members. At the large club described above, 17 year olds are full time paid staff instead of being YLs and many of the staff members have participated in the YL program for two or three years before going on to get hired as paid staff. On my initial visit to this club, Caleb, the Club Manager explained, "I used to run more formal classes, but now the program has gotten to a point where I can't afford the time to take all of his YLs off the floor at once to hold a class." He went on to tell me, "the YLs are integral to the functioning of the club in the summer and so there is no way I can take them all out of rotation without sacrificing the goings on at the club." Kristin, 13, in her first year as YL describes a typical day as an YL:

> Yesterday I got here at 7:34[am]. And I went into the game room and M.J.. told me to go in there because there wasn't enough YLs and all the kids were gonna end up in there. So I went in there and then I helped Jake behind the game thing where they give the kids the toys and stuff to play with. And then I yelled for everybody to clean up later and I went to the Tech Center and helped them get their kids to the blue gym after we got the game room kids to the gym. And then we did the blue gym announcements, we all went to

> our areas. I was sad 'cause I had to take away a lot of toys and I had to tell all the kids to pinky promise me that they wouldn't bring them back, 'cause James said that they're not allowed to have toys anymore. I felt horrible. Trust me, I felt like a bad person, 'cause these kids love their toys. And then we went to all our areas and we had fun. We made bracelets and yeah, then we went to "After Hours". And then James wanted me to go on the field trip with them to the van, and it was staff and YLs. We had a lot of fun till 8:00[pm] and then I came back here.

At one point or another, it seemed that every staff member told me how chaotic summer camp can be. A staff member who works as an office assistant at one of the clubs described the difference between the school year and the summer, saying, "During the school year, it's quiet until the buses get here around 3:00. We have the whole day to get stuff done, but the summers are chaotic from the minute you walk through the door". Caleb, the Club Manager, seems to echo this feeling of a lack of time during the summers. When I asked him if I could attend his weekly meetings with the YLs, he explains that they do not have weekly meetings, but instead he holds what he calls "morning huddles" with them before the YLs go off to their assigned groups or areas.

> Before Caleb opens the door to the gym I can hear the muted roar and feel the energy of hundreds of excited children being restrained, eager for their day to begin. Opening the door draws forth a sound wave to hit you in the face! There are about 200 kids (Caleb says in a

> few weeks it will get up to as many as 300) sitting in sloppy rows on the floor (apparently according to age). When Caleb calls the YLs to the jump ball circle in the middle of the court, we have to stand sideways, shoulder to shoulder, so that we can hear him with at least one ear above the shrieking of the kids who are playing games and yelling and screaming. He asks the YLs to squeeze together until they can hear his voice (which presents a challenge given the volume of our competition). When he called it a huddle, he wasn't kidding! We are a tiny group on the verge of being swallowed up by a sea of children. The huddle probably lasted three minutes, max, before the YLs spread out amongst their groups and begin directing children out of the gym.

Caleb explained that this quick huddle is the most efficient and effective way for him to communicate with his YLs and staff members. At his club, the YLs are so essential to the successful functioning of summer camp, he cannot afford to pull all of the YLs off the floor to hold longer meetings or YL classes. Instead, Caleb says that he huddles up with his YLs at least three days a week and communicates about any issues or concerns. He says he reiterates the same things most of the time, but he will take this time to call someone out for doing something or to address a particular problem that's been happening. Caleb believes that he can be more effective at communicating with the kids in these very short to-the-point conversations, rather than pulling them in for a longer more formal meeting. For

this club, the role of YLs is essential to making summer camp work and communication between Caleb and YLs is done with that in mind.

The second type of club is the Apprentice type approach, where the focus of the program is on competition challenges and winning. A number of clubs include an element of competition where YLs are selected as the top performer of the week or of the entire summer, but what distinguishes the Apprentice type of club is the central role that the competition element occupies as a foundation for the structure of the program.

Data for the Apprentice type of club comes largely from one club where the YL program was described to me by program officials as being modeled after Donald Trump's popular reality television show, *The Apprentice*. YLs still engage in the same tasks that they do at other clubs, including looking after members, cleaning up, and setting up activities, but the weekly challenges and the reality TV style eliminations seem to dominate the implementation of the program. Dean, 14, in his second year as YL describes a typical day.

> I get here at about 8:00, 8:10. Sometimes it's an early day. I'll go to the gym and instantly get a basketball game with all the kids and all the other YLs and I'll start playing that, and that goes on till 9:00. All the veterans play basketball till 9:00. Then after that, after I'm done, I'll go get some water, and then I'll go on to almost all the areas, make sure all the kid get there and stuff. 'Cause I know, like, a lot of kids stay back and just hang around the bathroom. So I'll do that with my other friend YLs like Rex and Miguel. And we'll do that.

> And then once we come in, I usually sit randomly with whoever kid I think is good, but they're kind of a little talkative today…During lunch, I usually pick a table and sit with a group of kids, talk to them, see what's going on, see what's fun, what's not, and then I'll sit with them for my lunch time, like at my lunch scheduled area.

The afternoons at the Apprentice club are spent like the mornings, by assisting staff members in the activities, but afternoons are often a time when YLs have an opportunity to meet and work on their team challenges.

Based on The Apprentice style structure, at this club, YLs are divided into two teams which compete each week to win challenges. This year team lines were drawn based on whether the YLs were "newbies" in their first year as an YL or "veterans" who were in at least their second year of being an YL. Both teams are given some sort of challenge each week (such as raising money during a car wash or bake sale) and on Fridays, in the "Boardroom" a winning team is announced and YLs get "fired" and eliminated from the competition.

The Boardroom is a term also borrowed from *The Apprentice* television show and used by the club to indicate the space where teams report to Donald Trump to explain and receive a review of their performance that week. The Boardroom is symbolic of a certain type of business model where decisions are made by high power executives and handed down quickly. On the television show, each week in the Boardroom one team is deemed the winner of the challenge and one person from the losing team is fired. The same is true for the YLs at the Apprentice club –

each week in the boardroom one team is named the winner of the challenge and YLs are fired.

In a departure from the television show, however, instead of one member of the losing team being fired, YLs from either the winning or losing team can be fired and typically about three to five are eliminated each week. The process of determining who is fired each week is left entirely up to the Teen Advisor, Blake, who selected YLs to be fired either based on their performance in the challenge or their overall performance that week as an YL. The Teen Advisor actually had to be somewhat strategic about firing the right number of YLs each week so that the final week there would be three YLs left competing for the final prize.

Technically YLs who have been "fired" from the game are still involved in the YL program which means they are expected to help their team with challenges and complete all the tasks in the original job description. Being fired only means that they are no longer eligible to win the prize at the end of the summer which includes a monetary award and a job offer as a YOC staff member the following summer. The only way any YL is completely removed from the program is for serious disciplinary issues. Most of the time YLs are fired for a lack of effort or for engaging in disruptive behavior such as spending too much time with friends, but the Teen Advisor's feedback is very often focused on YLs giving a convincing performance of what it means to be a good worker.

Blake's explanation to Grace, 14, of why she was getting fired was a perfect example of the premium Blake placed on the performance of a certain type of YL. He told her, "I don't think you did anything wrong, I think you did a good job, but

this is a competition. I'm always looking for people who come ask me if they can help and I'd like you to do that more." Blake justified firing Rex, 13, saying, "There are people who take more initiative than you. I want you to come to me and say you're doing something, or not even having to ask just doing it." And when giving Gabby, 12, advice for how to improve, Blake explained, "What I'd like to see you do more is raise your hand and be the first one to do things. Start asking me to do stuff that you don't necessarily need to do. I'd like to see you participate more and be the first one to volunteer to do things." The main problem in Carly's performance was her lack of a physical presence or "face time," having been gone four out of five Fridays. But Blake also raised another issue in her performance that he claimed, "really bothered him", he told her, "First thing is that I'd like to see you smile more. I think you get upset with the other YLs and kids and I'd like it to not let it bother you so much. I'd like to see you smile more." As a female worker, it is particularly troubling that Blake is reinforcing gendered norms for acceptable emotional display (Way, 2012), and this gendered comment also highlights the importance of a seamless performance of what it looks like to be a good worker.

But even as he told many of the YLs that they should be coming up and asking him what needs to be done, he gets mad at others for doing the same thing. Though she was not fired in this meeting, he tells Brittany,12, "it makes it hard for me to do my job because you're always coming to me to ask about things you I know you can do. So you need to take initiative. Sometimes I don't want you to ask and do what you think is right."

Even for the people who were the best workers, Blake demanded a particular performance of them, specifically he asked them to demonstrate confidence and a calm demeanor. When Blake called Nick, 14, one of the hardest working YLs, in for a meeting, he was understandably nervous, and Blake responded saying, "no way I'm going to fire you. I have been impressed every week. Don't come in here and be nervous. The only reason the gym was successful was because of you and Mary." He gave a similar version of the same speech to another YL, Summer, 13, who is also in her first year as an YL. After asking how she thought she had performed this week, Blake told her,

> You said you were a good YL and I disagree. I think you do a great job and you should say you do a great job. There are people who do a good job that have been fired. You should be proud of yourself. You always ask to help out and I just like your attitude. So obviously I'm not going to fire you. Good job, and keep up the good work.

In these individual meetings, it became quite clear to the YLs that the way to not be fired, and potentially be selected as the best YL, involved an originally unstated performance of competence, initiative and self-assuredness.

Toward the end of the summer, when the YLs remaining in the competition were all very hard workers, the process of selecting YLs to be fired was done completely based on comparison to other YLs. Despite the process of being "fired," turnover was notably low at the Apprentice club, especially as compared to the other clubs. There were certainly some YLs who dropped out of the program, but usually this was due to family travel schedule or some other planned event.

After several weeks of firing YLs, Blake began to notice a significant decline in YLs effort. YLs were caught goofing off or not completing tasks to the standard that was expected and both Blake and the Club Director were angry, as evidenced by the following excerpt from my field notes.

> Blake starts off the Boardroom by explaining that it's week five and everyone has gotten slack. He says that he thinks the main problem is that when he fires the YLs they lose motivation to keep working hard. He tells the group that when he was a YL, the program was not run in the same way (with YLs being fired each week) and he thinks it's a problem.

As a remedy for the situation, Blake came up with the idea of implementing "redemption" to motivate the YLs to keep working. Redemption is an opportunity for one YL who has already been fired to be brought back into consideration at the end of the summer for the final prize. Essentially, this was Blake's response to keep YLs motivated and engaged with the competition. Redemption serves another function as well; it shows the power of the organization to change the "rules of the game" at any time it suits them. Workers do not have the authority to change the game, but organizations have the ultimate power and will change the rules at any time in order to protect themselves.

Later in the summer, when redemption was not enough to motivate the fired YLs, the Teen Advisor had to come up with another solution. In our weekly boardroom meeting, he explained, "I didn't want to have to do it, but I'm going to have to start a discipline log. If redemption is not enough

to motivate you all, then maybe a discipline log will be". Blake told the YLs they could now be written up for anything that they do wrong and after three times of being written up, they would be kicked out of the YL program.

Of note in the game type of club is the decision to call the program *The Apprentice* program, rather than the YL program. Though the youth participating are called YLs, club staff would always refer to the larger program as the Apprentice program. This name was obviously derived from the television show after which the program was structured, but warrants further consideration. Typically an apprentice is a young person who goes to work with a master in order to learn a craft. Historically this model of being indoctrinated into a trade or craft involves learning the work by taking a "hands on" approach – learning by doing. In an apprentice model of learning, there are not formal classes or reading about a subject, rather the apprentice learns by engaging in the work and improving with practice. The apprentice's labor is exchanged for the opportunity to work side-by-side with a master.

Notably, despite the decision to call it the Apprentice program, the model of learning a skill deviates considerably from a traditional apprentice model of learning. The "worker bees" model of working, taking place side by side with staff members, in exchange for the value of the YLs labor is actually more representative of a true apprentice model. The Apprentice type club that calls their program *The Apprentice* program frames YLs work more as enjoyment and play – a type of game or competition than the setting aside of a specific time in order to learning a skill by doing it. The differences in these two approaches illustrate a class based model of

work. The Apprentice type of approach is illustrative of professional work (specifically referencing a television program that features highly privileged professional work). The framing of work as a game or competition as compared to a skill to be learned in exchange for one's labor implicate these programs very differently as discursive resources for participants, which is the basis of the analysis that follows.

Dress

Across all clubs, uniforms are a unique they unify workers, making each look like the rest. The act of wearing uniforms is symbolic of the normalization of the power and control of the organization over individuals. Foucault (1977) argues normalization is the most efficient way of exercising control over a group, by creating behaviors that are taken-for-granted or seen as natural. Uniforms simply become symbolic of the assumed power of the organization to exert control over individuals. Uniforms are symbolic of a particular set of ideals unique to that organization and function to demonstrate an employee's compliance with those particular ideals. For example, the uniform of an airline pilot invokes "a tradition of authority and rational decision making previously associated with [sea captains]" (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004, p. 147), but actually required a calculated shift away from pilots' identification as blue collar and trade workers. Though now it is difficult to imagine a pilot in any other way, this transformation required "a meticulous makeover, literally redressed and supplied with props to facilitate professional performance," (p.147).

While uniforms serve to control workers by making each worker adhere to the same ideal form, uniforms also function to individualize or differentiate through rank. Whether it is stars on one's chest or the presence of a suit and tie, one's rank is worn on their body for others to see and instantaneously know their value to the organization. Uniforms are an especially valuable form of disciplinary power in the way they function as a source of gratification and punishment. By highlighting gradations of difference among workers, uniforms reward rather than punish in the way that higher gradations demonstrate one's higher status in the organization. "In discipline, punishment is only one element of a double system: gratification-punishment" (Foucault, 1977, p. 180). So, rather than only disciplining the individual through punishment, in the case of someone not wearing the appropriate uniform, uniforms can discipline through reward by functioning as a source of motivation for individuals to work toward. As Foucault explains, "through this micro-economy of a perpetual penality operates a differentiation that is not one of acts, but of individuals themselves, of their nature, their potentialities, their level or their value" (p. 181).

YLs dress no differently than staff members in the club. "Uniforms" consisted of a YOC t-shirt with any kind of pants or shorts - whatever was comfortable for moving around and playing with children all day. YLs are required to wear their YOC shirts (which typically have the letters YL on the back) and risk losing points if they do not wear the appropriate shirt. Joaquin, 15, explained that he has been penalized for not wearing his YOC shirt while in the gym, "sometimes I won't be wearing a YL shirt, like because I'm in the gym…If I'm gonna be running around, my shirt's going to be going up and then it's going to be showing the kids.

And I like to cover up, you know?" Joaquin feels uncomfortable in his YL shirt, which he feels is too short and so he brings another shirt to put on over it when he is playing in the gym. Still, every time, the Teen Advisor tells him to put on his YL shirt (and potentially deducts points). When I first arrived to some of the larger programs it was challenging for me to distinguish the YLs from the paid staff members because my guess at their age was the only indicator of who was likely a YL and who was a staff member. Staff members are expected to wear the shirts all of the time as are YLs, but some of the staff, who held a higher position in the organization seemed to get away with not always wearing an official YOC shirt.

After spending a good deal of time in several clubs, I came to realize that there are hourly and salaried staffs at each club. Hourly staff are assigned to an area such as the gym, computer lab, or art room, and are in charge of the primary care of club members and leading activities with the members. Salaried employees, like the Teen Advisor and the Club Manager, are in charge of larger programmatic issues and spend the majority of their time in an office where they are somewhat separated from the main activity of the club. In addition to having an office, salaried employees also do not wear the YOC STAFF t-shirts that hourly employees do. Instead, based on my observations, salaried employees wear collared shirts or other relatively casual clothing that would still allow them to play and engage with kids if need be. At first glance, the relatively simple uniforms, made up of just a YOC shirt seem like a minor detail, but they become important when one considers their discursive function. Specifically, uniforms serve an important function in the way they standardize YLs while simultaneously providing space for their individual and

youth identities. The following section demonstrates how the YOC t-shirt, which is essentially the same shirt worn by YLs and staff across the country, become a resource for youth in different ways.

Clothing is one way for staff at the club to show status and individuality and earn the respect or attention from some of the members. Caleb, one Club Manager used the club colors, displayed primarily through club t-shirts to demonstrate a change in leadership. Apparently, several years before he came to the club, the former Club Manager had chosen purple as the club's official colors – to align with the professional basketball team in the area. When Caleb came in, he saw an opportunity to distinguish himself from the former Club Manager who was not as well liked. "Years ago, back before I was working for the club, the guy who was formerly in my position was kind of a hard ass and he set the club colors as purple. So, when I came into the job I made some small changes to set myself apart from this guy and one of those changes was to make the club colors red and black." Not only did Caleb use the club colors (and uniforms) as a resource to set him apart from the former Director, but many of the staff members do the same, as evidenced by the following excerpt from my field notes.

> On our way to the gym, amongst the hundred or so kids swarming around us, Caleb introduces me to Quentin and points out his bright purple YOC shirt. Caleb explains that Quentin is one of the older (and I guess more senior) staff members evidenced by his purple shirt. When I look around I notice that most of the other staff

> members are wearing red or white YOC shirts, which make them difficult to distinguish from the YLs.

Quentin's decision to wear an older purple shirt is his way of distinguishing himself by showing that that he has been around the club longer than other staff members. Despite making it a point to change the club colors from purple to red and black, Caleb does not seem upset by Quentin's decision to define himself by wearing the old colors, in fact, he seemed excited to show me and explain the meaning behind it. Caleb seems to interpret the decision as more of a demonstration of commitment and experience with the organization, rather than as identification with the former leader.

Quentin's dress set him apart from other staff members while simultaneously tying him to the organization. It also set a precedent for other staff members and YOCs about appropriate forms of self-expression. Megan, the staff member in charge of the art room, used her YOC shirt to set herself apart and was eager to show it off to Caleb and me.

> As soon as Caleb introduces Megan, she begins spinning around and pulling her shirt out for us to see the silver grommets she applied to it the night before. Megan models the shirt for us, pointing to her hard work in the form of silver grommets carefully placed around the Y-O-C and S-T-A-F-F letters. She can't stop smiling and laughing as she admits that she 'spent way too long last night bedazzling'.

Caleb seemed to be pleased with the staff's decision to show their individuality and commitment to the club. And though this was the only club where I saw staff using

their official uniforms as a way to display their individual identity, it was not the only example of how bodies were used as a space for individuals to identify with the organization. The Club Manager at another of the Worker Bee clubs never wore a YOC t-shirt, but as a salaried employee, wore collared polo shirts to work. Despite not wearing any sort of official YOC uniform, Victor's identification with YOC was a more permanent one, in the form of a tattoo of the YOC logo on the back of his arm, large enough to be easily seen by anyone.

Though clubs seemed to encourage expressions of individuality that align employee identities with the organization, there was also need to distinguish employees from club members. For YLs, who were in a space somewhere in between the two, dress functions as a way to clarify that distinction. On the day I interviewed Trinity, 14, I went off to find a quiet space for us to talk while she went to the restroom. When she came out of the bathroom for out interview, she was wearing a fitted orange top with cutouts and jean shorts. I realized this was the first time I remembered seeing any of the YLs from this club in their street clothes. During the course of our interview Trinity explained that the YL shirt is only to be worn when she is working at the club and not when she is spending time there otherwise. If she wants to stick around the club after her shift ends, she has to bring a change of clothes with her, "they said don't be in [YL shirt] it so if you like misbehave or something it's kinda bad…so it's not like your representing your job so it's kind of like a respect thing and a behavior type thing." In this case the club feels the need to make a clear distinction about when YLs are on and off duty. Such a

clarification may be for the benefit of the YLs, who often stay at the club past their shift, but whatever the reason such a distinction is deemed important.

At the Apprentice club, YLs dress is largely the same as any other club. YLs wear a t-shirt with "YL" on the back with some sort of short or pants that they can move in. On one occasion, halfway through the summer, after some disciplinary issues, the Club Manager explained to the group that wearing a YL shirt is a privilege and it sets YLs apart from regular club members. The Club Manager addressed the group and specifically referenced their YL shirts, saying "I had hoped I wouldn't have to talk about discipline because if I've got kids' walking through the halls with "Leader" on their shirt, I don't expect to have to discipline them." Paul's comment illustrates the importance of clothing on identification as a worker. The uniform or dress is literally the way that the organization is written upon the body and it changes the body from an individual to a piece of the organization. Paul's comment also shows that worker's uniforms and bodies are an important discursive resource for other people, for whom one uniformed member of an organization can stand as a representation of the entire organization. This was an important comment because in some ways YLs are both club members and YLs, but the Club Manager made it clear that the uniform implies that their position as YLs should be more salient and takes precedence over their identities as club members.

Paul's comment about the YL position as a privilege at the Apprentice club stands in marked contrast to the message Trinity, a Worker Bee, relayed about not wearing the YL shirt after one's shift ends in case of misbehavior or disciplinary issues. In one message YLs are cast as privileged members of the organization and

in the other as a potential liability. The message at the Apprentice club positions workers as individuals who have already proven themselves in some way, whereas the message sent by the Worker Bee club positions YLs as still needing to prove themselves. This distinction in the way YL is framed for youth certainly provides different resources for the ways they construct identities as workers. From the perspective of the worker, framing work as a privilege is very different than work as necessity, casting the job as somewhat more disposable and more of a choice. Granting someone a privilege implies some sense of their deserving of the privilege. For the organization, framing a job as a privilege indicates some sort of leeway because of high demand for such a job. The job-as-privilege mindset is another example of the way that YLs at the Apprentice club are motivated by external forms of validation. The job is framed as a scarce resource and YLs are encouraged not to risk losing the title of YL, rather being encouraged to work hard for some internal desire to be a YL.

The exception to this uniform is on Fridays, when everyone at the club is encouraged to dress up according to the theme that week. Every club seemed to follow the same basic structure for summer camp, which involved a new theme each week, around which activities were organized. Occasionally, I would see members and staff at other clubs reference that week's theme through a different shirt or accessory (such as thick black glasses with tape across the bridge on the Friday of Harry Potter week) but no club took the opportunity to dress up as seriously as the Apprentice club. Every Friday seemed like Halloween as the large majority of club members and staff (including salaried staff) would be fully decked out in costume.

Alexis, the Teen Advisor, was most excited about pirate week when her Friday costume allowed her to wear the larger gauge earrings that she typically wears, but is not allowed to wear as a staff member.

Another area where dress became salient at the Apprentice club, was in the "Boardroom" where the winning team was announced and YLs were fired. I had never been told what to wear at any club and my clothing choice (typically a collared shirt and shorts similar to what the Teen Advisors wore) never seemed to be an issue. The Boardroom was different though. As the following excerpt from my fieldnotes demonstrates, the Boardroom called for a different way of presenting ourselves.

> After a few minutes of sitting in the office while Blake worked quickly on the computer, he tells me it's time to call our first "Boardroom" meeting. He goes over to the PA system and calls for all of the YLs to meet us outside on the patio (where it is at least 115 degrees). Two ties have been sitting on his desk, already tied, since I walked in. When Blake walks back into the office he tells me to pick a tie and I select the more plain of the two – regrettably claiming it goes with my outfit better. When we walked outside, the YLs are buzzing with talk, but our arrival catches their attention and many of the girls cut short their conversations to comment on our attire. "I like your ties!" they shouted – perhaps hoping to provoke a comment. Blake just stands for a minute in front of them, seemingly pleased with the attention he is getting. With a smile on his face,

Blake responds sarcastically saying "it's the Boardroom, this is no joke!"

Every Friday for the first month, we put on ties before the Boardroom meetings and then for some reason Blake stopped bringing them. He never acknowledged the sudden lack of ties (and I was happy to no longer be wearing them so I didn't raise the issue), but I suspected it might stir up comments from the YLs. When we walked outside, the very first comments that came out of the mouths of the YLs was "where are your ties?" Blake didn't say anything this time and I just threw my hands in the air as if to say I didn't know.

Though I am certain that Blake's intention was to create a fun atmosphere in the Boardroom and in some ways signal the importance of the decision, the likely unintended implication is to articulate that only men are entitled to space in the boardroom. The message that is communicated from this practice is that if you want to work your way into the boardroom, you must act as much like a man as possible (starting with your physical appearance). In some ways, ties in the Boardroom were simply another costume to demarcate Fridays as a special day at the club. But unlike the staff and club members, I was not given a choice of what to wear to represent my role in the boardroom and my participation in the practice served as important resource for YLs about what it means to do work.

Perhaps more importantly, the decision to "dress up" with ties communicates to the YLs that what they are doing is more of a role play activity than an actual job. It is true that participants in the program are not paid and do not have quite as much responsibility (or authority) as regular staff members, but they are

putting in 40 hours of work a week. The tone at this club is that YLs are engaging in a bit of role playing about what it means to be a worker. Whereas at other clubs the kids are not role playing what it means to be a worker, they are simply treated as (probationary) workers. Thus, it becomes clear that the meso-level resources provided by each type of YL program play a significant role in mediating YLs experiences of work. In the next section, I demonstrate the ways that youth in each program take up these resources to construct unique worker identities.

Youth Appropriation of YL Discursive Resources

Reasons for Participation

Accessing youth's meaning making around why they wanted to be a YL in the first place is an important source of data about the way that available discourses serve to shape one's understanding of work. Since interviews occurred throughout the program, with the majority being carried out in the second half of the summer, youth's accounts of why they wanted to be a YL is retrospective and shaped by the discourses available to them.

Some of the reasons for wanting to participate in the YL program were the same no matter the club in which and are probably indicative of macro-level discourses upon which youth are drawing. Perhaps the most common response centered on one's ability or affinity toward working with children. Among other reasons, such as "it's fun" Maija, 15, cited working with kids as a reason why she wanted to be a YL this summer. When I asked her what about it was fun, she responded saying, "working with kids. Kids always are fun to work with." And again, when I asked why she felt like she got selected to be a YL, she thought that

one reason might be because of her enjoyment working with children. Olivia, 14, who had previously volunteered at the club explained that one reason she wanted to be a YL was because "when I was here, I really enjoyed all the kids. 'Cause you make a difference in their lives, and they also make a difference in your life." Many cited experience with brothers, sisters or other family members as sparking their interest or ability in working with children. Still, saying that one likes kids or is good with kids was typically always paired with some other response.

Another common response was to recognize the potential future benefit of working as a YL. Specifically, YLs understand that this kind of work "looks good on college applications, for sure" as Aubrey, 13, puts it. When I asked Brittany why she wanted to be a YL, she explained "well, I thought, it's going on the portfolio for when you get older." And Summer, understood the importance of this unpaid position for getting a paid job later, saying, "for another job, this would be a good resume thing." For many of the YLs the potential future payoff was an important factor in deciding to participate, Makenna, 14, explains, "I think about college and stuff like that, and I think about high school and service hours. And I think how this would look good on an application and how I can easily get a job here, also, 'cause of all the work I do." Jade, 13, reasons, that being a YL this summer will help her in the future because it will "help me like my college, college will say that I did some work when I was young, like...it would make me look older and stronger because it will make me have a good reputation."

Finally, a few of the YLs at both types of clubs also acknowledge the draw of the competition and the potential prizes for winning as a reason for participating.

Sabrina, 15, in her second year as a YL explains her initial interest in the program was her sense of competition. After hearing her brother talk about the program with their mother, she decided she wanted to participate.

> I was really nosy, so I was like, "What is this?" And he's like, "None of your business!"… I was like, "this sounds cool. Can I do it with you?" And he's like, "No, you can't!" So you know how brothers are. So I was like, "I'm gonna do it anyways."…. And like during the program, I find out it's a competition. And I'm very competitive.

That summer, her first year as a YL, Sabrina was named YL of the summer. When I asked her if she thought she could earn the same distinction this year too, she bluntly proclaimed, "I do…. I'm competitive. I'm trying really hard. I work a lot. And I think I can do it. Like I can win." Though Worker Bee clubs do not engage in weekly challenges, there is a modest element of competition among YLs to be named a top performer. Some Worker Bee clubs name a top performing YL weekly or biweekly and others save this distinction for the end of the summer. Sabrina is referring to being named YL for the entire summer.

Like Sabrina, Rex, heard about the program from his sister who had previously participated. Though his sense of competition did not appear to be as strong as Sabrina's the prizes were a draw. When I asked Rex why he wanted to be a YL, Rex explained that his sister had told him "the trip at the end of the year was really cool." And when I asked what he considered to be the best part of being a YL he said, "Going on the trip but then there's also like competing against everybody else." Clearly, the element of competition while perhaps not as strong for him was

part of what made the program fun for Rex. In our interview, Thalia, 13, actually admitted that she would rather be spending time with her friends this summer, but that her mother brought up the YL program and she felt like she had to do it. But, she explained that this job appealed to her because of the opportunity for winning prizes. Thalia explained that the Teen Advisor told her, "whoever wins, I'd get a back to school shopping spree and I need some clothes." Despite her initial resistance to participating in the YL program, Thalia found the potential for winning a shopping spree to provide some motivation. These commonalities notwithstanding, the reasons YL's articulated for wanting to participate demonstrated important differences in the ways these programs construct youth as workers.

Though some Worker Bees refer to the YL experience as something they can put on their resumes, the more common response is one that is focused on the present rather than the future. Specifically, youth at these clubs talk about the YL program as better than their alternatives. Her competitive nature aside, Sabrina explains that she sometimes arrives at the club before her shift and stays later because, "if I didn't do that, I'd just be stuck at home watching TV, and I didn't want to do that, or stay home and clean. No one wants to clean their house. I didn't want to do that. I wanted to do something." At YOC, Sabrina also has to clean, but cleaning at the club is situated as better or preferable, as actually doing something because it is a job and it's not her house. Though she is not paid for her work cleaning the club, she does receive recognition for being a hard worker. In essence, what Sabrina means by wanting "to do something" is a desire to do something for

which she receives credit, or recognition or some sort of cultural capital, which cleaning one's own house does not. This desire to be recognized for one's work is reflective of the way domestic labor is overlooked and devalued in our society. For most of the YLs who talk about getting away from home, boredom is what they are hoping to avoid by being a YL. In the following excerpt from our interview, Javier, 15, explains that being at home is boring and not something he enjoys:

AW: Okay so tell me a little bit about being a YL. Why did you want to be a YL this summer?

Javier: It gives me something to do besides sitting at home watching TV and playing game. Plus I like to work with kids.

AW: Oh you like to work with kids, okay. What's so bad about staying home and watching TV?

Javier: Um I get bored.

AW: You get bored?

Javier: I don't really do anything else, just sit there.

Avoiding boredom is something that a number of YLs talk about. Maija, 15, tells me she loves working and when I ask why, she says, "I don't like being home bored." Sabrina also expresses a desire to be a YL for the summer to avoid the boredom of being at home, "I just wanted to do something over the summer and not be bored…Cause if I didn't do that, I'd just be stuck at home watching TV," as does David, 16, who explains, "Well, I wanted to keep occupied, and I wanted more volunteer hours. Actually, more because I'm bored at home." On his YCW instrument David reinforces this idea, saying that the best part of having a job is "it

keeps you occupied and you make a difference." Orlando, 15, says he enjoys his work because, "you're doing something different, other than being at home." Christian realized the benefit of working as a YL after talking with his friends, "what I also like about it is just being able to have something to do during the summer instead of most of my friends, I ask them what they've been doing. They say, 'Nothing. I've got nothing to do. I wish school was back in [school].'"

When Joaquin's Teen Advisor approached him to participate in the YL program, he agreed, "I was like, 'Yeah, sure, as long as I'm doing something instead of just sitting there.'" Joaquin is one of the YLs who sometimes choses to stay at the club longer than his eight hour shift. When I ask him why, he explains,

> Because I don't like being at home, like 'cause if I'm home, I get bored and then I want to leave. That's why I'm mostly here, to keep me off the streets and everything, so I'm not like every other kid, so I'm productive. Need to be productive and doing stuff instead of just sitting.

It seems that working as a YL keeps Joaquin from getting into the type of trouble that comes from having no better alternatives. The issue of escaping home to avoid trouble is a theme that seems to resonate with Wynonna's experience as well.

> Wynonna: Well, just spending time with [the kids], 'cause I know they come here to get away from home, just like I wanted to work to get away from home.
>
> AW: What do you mean you wanted to work to get away from home?

Wynonna: Like…'cause usually the summers, I'll just stay home bored and everything, but now I have a job and everything, and so I actually have something to do and a lot of responsibility. And with them, it's just like they come here for fun and to get away from like their parents or brothers and sisters, you know.

And for Thalia, getting out of her house also means doing something with her time rather than just wasting it. "At the end of the day, I feel like I did something productive instead of just staying at home feeling lazy." Wynonna and Thalia both provide interesting ways of talking about their work. For Wynonna, 17, responsibility is not about power or status, but about having something to do with your time. Thalia contrasts boredom with productivity. For both girls working is a worthwhile endeavor because of the way it enables them to be contributing members of society; a very different notion of work than is articulated by YLs at the Apprentice club.

At the Apprentice club, the YLs also articulate other reasons for wanting to participate, including having fun. In addition to the activities and the end of year trip that were a draw, Rex tells me, "Well most of my friends are doing it to and I wanted to be with them." For Brittany, who has been coming to the club since 2nd grade, being a YL always looked like fun. She describes looking up to the YLs thinking "they would get to do all the fun activities. So I was like, I want to be one of those!" And now, as a YL, when I ask her what is fun, she tells me, "it's like I get to hang out with kids and do the fun activities and stuff." Lexi, 12, explains that in her

application essay she wrote about how enjoyable the job would be, "And I wrote that I'd really like this job because I'd be helping people…and participating in activities with the kids and for the kids." For Lexi, participating in the activities is part of what makes this an enjoyable job. Lexi went on to say "I like surrounding myself with other people that are happy. And all the kids are really nice and all the staff are nice. You're really nice." Clearly, YOC is a pleasant environment for her and part of the reason for working here.

For Brendan, 13, the reason for wanting to be a YL was that "it seemed like a lot of fun when I was here as a kid." Having fun seemed to be an important component of work in general for Brendan, who in his interview, mentioned fun 12 times. He reasoned that his parents like their jobs because "Well, they say it's fun—well, most of the time," but then went on to talk about how his father has to fire people and that can be really stressful. When I asked Brendan to think of someone on TV who has a job he would like to have, he came up with Homer and Lenny and Carl on *The Simpsons* who work at the nuclear power plant. When I asked why that would be a good job he explained, "they always goof off and mess around. But it just looks like a fun job, you know? It just looks dangerous and fun at the same time." When I asked about what might not be so good about that job, Brendan mentioned their boss, who he explained, "probably is the worst. He never lets them do anything fun. He's very strict, keeps them in late". Similarly when I asked him to think of a job he would not want to have, Brendan explained that "even though sometimes there's fun times being a teacher, there's also the bad times." The idea of "fun" seems to be an important yardstick by which Brendan measures a job. What is perhaps most

fascinating about his use of fun as a guideline for a good job, later in our interview, Brendan also cites "fun" as a reason for why some things are not considered work. In response to questions about driving kids to school, being on Facebook, and reading a book, Brendan reasons that none of these activities count as work because they are all fun.

Finally, another discourse about work available to YLs at the Apprentice club is the idea of being in a position of power. Though he was actually referring to wanting to be a staff member at YOC, Rex said the benefits were that, "you get to play the games but you also like control, because like to the YLs the kids don't pay attention as much so I want more control." Brittany, 12, tells me that the reason she wanted to be a YL is "because you get to be a leader to the kids and tell them, "Hey, this isn't right." You get to help them out and you don't have to listen to the other YLs say, "Hey, you can't do that." You've gotta let me do my job." And when I ask Brendan what is so fun about being a YL he tells me, "Probably just, you know, you feel like staff." The feeling of being in some position of power is compelling to the Apprentice YLs.

Dean, 14, is another member of the Apprentice club who has been attending since he was young and always imagined being in the YL program. When I asked him what he thought would be so good about being a YL, he described the increase in responsibility and power:

> I think all the responsibility, and like being a lot higher up, you know? I really felt like I was ready to get a little higher than a kid, 'cause I knew I was already being a leader with all the kids and stuff. And so I

said to myself, I'm ready to be basically the staff. And I was like, well, I need to be a YL first to figure out what goes on.

For Dean, part of having more power is not taking it for granted and demonstrating that you deserve it. With the benefits of being a YL come responsibility. I ask Dean, about what he perceives to be the benefits of being a YL and he tells me,

> Like other people looking at you more of like an adult and giving you responsibilities like an adult, like when they tell you to go outside and throw out the trash, you could just goof off like a regular kid, but you don't. You take out the trash, then you come back in, you keep sweeping or mopping. So you get a lot more responsibility and you're looked at as a more mature and older person.

Just being trusted to take care of the club and look after the club members is a positive experience for many of the YLs and it seems to drive them to want to show that they deserve it.

When comparing Worker Bee's reasons for participating with YLs at the apprentice club, it is noteworthy that Worker Bee's frame participation as a way of avoiding negative outcomes, such as boredom, while YLs at the Apprentice club frame their participation with the potential for positive outcomes like having fun and earning respect. This is perhaps not surprising, as the YL program at the Apprentice club is designed as more of a game or competition than at the Worker Bee clubs, which might actually be more fun. But we also cannot overlook the ways that the Worker Bees are drawing on larger discourse about needing to account for one's contribution to society, which the youth in the more affluent Apprentice club do not

seem compelled to do. For Worker Bees, part of constructing a worker identity is becoming a contributing member of society. In the following section I consider the way YL's requirements for dress also provide a space for them to identify as youth.

Dress

For the YLs shirts serves as more than just their uniform, they are a way of identifying with the organization while simultaneously standing out or highlighting one's uniqueness. Interestingly this idea of uniqueness or standing out from the crowd comes through displaying a stronger sense of identification or time spent with the organization.

For many of the YLs, staff serve as an example in terms of the way that one's dress can help to identify them as a part of the organization while setting them apart from other YLs. In a move taken from one of the staff members, one of the older YLs at Caleb's club wears a grey YL t-shirt – not one that I've seen any of the other YLs or staff wear. Her shirts are always faded and even have holes in them, but Caleb does not seem to mind. In fact, Caleb pointed Makenna out to me, calling her over, to show off that she wears the YL shirt from last year, which is a way for her to show that she has been around for longer.

At another club, YLs did not get official shirts, and instead just wore street clothes to the club to work in, but about halfway through the summer, the YLs got to make their own shirts. Bethany, the Teen Advisor, showed up to the YL meeting with two packs of white V-neck Hanes t-shirts and fabric markers. She explained that the YLs would be making their own shirts and explained that in addition to following B&GC dress code there were two rules the YLs had to follow:

> Put "BE GREAT" (YOC official motto) on the front of the shirt. You don't have to say great, you can come up with another word that describes you. You can make it any positive adjective that you want. And on the back, at shoulder level, you need to write YL big enough so that people can see it.

As long as YLs followed these two rules, Bethany said that they could put anything else on the shirt they wanted. Her only other instruction was to say, "Keep in mind it is a uniform, so you remember that people will be looking to you to know that you're a YL." Malcolm, 13, made his shirt relatively quickly, with not much more than the required elements. The only additional design was his attempt at the YOC logo, which he put on the front of the shirt. Ethan, 12, played on the theme of "Be Great" and wrote about seven or eight variations on Be Great, which he felt described him, such as "Be Kind", "Be Fun", "Be Responsible." Jackson, 14, spent the longest on his shirt. In addition to the required elements, he put the name of his dance crew on the shirt. When I asked what it said, he told me that he was involved in several dance crews, but that this was the name of the crew he danced with at YOC.

Ethan and Jackson's decision to individualize their shirts is significant because it shows one space in which the resources for identifying as workers overlap with resources for identifying as youth. So much of their identity as youth is tied up in the characteristics by which they describe themselves as well as the activities they do and the groups with whom they associate. For Jackson, part of his identity as a teenager is as a member of a dance crew. In this way, by allowing YLs to personalize

their shirts, they were able to embody the parts of their identities that identify this time in their lives as youth. The personalization of club t-shirts allowed YLs to express themselves while still representing the organization.

In a similar way, at the Apprentice club YLs take up dress as an important resource for identification as both workers and youth. Just as staff and club members, dressed in themed costume on Fridays, so too did YLs. While not every YOC dressed up every week, most had some sort of costume every Friday. Since Fridays were also when the Boardroom meetings took place, I conducted a good bit of my data collection for this club on Fridays which often meant conducting interviews with mermaids, 80's punk rockers, pirates and all sorts of other characters. In a similar, but still different way from the Worker Bee club described above, clothing serves as an important resource for performing youth as it does for performing worker. Youth is a time for role playing (and many of the themes such as Disney week are geared toward youth). So, where much of the YL programs do not provide many resources for these youth to actually perform a youth identity, dress is one space where they can engage in being youthful, and not just a worker.

In the previous section I described the numerous ways in which The Apprentice style program is one that highlights the element of performance as an important discursive resource for youth about how to do work. Whether by the Club Manager's lecture on the importance of the YL shirts or through our ties in the Boardroom, YLs learn that an important part of being a successful worker is the performance of it. So, why should dressing up as characters from movies or fairytales be any different? There is the potential that such blatant performances at

the club actually demonstrate to YLs that worker is no more "real" of a category than any other identity we perform such as woman, or athlete or pilot or exotic dancer. Identification as worker can be done in the same way through a particular performance that is visibly marked on one's body (whether through clothing or physical comportment)Through the Apprentice style approach, the importance of embodiment is more explicitly offered as a tool or resource for how to do work.

Notions of success

Across each of the programs, the idea of being noticed is a common discourse among YLs about who experiences success. It seems that YLs understand the way to win the competition (so essentially the way to be recognized as a good worker) is to make sure that the work you do is seen and acknowledged by the people that matter, the people in power. Trinity, explains that in order to be selected as YL of the summer, "You have work really hard and have to be noticed, you have to let the staff know that you're here and you're here to work and to help." Sabrina succinctly states, "You just have to stand out." Javier explains to me that the award for YLs (awarded each week at his club), "just shows that the staff notice how good you're doing". When I ask her if she thinks she is doing the things she needs to be selected as YL of the week, this idea of doing work that is visible again comes up. Of her own work, Jade says, "well I'm in the back and in the front because I help them out a lot, but there is only like one person out there so they don't really get to see me." It seems that Jade recognizes that she's been doing a lot of work, but she worries that it is not appropriately being seen by the people that count – in this case, the Teen Advisor and the other staff who votes for the YL of the week.

It seems that some YLs understand the importance of being noticed and have begun to use it as a strategy to earn more points or the favor of the staff or Teen Advisor. Trinity describes the way to set yourself apart to the staff is by being noticed for the work you are doing. She says,

> Or if there is nothing you can do in that area you say, "are you sure you don't need any help" they'll be like "yeah, I'm fine, go ask somebody else." So you just walk and go around and ask if anyone else needs help. If they need help, you're noticed 'cause you asked if they needed help.

Sabrina, a consensus contender for winning YL of the summer for the second year in a row, gets worried about other YLs who she sees as competition when they are noticed. When I ask what other YLs are doing that make her worry about winning, she tells me "I guess like just people, like, say more things about them." In this case, being talked about by staff is equated with staff noticing the work that you do. But Sabrina gets frustrated with some of her peers' performances of work, especially when she sees them taking advantage of the technique of being noticed. Sabrina describes another YL who she sees as her competition, "I guess…he does it more to be noticed. And like he'll do it when someone's looking or something like that. Yeah." Sabrina feels like her work is noticed for her genuine display of hard work where as some of her competitors simply use visibility as a strategy to win.

At the Apprentice club, being noticed is a strategy explicitly communicated by the Teen Director, who told Aubrey that she was a great YL, but not a really great one. When I asked her what was the difference between a great and a really great

YL, she gave me Blake's response, "He said I needed to tell him some of the stuff that I did that other people didn't do, and I didn't do that enough." For Blake, if a YL is not being noticed, then it is up to her/him to bring their contribution to his attention

One indicator that a YL is, in fact, standing out to others is through the compliments he or she receives. Receiving compliments was the most common way, cited by participants, of knowing that you are good at your job. When I asked participants, "how do you know you're good at your job?" the majority of participants cited some other-oriented marker of success. Pleasing others and having other people evaluate your work as good were important indices. However, compliments were the most commonly mentioned indicators of success. Sebastian, 15, told me, "you get compliments," Delilah, 18, said, "probably compliments," and Emilio, 18, said "I would get a lot of compliments." Wynonna did not specifically mention the word compliments, but when I asked how she would know she had done a good job as a pediatrician, she surmised, "maybe if they tell me?"

Christian,14, who wants to be an NFL football player explained that you would know you've done a good job, "when, like you hear all the fans chanting your name and stuff." When I asked him how, in a job where you are not publicly recognized you would know you had done a good job, his answer was similar, reasoning, "usually like if your boss compliments you or tells you, like, gives you a raise or something like that. Then you've done a good job." Eduardo, 14, who aspires to be a firefighter, also sees compliments as the way he would know he was good at his job. He tells me, "well, I'm guessing usually the people will tell you when

you're doing a good job. I'm guessing, for example, you saved this person and their family would be like, 'Thank you' or 'You did a good job.'" Even in the case of saving a person's life, Eduardo believes he would feel successful when he was told by others that he had done good work.

Despite their agreement upon the importance of being noticed and explicitly recognized as hard workers there are a number of factors which distinguish the ways that YLs understand success in these very different types of program. The differences in YL's articulations of success across types of club do more than point to differences in the way the program is implemented, but highlight how discourses of work at each club are drawn upon as a resource for how to identify as worker.

Slightly different from just being noticed, at the worker bee programs, success is often characterized by going above and beyond what is expected or required of YLs. Participants judged the most successful YLs (the YLs who were most likely to win) to be those who put in extra hours or did more than what was asked of them. Christian explains, "Well, the person that gets selected is the person that's been working the hardest that has the most points." He adds, "Like their attendance is the best and everything." Christian points to material outcomes as an indicator of success. In many ways, putting in the extra effort is characterized by more face time (which ties into the previous focus on being noticed). Sabrina, who won YL of the summer last year, is identified by nearly everyone in the club as a top contender again this year for YL of the summer. Though she tells me she doesn't work more hours than the other YLs in the club, she does say, "Mm…I think what makes me work more hours is I take shorter lunch breaks, or I come in early

sometimes or I stay in late." So, it would seem that Sabrina, as a top YL, does find ways to go above and beyond what is expected of her, by shortening her lunch or increasing the amount of time she spends at the club to work more hours.

Putting in extra effort is determined to be especially valuable when it involves taking initiative – or completing tasks without being asked. Cheyenne, 14, explains that to be considered a top YL, "you definitely have to like...not wait for someone to tell you to do something, but ask if they need it done or do it yourself." Sabrina is well known around the club for what she calls taking initiative and doing work around the club before she is told or asked to do it.

Sabrina: You just have to stand out. You have to, like, take the initiative.

AW: And how do you stand out?

Sabrina: I do things without being told. Like if something's wrong, I'll just go for it. Like I don't expect to be noticed or anything. I just do it.

AW: Okay. So can you think of an example of that?

Sabrina: Mm…maybe like in the—when we're setting up for lunch, if someone doesn't do their job and they're doing something else and I know they're not doing it fast enough, I'll just go ahead and get it started for them. And if they don't finish, I'll finish it for them. So like I don't expect someone to come and say thank you or "Can you do this for me?" I'll just do it.

To other YLs this tendency to do other people's work for them might seem intrusive, but it seems that this is a strategy that Sabrina has developed to be considered one of the top performing YLs at the club. When I ask Sabrina how other people respond to her "taking initiative" she seems relatively unconcerned with what her fellow YLs might think and instead brings the focus back to her own performance, "I think it's a good way just to be helpful, to not need to be asked. To just do it if you know you can." There is a certain amount of independence and drive associated with taking initiative that seems to highlight some participants as harder or better workers than others.

Jake, 16, also talks about taking initiative as a marker of good performance. When I ask if he thinks he has a shot at winning YL of the summer he initially brushes it off and then tells me the following story:

> It'd be cool. I mean I never really thought about it that much. I just want to do what I love to do, so I want to make this place the best place for all the kids. I saw the blue gym's floor and it was so bad, and I remember when it used to be nice and clean. It was just so bad and I wanted to clean it. Like, me and some other kids actually helped. We were all on our knees and just scrubbing it and mopping it over.

This example, of taking the initiative to mop the floor, is one that Jake offered on his own after considering whether or not he could be YL of the summer. Though he may not have ever considered whether her could be named YL of the summer, he seems to have a clear idea about what it takes to be worthy of such a distinction –

and for Jake and a number of other YLs at the Worker Bee clubs, taking initiative is one important indicator of success.

Another discourse unique to the Worker Bee programs is the focus on self as an indicator of success. In this case, a number of participants articulated that they would know they were successful by how they felt inside or how the job made them feel. An example of such a response is found in my exchange with Isaiah, 12. When I ask him how he would know he had done a good job as a nurse, he said, "Just to think that you did good." Orlando, 15, answered with a similar response, indicating that he would know he had done a good job as a lawyer "when you go and be like 'ah I got so much work done today, I'm proud of myself.'" David, 16, who wants to be a surgeon, responded saying, "I don't know. When you feel accomplished I guess, at what you do….If you think you did a good job." Cheyenne, who wants to be a singer, says, "Um when I felt that…like I gave it my best and just if I knew I could do better, then I wouldn't be done. But if I knew I gave it all I had and there's nothing left I could change, then I would be done."

Though she is unsure of what career she would like to have (perhaps working at YOC or having a career as a runner), Jade, explains, "I'll feel positive and I'll feel like I accomplished something in my life." Ronaldo, who imagines himself as a pediatrician, says that he will know he did a good job because, "I feel completed…Like I did a lot of work that day." In light of the plethora of comments about receiving compliments from others as an indicator of success, Worker Bees' notions of success based on how the job makes them feel is notable. Such self-directed feelings of success are perhaps more interesting when compared to YLs at

the Apprentice club, none of whom talked about internal satisfaction as an indicator of success.

The Apprentice YLs seem to have a slightly different notion of what makes a successful YL. Popularity and being a "favorite" of the staff seem to be important currency for YLs. Summer, who applied to be a YL last year but was not hired, learned the importance of being a popular club member. When I asked her why she thought she was selected this year to be a YL, but not last year she described the difference, "I think I was louder and more like optimistic and I would talk to more people, and last year I just had one little group of friends." Additionally, she acknowledged that this year the staff helped her with her application, offering to "check it and see if there's anything you should take out or add in or anything." What became apparent was that the YLs were aware of the idea of playing favorites and how it might impact their chances of winning. In our interview, Brittany actually labeled some of the YLs as "favorites" explaining,

> A favorite from my point of view is someone who the staff like, just like. Maybe they don't even do a good job. They just think they're funny or something like that. They think they're funny or they think they're sweet, but they may not be doing a very good job. "Better" as in they do a good job and responsible, but "favorite" as in they don't do maybe such a good job. They just—a staff would like them.

Brittany clearly explains that success is not always the result of hard work, but often comes from being popular or well-liked by those who are in a position of power. What is interesting about Brittany's comments is that, though she understands the

benefits of being a favorite, she is confident that being a favorite is not enough to be selected as YL of the summer. When I ask Brittany if she thinks the Teen Advisor (who makes decisions about who to fire and who wins) knows the difference between a favorite and a hard worker, she responds by saying "yeah obviously" and then provides an example of someone she considers to be a favorite, who was also fired. "They're not choosing favorites" she says.

Earlier in the summer, in a private conversation, Blake explained that several of the staff saw Grace crying after she had been fired. Blake explained to me that Grace is one of the staff favorites, that a number of people thought she could win and were shocked at her firing. Apparently Blake had not realized how well liked she was by the staff. He told me,

> After taking so much crap from the staff, I sat her down and apologized for firing her. I told her that while I can't "unfire" her, she is up for redemption at the end of the summer and she has a really good chance at it.

The reason Blake fired Grace in the first place is that she did not stand out to him as a top performer, but he was shocked by the reaction of the staff. It was not until he felt their overwhelming backlash at his decision that he started to second guess his original decision about her performance as a worker.

Over halfway through the summer, Brittany felt like she really did have a shot at winning the competition because of her hard work and responsibility. Still, she acknowledges that there are other people who might win.

AW: The people who you think might win, what are they doing that they might get selected?

Brittany: The same things. Just helping the kids and—I don't know if they do the report thing. I just know that they clean up and they help and they just do a good job.

AW: Okay. Alright.

Brittany: And maybe they could be one of the favorites, too.

Despite her insistence that being a favorite is not what gets a person selected to win YL of the summer, the idea of "favorites" is something that seems to dominate her talk about the successful YLs. Lexi also thinks that being a staff favorite is an advantage in this competition. Like Brittany, she may not feel that being a favorite is enough to win the entire competition, but it does seem like a distinct advantage for those that are. Lexi believes that either Brendan or Rachel will win this year's competition because of their hard work, "They have like a really good reputation here and they're always on top of their game. I think Brendan should win." "He's always doing what he's supposed to. He's never just slacking off. And when he sees us cleaning, he stops eating and goes to clean with us. But all the staff favors Rachel, 'cause she's a lot—not a lot—just a little bit more social. But once you get to know Brendan, he's really social." Even though Lexi thinks Brendan should be the winner, she can't help but acknowledge the importance of being liked by the staff.

And perhaps Brittany is not wrong in her attention to favorites. In my last interview of the summer, a week away from the final challenge that determines YL of the summer, I ask Rex who had been brought back into the competition for

redemption. "Grace" he answered. The importance of favoritism as a way to get ahead may be more salient in a club where symbolic performances of ideal worker are valued more than material outcomes. The discourses of managerialism that is modeled at the Apprentice club, finds its strength in symbolic performances of work including face time and self-presentation rather than results or outcomes that produce material gains for the organization.

Another discourse that shapes the Apprentice YL's understanding of who are the top performers is the idea of seniority. Seniority is what initially distinguished the team of "Newbies" from the "Veterans." The Teen Advisor made the decision to divide the YLs this way and this distinction of being more or less experienced continued to serve as a device for the YLs to make sense of who would ultimately win the competition. Aubrey tells me who she thinks will when and when I ask why she has named these two girls, she says, "They do a lot, and they're the oldest, I think that would have a bigger impact on it." When I asked Maggie,12, a "newbie", if she thought she had a chance at winning, her response was "I think a veteran is gonna win." When I asked why, she explained, "Because they have more experience." Like Maggie, Lexi recognizes the advantage that "veterans" have. She tells me, "I really want to win and be the staff, but I know I probably won't because all the veterans always have—like the people that have been there longer." Recognizing what she is saying, I asked if the veterans usually win. "Always win" she said, "There hasn't been a time…" Lexi stops short, recognizes that for her to win YL of the summer as a "newbie" would take some breaking down of norms, but she is hopeful, " But maybe history can change," she suggests.

Though he is on the Veteran team this year, last year Dean was a first year YL and made it to the final weeks of the competition before being fired. He explained to me that as the weeks went on and he found himself still in contention for the prize, his position as a less experienced YL seemed to impact his performance. "I was scared 'cause when we had people who worked here for like three or four years." When I asked what about the experience scared him, he told me,

> I was afraid of possibly getting in another YL's way, 'cause I had a lot of older friends. And I think… I wouldn't have now, looking at it, but I think I thought that it was like I would be stepping on their toes and they'd be like, "Come on, Dean, what are you doing? You're first year."

As Dean explains it, once he realized that he had made it as far as some of the more senior YLs he pulled back a bit and let his performance slip and soon after was fired.

What is evident from YL's talk about success is the degree to which they feel in control of their own success. For the Worker Bees, who understand success to be a result of putting in extra effort, taking initiative, and finding personal satisfaction in work, they are the means of their own success. If Worker Bees want to be successful, they may put in more effort or take more initiative or find work that is (or find ways to make work) more personally fulfilling. In contrast, at the Apprentice program, YLs feel that success is determined by symbolic indicators of fitness that are unchangeable by the worker herself. Apprentice YLs articulated that it is largely out of the control of a worker whether or not she is liked by her

colleagues or how long she has been in an organization. YLs' talk about success highlights different orientations to work that rely on either internal or external validation. In actuality, however, both Worker Bees and Apprentices are subject to judgment of their visible performances of worker as the basis for success in the eyes of the organization.

Both the Worker Bee and Apprentice style approaches to work entail a particular performance from workers upon which success and fitness for the job is assessed. To some degree, no matter how a worker completes the tasks she is assigned, not embodying a convincing performance of worker is a threat to her success and ultimately to her identity as worker. In the following section, I consider the instances where YL's performance of worker breaks down and the consequences for workers when their performance is threatened. Despite whether they claim success to be from internal or external validation, the next section shows the importance of workers' visible performance.

Ruptures in Performance of Worker

A break down in the performance of worker can be based on any number of things such as a bad behavior, costly mistakes or disciplinary issues, but in other cases, just the decision or inability to adequately engage in the managerial performance expected of an ideal worker is enough to 'cause a rupture. Foucault (1972) points to ruptures as breaking continuity and giving rise to analyses examining how the seamless nature of discourse works to makes existing conditions seem natural. In the YL program, a rupture provides a break in the seamless performance

of worker and a way that we can point to discourse and the performativity of youth's worker identities.

For many YLs, these ruptures are accidental; for others, the rupture is a choice not to engage in the managerial performance required to be seen as one of the best. But what is common across the accounts in my data is that the rupture has nothing to do with the quality of work performed or the ability to complete the tasks assigned. Instead, ruptures are rooted in expectations of what it looks like to be a worker. When a YL no longer engages in the prescribed performance, it causes co-workers and managers to see them in a different light. It is this violation of expectations that has such an impact on their success as a worker, rather than any failure to complete the job.

Though they are completing the job (or the hours) they have been assigned to do, those YLs who cannot or choose not to put in extra hours end up at a disadvantage and feel that they are judged by others as less valuable workers. When I ask Luisa if she is going to be named YL of the summer, she tells me she will not because she is only participating in the first half of the summer. I ask her if she would win if she was only being judged based on the work that she had done to this point and again she tells me she would not. Luisa, 13, explains that her participation in summer school has limited the number of hours she can put in at the club.

> Because a lot of the YLs, like although we're close, they kind look young, because they see that only that I don't—like, "Oh, you don't work the full hours like we do." But I'm still basically working at school. I work at school, then I come here. So it's like I do different

types of work, but I still work all the time. I'm not fooling around.

But they see it as if, like, we deserve it 'cause we worked more hours.

So it's kind of like an argument there.

Despite the fact that Luisa is working the number of hours agreed upon by her and the Teen Advisor, this is not enough to successfully perform worker, especially as it stands in comparison to other YLs who work full days. Thalia is another YL who, when I ask if she will win YL of the summer, admits she does not think she has done what it takes to be selected as the winner based on the number of points she has earned from her Teen Advisor for doing her job.

Thalia: I don't think I will, at least. 'cause everyone's ahead of me.

I'm behind by 33 points. Everybody else is like 160, 170 and 180.

AW: What do they do to get ahead of you?

Thalia: They do extra work, 'cause they actually bug Victor about it, I think. They're like, "Victor, can I do this? Do you want me to do this?" Victor doesn't let us know if he's going to give us extra points, 'cause that's part of the job. But he might not give me extra points.

Thalia recognizes that in order to win, she would have to put in more work than just the basic 40 hours a week and she has chosen not to. She seems to understand that she is not the ideal worker at this club and does not want to put in the extra effort (beyond what is required of her as a YL) that would be required to qualify as one of the top workers.

The risk of failing or choosing not to engage in the managerial performance that is required to be identified as a top worker is to risk losing one's identity as worker at all. It is as though once "worker" is not performed seamlessly, YLs are no longer seen as workers and are instead treated as regular teens.

In Dexter's case, being treated as a regular teen at the club meant largely being ignored. The prior year, Dexter, 14, had been a member at the club during the summer and describes his experience as largely unsatisfying, "last year I was here as just a club member. Well, I was only there for a few weeks, because I didn't really like it as a club member. I mean, I felt kind of too old from the other kids." Dexter agreed to return this year because he was old enough to be a YL which would demand more responsibility and give him something to do. Still, as a worker, Dexter is ignored. When I asked him about the instruction he receives about his job, he explains, "Honestly, I'm not really told much. I'm not really given a lot of assignments. I'm really just… if I see something, I just do it." Though it appeared that Dexter was perfectly capable of identifying and completing tasks on his own, he explained that he would actually prefer a bit more direction, "well, I'm okay to do things on my own, but I would like to have some more guidance so I can be given some more things to do." His response surprised me because it was not something I had heard from any of the other YLs at any of the other clubs, but the Club Manager's reaction to Dexter confirmed his experience of being ignored.

> After about an hour, Dexter leaves the room and Caleb pokes his head in. "Did that kid actually talk to you?" With raised eyebrows, I shake my head "yes" to indicate that I was also a bit surprised at

> Dexter's willingness to talk with me. Almost laughing, Caleb exclaims, "Man, I don't think I've ever heard that kid talk before!" and goes on to say, "when I saw you bring him in for an interview, I figured he would be like five minutes."

The reason for Caleb's surprise, which I only understood once we began our interview, is because Dexter has a severe stutter. It takes Dexter several attempts and about three times as long to fully articulate an idea. While still poking his head in from outside the room, Caleb explains to me that he never talks to Dexter because he is "quiet and so hard to understand." Upon reflection, it occurs to me that Dexter is largely ignored as a YL because his performance of worker is not seamless. He seems to do the work that is expected of him, but his speech impediment means that he cannot communicate in the fast paced way that Caleb prefers. When left alone, without having to engage in conversation with Caleb, Dexter can adequately conform to the performance of worker, but any attempt at conversing with Caleb ruptures that performance. Thus, Dexter is largely left alone almost like a club member rather than a YL and allowed to do whatever work he sees fit.

Dexter's experience of being ignored as a YL because of his stutter brings up important policy implications. Technically Dexter's speech impediment would qualify as a reason for accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). According to this national policy he could be granted additional resources that would make it easier for him to overcome his physical impairment and do his job to the best of his ability. And yet Dexter's particular disability is a perfect example of the limits of policy. While accommodations may help Dexter and other

people with disabilities eliminate the challenges that keep them from performing at their full potential, they are limited in their ability to change our narrow prescription for who is viewed as an ideal worker. For some workers with physical disabilities, accommodations may allow them to work more efficiently or effectively, to better embody the performance of ideal worker. Unfortunately, no matter how hard Dexter works or how much time he puts into the organization, no policy can motivate a manager to pay more attention to his workers or see them in a different light.

Youth are going through a process of constructing worker identities, which in some ways involves casting aside their identities as teenagers and adopting an organizational identity. In the space of this program, it seems that expressions that position YLs as youth are not acceptable expressions of worker identities. The most glaring example of this contrast happened at the Apprentice club when two of the YLs were caught kissing by the dumpster after the late night challenge. Technically the event was over and the YLs were cleaning up for the night. All of the children who regularly attend the club had gone home and none of the staff actually witnessed the interaction between Rex and Cara, but word got out among the YLs and the Teen Advisor and eventually the Club Manager found out.

This incident brings up issues of the scope and boundaries of the performance of worker. Though they had both been at the club to participate in a "late night" event and they were on YOC property, it is important to keep in mind that the incident happened after regular work hours when there were no children at the club. Rex had been fired before the incident took place and as soon as word got

out, Cara was also fired. Blake explained that he had no choice but to fire her because "we've had several parents come to me and say that we've had YLs kissing. It wouldn't be a big deal to me, but it is a really big deal to Paul." Blake explained to Cara that "it's not your work that I'm worried about" and told her "you're literally the hardest worker we have in the apprentice program." But unfortunately for Cara, what delineates someone as a worker from not being a worker depends a great deal on others' the believability of one's performance of worker. Still, it raises the questions about the scope of the organization especially under circumstances in which they are working are outside of the normal boundaries of their job or organization.

A second rupture that came to the attention of the Club Manager in the same week was an incident in the gym that happened while the members and YLs were playing a game of dodge ball. Dean and Jordan, both in their second year as YLs, apparently hit a club member (fairly hard) in the face with a dodge ball. The boys claimed it was an accident, but the young girl was understandably upset. I was never told the details of the incident, but whatever happened was enough to get Dean and Jordan both fired for their actions.

At the Apprentice club, part of the process of being a YL is playing the game, which for most, includes getting fired at some point. When YLs are fired through this process, it is really in name only. YLs that are fired still participate each week in the challenges and are still invited to the trip at the end of the summer and most importantly, they are still expected to work 40 hours a week as YLs. Being fired simply means that they are no longer eligible to win at the end of the summer.

At first, the firings are fairly easy, Blake knew who he wanted to eliminate each week based on their lack of effort. There were several YLs who just did not perform worker with the same amount of commitment or fanfare as the others and it was relatively easy to select these folks to eliminate from consideration. As the game went on, however, the selection of YLs to eliminate became harder for Blake. By the last few weeks, he still needed to eliminate YLs to get down to a final three, but he struggled over the decision. It came down to a point where he was eliminating YLs that he really valued, YLs he characterized as good, but just not as good as some of the others. "I'm at the point where I think all of the people that are left are really hard workers". He would tell YLs this in our firing meetings.

The structure of the YL program at the Apprentice Branch as a game or competition creates an interesting discourse around being fired and what that means for participants identities as workers. Getting "fired" from the program seems to be an upsetting experience for some of the YLs. There were several times when a YL left in tears or almost in tears because of being fired. At the time of our interview Lexi, 12, had not been fired and had made it pretty far along in the competition. Even outside of the context of the boardroom, the thought of being fired was upsetting to her. When I asked if she had been fired, she said, "no, not yet. I have a feeling I'm getting fired today". When I asked why she thought that, she explained, "Blake is giving me the look" and then she smiled and began to tear up.

Lexi: He's like… I don't know why I'm tearing up right now. I didn't mean to.

AW: I didn't mean to upset you.

Lexi: It's not upsetting me. Sorry, I just do that sometimes. And then I don't want to disappoint anybody. I just don't want to be fired.

AW: Yeah, yeah. Okay. That makes sense. I don't think anybody wants to be fired.

Lexi: Yeah, 'cause I think I do a really good job. I really do. I try my best on everything.

Lexi's tears are perhaps another space where we see the difficulty of simultaneously identifying as youth and worker. The thought of no longer being able to identify as a top worker after so much effort was upsetting to her, but she also realized that in order to maintain the performance of worker she must not cry.

Being fired is supposed to mean that YLs are not eligible to "win" the grand prize at the end of the summer, but they are still included in all activities and challenges and expected to do the same work. The game seemed to backfire this year. After being fired, YLs not putting in the same effort – even acting up in some ways because they knew they could no longer be fired. After a strong performance in his first year as YL, Dean was a standout in the competition as a second year YL until his mistake in the gym – accidentally hitting a girl in the face with a dodge ball - caused him to be fired. Dean explains how after being fired, his motivation plummeted.

There is a shot at redemption, but I really haven't been like so into it that much. I got fired and I just felt like so bummed about it. I

> mean, on certain days I'll really push myself, but then it's not kind of showing to some of the higher-ups. That kinda just makes me not want to.

Even Blake made comments about the change in Dean from star performer to a being a bit of a distraction to others. When asked about his change in attitude, his mistake weighed heavily on him.

> It was so important to me because I felt like I was ready to just show myself, because last year I really wasn't. 'cause after I got fired, I became a really good YL and I just wanted to show it to Blake, or I really want to show it to Marisa this year. I really want to show how much I've matured from last year. I was not as good as last year. So I really just wanted to show Blake and Alexis how much better I could do. So after that happened, even though I was still working hard, I was just falling back. I'm working hard, but then I just made one wrong decision.

Rather than feeling excitement about being identified as a standout, Dean felt his identity as a worker was being defined by one mistake, one slip in his otherwise convincing performance. In his mind, the mistake he made was more important than any of the hard work he had done previously.

Finally, the week that so many disciplinary issues had come to light – the dodge ball incident and the Club Manager learning of Rex and Cara, there was a spirit challenge going on at the club. Everyone at the club (members and staff) was divided into teams based on age group and asked to participate by creating a unique

costume, dance, and cheer. The YLs were on a team of their own. I was asked to be a guest judge along with the daughter of one of the donors to the club. When final scores were tallied, the YLs won by a very small margin, just behind them were the seven and eight year old team. When Alexis found out that the YLs had actually scored the highest number of points, she inquired about which team came in second and the margin of victory. After an explanation of our decision, Alexis indicated that she would prefer that the seven and eight year olds win instead of the YLs, because "the YLs had a tough week" and she thought it better not to reward them. Alexis's decision not to reward the YLs exemplifies the importance of the performance of workers. Because the YLs had not performed as good workers that week they were not deemed worthy of being publicly recognized – despite that their performance as YLs was separate from their performance in the spirit challenge. Their behavior as sub-par teen workers eliminated the possibility of them being acknowledged as good organizational members.

These incidents or ruptures demonstrate the importance of adopting a managerial performance in making one's work visible and valuable. All of the YLs fired for these disciplinary incidents were considered top performers by Blake, but their value as workers was not contingent upon their ability to complete tasks or contribute to the organization, but by their ability to provide a seamless performance of worker. In the following section I discuss potential implications of framing work in such ways.

Implications: Organizations as Discursive Agents

My analysis reveals that for youth, resources for identification as worker are somewhat exclusive of resources for identification as youth. When youth acted like youth by testing boundaries and socializing with other youth, their worker identity was completely erased for them. In the case of the Apprentice style club, they were "fired" from the program. The strong inclination toward a performance model of worker (which relies heavily on performances of business and professionalism) seems incompatible with performances of youth which are often egocentric, exploratory, and sometimes reckless.

There were, however, some small moments where resources for work and youth identities did intersect. At both types of club (Worker Bees and Apprentice style) opportunities for individualization in dress provided a space for youth to construct identities as both workers (in the club uniform) and youth (incorporating their own style and preferences). YLs at two of the Worker Bee clubs were encouraged to personalize their YL shirts to show their personality while the YLs at the Apprentice club were encouraged to dress in costume according to a particular theme.

Youth are actively engaged in the process of constructing worker identities, but this must not be at odds with their identities as youth. Lexi seemed devastated at the thought of being fired from the YL program, but perhaps if more resources had been provided for her to identify as a youth, it would not have been so upsetting.

Taken together, the similarities and differences in the types of program illustrate the role of meso-discourse in shaping meanings and performances of work.

The YL program offered across the country is essentially the same program and yet the way it is implemented has important implications for the work it does to help youth understand work. These differences in framing of work function to construct work differently for youth, yielding potentially very different outcomes. The different ways that work is framed in the context of the program become the differences that make a difference, and are discussed below.

Essentially, the tasks required of the YLs do not vary much from one club to the next. This is quite significant given the differences in the ways the program is framed. When considered in the context of the very different implementations of each program, the consistency across tasks demonstrates the role of discourse in shaping experiences for participants. Though they are completing largely the same work, YLs at the Apprentice type programs are learning the importance of the performance of work which is much different from the internal and task based approach to the Worker Bee programs.

One of the main differences in the implementation of the program is the way internal versus external validation serves as a resource for YLs. Each club I observed offered some sort of external validation or tangible reward to the top performing YLs. At Worker Bee programs, top performers are given cash, taken for a back to school shopping spree, and/or had the cost of their end of year trip paid for. At the Apprentice club, the top YL wins cash and/or gets the cost of their end of year trip paid for, or if s/he is old enough to be hired as a staff member, they are offered a job as a paid staff member for the next summer. But the presence of internal and external forms of validation as a resource for YLs extends well beyond the prize for

being selected as the top performing YL of the summer; it is a distinction that structures each the program and the way YLs are taught to perform with in them.

Given their micro-discourses about rewarding popularity and favoritism, YLs at the Apprentice club seem to understand the politics of performing worker. Being labeled an exceptional worker is more about one's ability to play the part of a dedicated worker according to a managerial model and be noticed for it (by other YLs and staff), rather than getting the most work done. The resources available from their program, that instruct them on how to be a worker, teach them to be hyperaware of how they look and how they are talked about, over and above any work that they actually do. But the importance of role playing is not to be understated, particularly given the discourses of managerialism that dominated constructions of work at this club. Worker, like any other expression of identity, is nothing more than a performance. Perhaps Blake's and my performance in the boardroom, donning ties, seemed over the top or even fake, but in reality creates a space for reflection and awareness that serves to illustrate that worker is nothing but a performance. Mocking or satirizing the performance of the boardroom actually functions to make visible the performance of worker that is easily taken for granted. Role playing is not just a method for learning how to become a worker, role playing is what it means to be a worker.

At the Apprentice program, the heavy reliance on external forms of validation as a motivation backfired when it started to affect YLs performance. After just a few weeks of the program the Teen Advisor began to complain about the lack of motivation from the YLs who had been fired. YLs themselves

acknowledged this lack of motivation that came from being fired. The fact that there was no longer a chance of winning (no external reward for performing worker) meant that workers (who had previously been motivated by external rewards) had no reason to put in the effort they once had. When the primary resource for looking the part of worker is based on others' judgment of your work (external indicators of success), the need to perform and look the part of worker is strong (as the performance of worker is the only visible indicator of success), but once that motivation is removed, there is no internal drive to motivate the worker's performance. Thus, YLs who have been fired from the program then perform disinterest – if they have not successfully performed worker, they have been successful at performing a less than ideal worker and thus there is no reason not to take up this identity. In this way, the firing of those YLs who do not successfully perform ideal worker becomes somewhat of a self-fulfilling prophecy where workers who are told that their performances are poor, so too becomes their work.

Of course, it is not as though internal rewards as a discursive resource is necessarily any better for workers. Performing worker based on internal motivations simply provides a different set of resources that come with dangers as well. Workers who internalize their motivation for work, claiming a specific calling or skill at work – especially service work – may set themselves up for low pay and little respect. Many jobs that are characterized by little pay are also justified by the supposed claim that the work is internally motivating, something that a person wants to do or feels they can do well. Throughout our nation's history those with money have justified paying immigrants and women unfair wages for domestic and care work based on

the thought that they were more fit for or skilled at this type of work (Hondagneu-Soltelo, 2001; Hrdy, 1999; Shields, 1975; Wood & Eagly, 2002). By positioning work as internally motivated, workers put themselves in the position of not being able to negotiate for more external rewards (such a pay or benefits). This truly is a false dichotomy (consider wealthy businessmen, like Steve Jobs, who claimed to love his job and garner impressive wages), but it is an easily perpetuated discourse that puts (typically low wage) workers at a disadvantage.

In many ways, YLs at each club are learning to do the same type of work, but in practice, they come away with a different set of resources about how to be successful in work. The YLs at the Worker Bee programs engage in the same type of work as those as the Apprentice programs, but what they do not get (that Apprentice YLs do) is an explicit lesson about outwardly performing worker according to managerialist discourses where symbolic performances of worker become more important than the work itself that characterizes professional work. In this way, Worker Bees and Apprentice YLs are learning resources to construct worker identities that prepare them for certain types of work that are in many ways classed Unfortunately, the difference in availability of resources also reproduces class differences in terms of professional and nonprofessional workers.

What is troubling about the ideal worker norm and other such narratives of work that reward workers based on their ability to perform a worker identity is the illusion of individualism (Trethewey, 2001) and meritocracy (Chiapello & Fairclough, 2002; Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008) that is left unquestioned and thus perpetuated. If being successful at work (especially for the highest earning and most

prestigious jobs) is not based on skill or ability, amount of education or size of network, but on ability to perform a worker identity (Williams, 2000), a symbolic indicator of fitness, then it is available to anyone. With enough effort, anyone could put in more face time and identify with organizational goals and values to demonstrate her/his commitment and fitness to the organization – or so it makes sense to believe.

Judging one's fitness as a worker and her/his subsequent earnings based on a model of performance fits into narratives of the American Dream, individualism and meritocracy. When fitness as a worker is based on the performance of managerialism or entrepreneurialism, it creates the illusion that everyone has equal access to such a strategy. If all that is required to be an ideal worker is to act as such, then it would seem that anyone can do it, it requires no skill or training to which individuals may have limited access. This idea of equal access then perpetuates the assumption that if one chooses not to play the role of the ideal worker, s/he has only herself to blame (Holmer-Nadesan & Trethewey, 2000; Trethewey, 2001). It also serves to mitigate any guilt about reproducing the class system in the US that rewards those who fit a particular image of the ideal workers and provides a source of motivation for those who do not.

The problem with such reasoning is that it is an illusion – a very powerful illusion that is deeply sedimented and difficult to disrupt. The illusion of the equality of a performative approach that values a worker's visible effort is that it relies on what is seen and ignores what is rendered invisible. Thus, women whose effort in the workplace is seen, but who take on greater care and domestic responsibilities

than men in the private sphere (Alberts et al., 2011; Williams, 2000), immigrants who work is rendered invisible by their legal status or their personal relationship with employers (Romero, 2011), and even Dexter, whose disability makes his boss uncomfortable or unwilling to take the time to give him the attention he deserves are all rendered invisible by popular notions of the ideal worker whose efforts are based on a performance of worker.

Ultimately, the analysis presented here demonstrates the role of discourse in creating outcomes for/by workers. Every day, programs and policies are carried out across organizations, across the world and they are subject to the interpretation and implementation by individuals. No program or policy can be carried out in exactly the same way (and arguably nor should it be), but the contribution of this research is to consider how small differences in program framing and implementation, meso-level discourses, can create meaningful differences for the way youth organize their identities as individuals, as organizations and as a society. In the next chapter I move away from a focus on meso-level discourse to a focus on youth's micro-discursive practices, to consider the way work is made meaningful by youth. Though youth draw upon and implicate meso- and macro-level discourses in their talk about work, youth's micro-level discourses play a mediating role in how we understand the role of work in our lives.

Chapter 5

DISCOURSES OF WORK AND FAMILY

More than just talk about work, discourses provide important information about the role and value of work in a society. As a result of the growing importance of work in contemporary lives, there are also a number of discourses that guide our understanding of work and the role it plays in our lives. In this chapter I shift the focus of analysis to macro-level discourses to consider how popular narratives position work and family as ways of organizing individuals. In many ways, extant literature theorizes work outside the home as the central role around which one's identity is constructed and places it in competition or tension with other elements of one's identity. This chapter serves to demonstrate the impact of macro-level discourse to shape our identities around work and family, but also points to the presence of micro-level discourses that disrupt and resist dominant discourses and potentially to reshape them.

The following research takes a discursive approach to move away from a focus on positive and negative outcomes of the multiple roles of work and life to consider the process of how work comes to have meaning for youth participants in a leadership program. In the following analysis, I explore the ways that discourses of family make sense of work and give work meaning for youth. My focus here is not on how individuals manage work and family, but instead on the meaning of work and the discourses that come to constitute it for youth.

The research presented below complicates existing macro-discourses of work and family and argues for the importance of considering a variety of narratives about

the meaning of work and its role in our lives to expand our thinking and provide alternative ways of engaging with work and family. The analysis below suggests the importance of a processsual approach to consider the ways that work comes to have meaning. For some, work and family are constitutive of one another and participants' micro-discourses demonstrate how work is made meaningful in ways other than to cement the importance of the organization in our lives.

Youth's Micro-discursive Practices that Give Work Meaning

The following analysis moves through macro, meso, and micro-levels of discourse to examine the ways that the concept of "family" was drawn upon by youth as a discursive resource to construct meanings of work. In labeling "family" as discourse, we see how family is valued and prioritized and how it gives/takes meaning to/from other discourses – in this case, "work". I move through each level of discourse, starting with macro-level discourses and moving to meso and micro-level discourses to consider how family and work and constitutive of one another. I start by identifying the macro-level discourses invoked by participants when talking about work. Throughout the data, participants echo social discourses of capitalism and consumption to explain reasons for work. Next, I move to meso-level discourses, where participants draw upon their own familial practices and assumptions to construct care for family as something other than work. Finally, I explore the micro-discursive practices of participants to construct their future work as a source of meaning, specifically pride, for their families as well as practices of engaging in work as a way of "doing" family. A discussion of implications for research and practice follows.

Macro-level Discourse: Family Gives Meaning to Work

Macro-level discourses, identified by their taken-for-granted nature, point to larger social narratives that shape our actions in the world. Macro-level discourses are identified by asking the questions, "what is valued?" and "what is assumed?" Macro-level discourses are often identified by locating the justification or "why?" behind policies and practices. In answer to the question of "why work?" the overwhelming majority of responses drew on discourse of consumption that what is fascinating about these discourses is the way that youth understood them to be in service of family.

Perhaps the most ubiquitous discourse of family in relation to work is the way that family serves as a motive for working. In other words, youth in this study largely understand the reason for work as supporting family. When asked, the most common reason participants say their parents work is to financially support their families. Dominic, 16, succinctly explains, his parents work "to put food on the table and a roof over our heads." This simple desire to earn money to provide for the basic needs of their families seems to answer the question of why parents work, no matter the family structure or socioeconomic status. Roberto, 13, suggests that his father works "so he can support us—food in the kitchen and clothes on our back and stuff like that." Kendall, 13, echoes this, saying that his parents work "to provide like food, pay the bills, water, gas, electricity… Clothes. And like other things that like—like movies and stuff". While some might critique the somewhat materialistic bent of these answers (Schor, 1998), a discourse of work that is made meaningful through family is an important one because it brings forth the

importance of work to our personal relationships and for our identities outside of worker. Work becomes meaningful in that it is a way that people can directly contribute to their families.

In some cases, the urgency of these basic needs are more immediate for some of the youth than for others. Thalia, 13, explains that her cousin and mother work, "to support me and my little brother 'cause my dad doesn't pay child support". Sabrina, 15, adds,

> I think my parents work to support our family, I guess. 'Cause my grandma doesn't work…I have me, my two brothers. So they have to pay bills and just keep food on the table. So I really think they work just to support us.

When asked about the most important thing he has learned about work, Joaquin, 15, answers, "the most important thing I've learned about work is making money for the family". Clearly, for Joaquin and the others, family not only gives meaning to work, but is the primary reason for work.

In addition to the basic needs including food, shelter, and clothing, youth report that their parents work to provide for them in other ways as well. When asked about why she thinks her parents work, 14 year old Olivia, who attends private school, explains, "to provide good education for us, and so they can show us good work ethic and stuff." Sometimes the specific contribution of work to a family goes beyond the family's basic needs. And yet, it is obvious that these youth feel work somehow supports or provides for their families. Christian, 14, explains "my parents work to like provide me and my sister with the best life that they can and to do

anything they can for us." Joaquin adds, "I think they work to help us, help us get a better life and everything, because to us, we're the only kids she has. And we're, like, the first. To her, we're everything to her, so she wants us to do good in school, never get in trouble." Neither Christian or Joaquin articulate any specific needs that their parents' work provides for them, but work still seems to be the basis for generally supporting their families.

It is not just parents who make sense of work as a way to provide for their families, however; youth talk about a desire to make a contribution to their families through work. Specifically, youth talk about working as a source of income to pay for their own expenses, to take some of the burden off of their families. Dominic reports his grandfather encouraging him to work, "Um...he just um he just wanted his—he wants me to apply here or at Fry's so I can get some money." When Olivia's mother, an engineer at a Fortune 100 Company, found out about a scholarship offered by Olivia's private school – given to students who put in enough volunteer hours in the community – she encouraged Olivia to work to get it. "My mom, she brought this up, she said, "You should go for this, 'cause she knew I could do it. She was really happy when I got it." Olivia reports that in the last three years, she has put in over 800 volunteer hours in her community to earn the $2,000 per year award. Olivia seems to understand the cost of her education and feels compelled to repay her family in some way.

Most of the time, youth do not seem to be prompted by family members, but instead recognize on their own a desire to contribute to their families and repay the many things they have been given. When Wynonna, 17, told me about her prior

work experience cleaning yards, I asked if this was something she was asked to do or took the initiative to do on her own, she explained that she sought out the opportunity to make money "'cause I can help, like, my mom and grandma's bills and everything. And stuff I needed that they didn't have money for. Like personal-wise stuff." After acknowledging herself, her two younger brothers and her grandmother who all live in a house together with her parents and do not work, Sabrina explained, "I want to work so like one day I can support them." When asked about what she most looks forward to about work, Maija, 15, says "Money. Helping my mom out with the bills". Luisa, 13, reveals a similar motivation for getting her first job:

> Yeah, it was my first time ever working. I worked because I wanted to get, like, clothes… So I started working for [my aunt and uncle] and they paid me pretty good money. I made like 600 bucks in two months. So I was really happy, and I spent my money on clothes, shoes, so my mom wouldn't have to worry as much about me for clothes and stuff like that, and she can put it in savings or something. So that was my first time working.

Thalia, a 13 year old, is in last place in her club's YL program. Though she is considered to be somewhat of a trouble maker by the staff at the club, in a one-on-one conversation she seems to be pretty clear about the value of work and her goals for the future. In our interview, she listed the places she would consider working when she turned 16, which included a fast food restaurant, two clothing stores, and a shoe store. When I asked why she would work in any of those places, she explained

that each establishment would give her a significant discount on her food and clothes if she worked there. So I pressed further, asking why she thought it was important to get a job at 16:

Thalia: Because I want to learn how being an adult feels and paying for my own stuff instead of my mom trying to get it for me. 'Cause I feel like I owe her—which I do.

AW: Why do you owe her?

Thalia: 'Cause she took care of me for almost 14 years and when I was an embryo forming in her belly, she did what she had to do for me. *(laughs)*

AW: And what did she have to do for you?

Thalia: She had to stay healthy and not do the wrong things like drugs and alcohol and such.

AW: Mm-hmm. So you feel pretty grateful for that?

Thalia: Yes, ma'am.

It is clear that these youth view work as an accessible way that they can show their appreciation for their families and potentially repay them in some small way.

It is worth noting that the participants who talk about work in this way are from relatively low income families, some from single parent households. These youth are children of McDonald's employees, customer service representatives, and construction workers. Thalia lives with her mother, who is currently unemployed but had been working as a hairdresser. Though clearly not every participant from a working class family talked about work as a way of acknowledging what is owed to

families, it is important to consider that none of the children from the upper class club ever spoke about work as a way to repay parents or help with bills. For the most part, the reasons for working articulated by these middle and upper class youth was primarily as a resume building activity or as a way of ensuring a future summer job at the club. When building one's resume was not mentioned, youth at the wealthiest club reasoned that they found participating in the program to be fun or a way to hang out with friends.

For family members who do not work outside the home or are not able to work in paid jobs, many choose volunteer work that does not include a paid salary, but benefits the family in other ways. Even his unpaid work as a YL is contributing to Dakota's family because as a YL he does not have to pay to be at the club every week over the summer. When I ask what is important to him about this job he says, "Helping people and it's also cheaper for my dad." Dakota understands that by working in the club all summer he can make things easier on his family. Like Thalia, who realized the value of selecting a job based on what discount might be available to employees, Jessi, 13, works in her school's kitchen, "I volunteer there and I get like free lunch and cookies and stuff like that". A free volunteer's food handler's permit was required for Jessi to work in the kitchen, but by putting time in before school each day, she can save her family money on her school lunches. Dean, 14, and his sister, Anna, 12, both directly benefit from their mother's unpaid work outside the home. Dean explains that his mother used to work for the YOC so he and his sister were able to attend for free. He goes on to describe other unpaid contributions his mother has made.

> Well, basically, I started four years ago as a kid, because my mom got a job here at the front desk. So I got to come here for free…My sister does cheerleading and my mom works at the cheerleading place, so that gets her, like, free cheerleading. She likes it, too, so it's not necessarily like working.

Dean seems unclear on whether or not to consider this a job, saying that his mom "partially works" but he does see how he and his sister have benefitted from his mother's labor. And it seems as though his mother's choices about where to spend her time have been somewhat strategic, to contribute to her family's finances. It is somewhat troubling that Dean discounts his mother's participation as work, simply because she might find it enjoyable. Still, he is aware of her conscious choice of where to work so that he and his sister could benefit. Joaquin's mother also volunteers her time outside the home and receives a benefit for her family. Twice a week Joaquin goes into work early to walk with his mother to the town hall where she helps hand out food to community members donated by the food bank.

> Joaquin: My mom goes to the town hall and they cut our bill for our house so it helps us live.
>
> AW: Yeah. So do you think that's work?
>
> Joaquin: Well, yeah. Kind of. To me it is.
>
> AW: Why kind of?
>
> Joaquin: Well, I say it's kind of not, because it's helping the community. But then again, she's trying to help us, so it's

kind of work at times and it's kind of not. She's not getting paid, but then the bill thing.

AW: Yeah. She's not getting paid, but she is…

Joaquin: Getting the bill cut.

Like Dean, Joaquin is somewhat unsure of whether or not his mother's time at the town hall counts as work, but he is certain about her contribution to the community and to his family.

Meso-level Discourse: Family as Transcendent of Work

Meso-level discourses indicate the formal and informal policies that govern and guide our behavior. Meso-level discourses are easily seen in the formalized and often written policies that organize individuals, but are often informal and unwritten in contexts such as families or other socio-cultural groups. Typically, meso-level discourses are understood to operate at the organizational level, but I challenge this notion and extend meso-level discourses to families and even friends or peer groups. Meso-level discourses are identified by routinized or patterned behavior, and answer the question of "how?" such as how organizational members divide work or know their roles or how change in such practices might come about. In talking with children about care work, which often occurs inside the home and is done by family members, the question of "how?" is often found in family practices. Though no formal policy exists to designate care work to the domain of family, youth make meaning of care work though obligation to family.

Care work, which is often not done for pay, done inside the home, the overwhelming responsibility of women, tends to evoke popular discourses for youth

that overlook it as work. Despite discounting it as work, youth do seem to recognize the challenge of this type of labor. Nearly all of the participants in this study said that they had experience working with children and/or they had some sort of skill or affinity for working with children. And even with that skill or affinity, many of them describe caring for children as difficult work. When Jade, 13, was asked about caring for a brother, sister or other family member, she explained "it takes time to watch family because sometimes family can be annoying they can get really mad sometimes… Working with your family takes times, you get to know them much better and it takes a lot of time." Trinity acknowledges, "sometimes [children] don't listen and it's a lot of work to watch kids." And Dean explains that caring for siblings or other family members, "could be very difficult. Say the brother or sister is being very rude, which happens a lot." Wynonna adds, "you have to make sure nothing bad happens to them, you always gotta feed them, you always gotta make sure they don't fight, make sure they're doing what they're supposed to be told, they're not goofing around. You just always have to keep an eye on them." All of these youth, whether at the YOC or within the context of their families, have had experience working with children and recognize that it can be challenging work. But, even in the space of recognizing the effort that goes into this type of work, youth seem to refrain from giving care work the credit it deserves by identifying it as work.

Despite the time, effort and sometimes physical labor that is required in performing care work, these youth noticeably do not consider care work performed for families as work. When asked about spending time with his grandparents, Christian was clear that this was never to be considered work, explaining, "because

like you should just do that if you really love your grandparents. One day you're not gonna have them". Trinity makes the same argument that spending time with parents and grandparents is never work "because they're your family and you're supposed to be hanging out with them. You're not just supposed to forget about them." Sabrina explains "It's something that should just come natural to you, like you put family first. You don't get anything—like you don't get money or anything from it. Like, you do it." These participants' remarks demonstrate a clear sense of obligation to family.

Perhaps just spending time with family does not register as work for youth because it does not require much time or effort outside of one's normal day. But even with tasks that require more time, effort or skill, such as attending a child's school play, driving children to work or watching a brother, sister or other family member, youth still seem hesitant to label this kind of activity as work. Sabrina reasons that such activities are never work "because like family comes first". When asked why she would never consider watching a brother or sister as work, Jessi responds, "Well, because it's family. You're supposed to help family." Of the seven participants who said that watching a family member is never work, six of them come from working class families. Twelve year old Maggie, was adopted by her mother, a nurse, and her father, a realtor, was the only participant from a middle-upper class family who said that watching a family member is never work, largely for the same reasons as the other participants – that family is not work. These youth explain that caring for family is an expectation or an obligation. It is part of what it means to be a family. Or, as 16 year old David says, "it's just what I have to do. It's

just a thing that I'm obligated to do." For youth who reside in families with a higher socioeconomic status, care work may more often be paid work done by someone other than a family member, creating the sense that childcare is paid work. But for the youth of lower socioeconomic status, who have been responsible for care of their family members, care work seems to be an unpaid obligation you do for family.

Though the prevailing discourse seems to portray care for family as desire or obligation rather than work, there are exceptions. Dexter, 14, dryly states, "it's work" when I ask about watching a family member. Dexter lives with his mother who is a child care worker. She has two jobs, both of which are at childcare centers. Dexter's indirect experience with childcare through his mother's work may be the reason for his insistence that childcare is, in fact, work. But his mother also works in childcare at two different jobs. Likely from seeing the effort and exhaustion his mother experiences with her jobs, Dexter is drawing upon the physical effort involved in caring for children when calling it work.

When asked whether or not driving your children to school would be considered work, both Javier, 15, and Dean frame it as a choice to spend time with family. Javier says, "It's not really work because it's your kids so it's a normal priority you have to—not have to, but almost always do it." Dean says, "if they are your kids, you want to—I want to give them the best that they could get, and me taking time to drive them to school, that's what I always want to do." In these cases, discourses of family seem to influence youth's decision about whether care constitutes work.

There is a sense that naming these family care tasks somehow negates the desire to perform such work. This has interesting implications for the discourses surrounding work. While care work often fails to garner the same respect, status, and monetary compensation as work that takes place outside the home, the micro-discourses that circulate among these youth contribute to the notion that doing something out of love cannot be work (and therefore does not deserve the same amount of monetary compensation). The gendered implications of such an attitude toward care work are quite significant. If care work (which is still predominantly the responsibility of women) continues to be invisible in terms of work, it is not granted any sort of social value, either through gratitude from other family members (Alberts, Tracy & Trethewey, 2011) or monetary compensation.

Micro-level Discourses

Identified by their individual or interpersonal and fleeting nature, micro-level discourses are the mundane practices and interactions that make-up our daily lives. Micro-level discourses are the communication or actions that position us as agents in the world. Micro-level discourses can be recognized by asking how an individual positions oneself or performs a particular identity, in this case a worker identity. An interview is a rich context to examine micro-discursive practices because participants are directly asked to make sense of work, specifically in ways they may not have previously been asked. To some degree, everything said in our interviews counts as micro-discourses as participants and I were in the process of meaning making. As previously explained, the separation of macro, meso, and micro-level discourse is

artificial and somewhat impossible, but this separation is an analytical tool that allows us to examine the process of how things come to have meaning.

Work brings meaning to family. Discourses of family operate to give meaning to work in ways other than as a manner of financially providing for family. Instead of potentially taking away from work because of obligation to family, notions of family also serve to make work more meaningful, contributing more than just a paycheck. In these interviews, youth referred to work as a positive reflection of their families and a way to make their families proud. Wynonna's family is a source of inspiration and motivation. To show her appreciation for the way her grandmother believes in her, Wynonna explains that she is going to use her second paycheck to take her grandmother out to dinner:

> Because she's been there for me this whole time. She helped me through everything, even when it was hard. And she's the most important to me and she's the one I want to make proud, too. So I always tell her, like, what are my goals and everything and she says I can do it. You just got to believe in yourself and everything. So I always do my best to try to make it to those goals, for not just me, but her, too. Like I want her to be happy and everything.

A number of participants express a desire to make their families proud as a result of the job they end up in. For Ava, 21, work is something that she chooses so that her nine month old daughter will have what she needs for what Ava considers a "good life". But, for Ava, providing a good life means more than just providing the things

her daughter needs to survive, it also means acting as a role model for her daughter – which for Ava starts with working.

> Yeah, 'cause all that I do, everything I do, it's like it's for me, it's for myself. But most of it's for my daughter, you know? 'Cause I want to give her a good life, the life I never had, you know. I really want to be a good influence on her.

When I ask Ava what she needs to do in order to be a role model for her daughter, she is confident that she already is – pointing to the fact that she has a job and is at work as well as finishing school. "I think I already am. I feel I am already... You know, if I didn't care, I could just not have a job or kind of be finishing school, you know? Like other people."

For other participants, having a job is important, but the type of job is what becomes meaningful to them and their family. When asked if she would ever consider working in the jobs her parents work, as a customer service representative or a construction worker, Sabrina explains, "I want to do something more… I want to be a brain surgeon". Her reasoning for this is to be a role model to her entire family:

> It's important to me for my little brothers. I know they are so smart. They have a lot of potential to do anything. 'Cause I know that I'm smart, I know I can do anything. So I don't know why, it's just really important to me for my brothers to look up to me, because I'm the oldest. If I do go to a university, I would be the first one to go, like, ever.

These youth are describing work as something that is valued by society, and so by working hard and getting good jobs, it shows that their family's hard work has paid off and that each subsequent generation is doing better than the one before. Joaquin talks about his parents wanting a better life for him, saying his mom, "wants me to go to college, get more money than how much she gets—well, she doesn't actually get anything. And she wants me to get a good wife and everything so she's there for me to take care of my kids". Though Joaquin articulates a very particular vision of family, it is one that his culture casts as ideal and one that requires a different kind of work than what his family had.

Orlando, 15, also reflects on his family's work and expresses his desire for something better; his father is a machinist, his mother is a childcare worker and his grandfather picks crops. When I ask him to complete the sentence "I would never work in a job that…," he responds saying, "I would never work in a job that requires back-breaking work. I would rather spend my time in college so that it could pay off later." I follow up by asking if he thinks "back-breaking work" does not pay off as much as a job that requires a college education and he responds saying:

> Like I just learned from examples like most of my family, they don't have papers, they don't have citizenship, so they have to work in that, and I know that I have the opportunity, I have my birth certificate I need to like show off for it.

Orlando recognizes the opportunities his family has created for him and wants to repay them by working hard in a job that will bring pride and honor to his family. Working is an opportunity for Orlando to "show off" or make something out of the

life he has been given, an opportunity his family members have not had. This notion of showing off one's legality and citizenship is a privilege overlooked by most people with white skin.

It is not uncommon for children to want to make their parents proud through the jobs that they choose, but for these children their motivation to get a good job seems to go beyond a desire to make their families proud, to serve as almost a repayment; at the very least a good job indicates youth's recognition that they have opportunities that their family members may not have had.

Work as a way of doing family. A unique feature of this sample of youth is the way that they draw our attention to another important manifestation of how discourses of family and work are so intertwined, one perhaps not as easily recognized with adult and professional populations. These youth talk about work as it actually becomes a means of doing family. Far from the pervasive discourse of work as something that takes time away from family (which can also be found in this data), the following discourses illustrate how work often functions as a time when parents and children can be together. Work represents time that parents or grandparents and children might not otherwise have if not for the space of work to bring them together. For Orlando, whose grandparents still live in Mexico, trips to visit family mean hard work.

Orlando: When I go to Mexico he makes me go to the field with him and pick crops

AW: What are you doing out in the field?

Orlando: Planting, cropping...

AW: Okay and you've done that before?

Orlando: Yeah on a donkey.

AW: And how does that feel?

Orlando: Its hurts you can't…I can't walk after the first day. Your legs are so sore.

AW: Does he pay you for it?

Orlando: No because I live at their house, but it's my grandpa too, you know?

AW: Yeah, okay. So you don't mind doing that for your grandpa?

Orlando: No.

It could be that Orlando's grandfather brings him to the fields with him to teach him a skill or demonstrate a strong work ethic, or it could be that his grandfather's job does not allow for days off to spend time with family. Either way, Orlando is simultaneously engaging in both work and family on these visits.

For Dean, spending time with his father, a contractor, by working side by side with him is something that he has grown up doing and now does nearly every weekend for pay.

Dean: When I was a toddler I had my own little mower, and when my dad would mow, I would be right behind him. So it was always something that was always there. That was always something that I always wanted to do, like do what my dad was doing, and that was construction, around the house stuff, remodeling. My dad for a long time remodeled with his friend.

They would buy a house, remodel it, make it really nice, and re-sell it. So I would sometimes come along and help them, like actually really help them. And I learned a lot from it. The whole garage is filled with all these tools and stuff, and whenever there's something that needs to be done and my dad's not there, I can handle it. So it's nice.

AW: So whose idea was it? How did he decide to start paying you for the stuff that you're doing with him this summer?

Dean: Well, this summer, it got more actual work, like actual showing up at like 4:00, early morning since it's hot out. And actual hard, hard labor work. But it's with my dad, so it's fine. So either way, I used to come along, just help him where he needed it. And I enjoyed it. Like I would ask to.

Dean's desire to work with his father does not seem like an obligation, but rather something to which Dean looks forward. He is learning important skills, in both construction and business, as his father is starting his own contracting business, but he is also doing family.

For Joaquin, work provides a unique opportunity that he may not otherwise have -- the chance to get to know his father. Joaquin explains, "Me and him don't talk that much because we don't live together. We barely see each other. I go to work with him on Saturday sometimes." Without any other reason to spend time together, working together provides a way, an excuse even, for Joaquin and his father to get to know one another in a way that is reasonably comfortable for both of them.

Joaquin explains that his father, who works landscaping, initially suggested working together, "because, I mean, we barely talk. It's always awkward when we're in the car. So he asked me, 'So you want to go to work with me?' I'm like, 'Yeah, sure,' 'cause I barely know him." In Joaquin's case, work is not just a way to spend more time with family, but actually the only way he and his father know how to "do" family, how to act as father and son.

In some ways the narratives from this sample of youth are quite gendered. Based on the preceding examples, work is a way for young men to bond with the men in their families. For Orlando and Joaquin, work is a way to spend time with their grandfather and father, respectively, which they may not otherwise have if not for the opportunity to work together. But my sample reveals that work as a way of doing family is not limited to young men and their fathers.

Brittany, 12, also understands work as a way to spend time with her father, who is divorced from her mother. Brittany spends weekdays and nights with her mother and her time with her father is on the weekends, the same time that he works doing maintenance jobs in the mobile home community where they live. Many of her weekends are spent walking around with her father as he completes the maintenance jobs around their community for which he gets paid. When I ask why she goes along with him on the maintenance calls she explains, "just for fun…but it's like me and him time, seriously. I have five siblings, so when I finally get to hang out with my dad, it's like, hey! Finally alone!" As Brittany goes on maintenance calls with her father, she is able to spend one-on-one time with him, time in which she does not have to compete for his attention. But this time is not only useful as a way for

her to be alone with her father, she also learns about what it means to do work, noting the difficulty of physical labor as it compares to the work that her mother does as a realtor. When I ask what job she would never want to have, Brittany answers "Maintenance man… I know because my dad has to do it all the time. And I always go with him." The experience of work as family is important in the way it shapes both notions of family and work for Brittany.

Implications

This research show that commingling discourses of family and work is inescapable for these participants. Certainly, one of the practical reasons for having a job is to earn money to live and thrive in the capitalistic (and increasingly individualistic and materialistic) society we have created, especially when one has a family to support. But extant research has focused on the positive and negative *outcomes* of these work and family negotiations to the point of overlooking the *process* of how work and family come to have meaning in the first place. Thus, the analysis above provides an important perspective into the way notions of work and family are discursively co-constructed.

Macro-level

When youth refer to jobs as being meaningful in the way they allow family members to provide for one another, they are characterizing work as a "job" or as a means to enjoying other aspects of their lives, such as their family. To be fair, these are only reports of parents' motivations for working given by youth, who are by nature quite ego-centric in their thinking (Elkind, 1967; 1978) and not the actual descriptions given by working adults themselves (whose descriptions may contain

more reporting of how the job fulfills them as careers or callings as well – based on study done by Wrzesniewski et al.) -- still this has important implications for which discourses of work take hold and shape youth's understanding of what it means to do work. For youth, the meaning in work is very focused on work as it can bring meaning to other areas of their lives.

Though there was evidence of other orientations to work, such as a career or a calling (for example when youth were asked to think about their own work), the overwhelming majority of participants understood their parents' reasons for working as supporting a family. There are other important reasons for having jobs, ones that are potentially overlooked when a focus on supporting oneself and one's family become the primary reason for working. Such an emphasis on financial motivations for work certainly discourage any ideas about work as being something for the self. It is possible that youth engage in such a framing is because it is threatening for them to think that their parents may engage in work as a primary source of meaning.

When I asked these youth about reasons for why they wanted to work, many of them explained that they wanted money to support themselves and/or their future families, but many expressed other reasons for wanting a certain type of job – like helping people, pursuing a passion, making their families proud or being a good role model. All of which are important motivations for work. When financial security becomes the primary motivating force for work, there is a strong potential for discouraging young people from taking risks in jobs or pursuing passions that might not always be the highest paid jobs.

Meso-level

A second important implication is in the way that youth make sense of care work. Based on this research, it is clear that discourses about work done to care for families and work done inside the home, are still sedimented in antiquated and gendered notions that care work is not comparable to other types of profit generating work (Drago, 2007; England, 2005; England & Folbre, 1999; Herd & Harrington Meyer, 2002; Tracy, 2008). And the way that youth continue to make sense of care as something other than work reconstruct this type of work as marginalized and undervalued – even when they are the ones performing it. This type of thinking further limits our understanding of what it means to do work in this country – at a time when a number of jobs are moving out of offices and into homes and when our economy is becoming less product based and more service based (Connellan & Zemke, 1993; Gutek, 1995; Hochschild, 1979; 1983). This type of thinking is potentially dangerous in the way it limits our idea of work as that which belongs in the public realm and further creates a binary between public and private work that tends to lead to inequitable gendered practices.

Participants' treatment of work and family as constitutive of one another raises important questions about the way that border theory and boundary theory treat work when it is simultaneously family. What does it mean when the labor you perform falls both squarely in the categories of work and of family? The purpose of these theories is to point to borders and boundaries, clear markers of where one role ends and another begins, but it would seem that notions of blurring boundaries, or boundaries at all, does not capture the complexity and nuanced relationship between

work and family for these participants. There is some literature on work done in family businesses (Sharma, 2004; Sundaramurthy & Kreiner, 2008), but even in this research, though the context of work and family are one in the same, work and family are still talked about as separate or overlapping roles. In the way my participants talk about work, there is no moving between work and family, but instead engaging in both simultaneously. Work *is* family and vice versa. This is important because it disrupts our means to ends assumptions about work as well as the idea of separate spheres for work and family. By blurring these boundaries, workers may be able to engage in work in ways that are more fulfilling of other aspects of their crystallized identities (Tracy & Trethewey, 2005). And what are we doing to care work when we only theorize about it as family and not as work? Do these theories consider care work or work done inside the home as "family" and not as "work"? And what are the implications for that?

Micro-level

The third theme discussed in this chapter is the discourse of work as a way to uplift and bring pride to a family. This discourse is one which pulls from ideas about the "American Dream". It is touching and notable that much of the reason why children want to succeed is to make their families proud. Most of these youth recognize the opportunities that they have been given (which their parents did not have) and want to repay their parents in any way they can. And this desire to repay their families and having a better life than what their parents have is strong motivation to get a good education and make the most of their lives by getting a good job.

Unfortunately, discourses of the American Dream also perpetuates the myth of America as a meritocracy and that hard work is enough to protect a family from unfair circumstances that might keep them from continually moving up in socioeconomic status. The likelihood is that not all of these youth will fare better than their parents did (Hiltonsmith, 2011; The State of Young America, 2011). Many may never make it out of the small town or house in which they are living now (Buchholz & Buchholz, 2012). Progress narratives about always wanting something more and better, which was present in the words of these youth, devalues the importance of hourly and low wage jobs that, in the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., are important and dignified and uplift humanity. The fact is that this type of work must be done by someone and most of us are grateful to have it done, and we should hesitate to perpetuate any discourse – no matter the good intentions— that risks alienating the men and women that work in these jobs.

Additionally, the drive these youth have to achieve something their families can be proud of is remarkable. That said, it also can become overwhelming and a threat to the work of being a child. Some of these youth are so focused on being the best and brightest that they miss out on just being children. Olivia put in over 800 hours of her free time in the last three years to volunteer in her community to win a scholarship from her school and Sabrina comes back early from her lunch breaks and stays later working so that she can win the competition. Neither of these examples are bad – in fact in most cases these youth are commended for their hard work and dedication (and they also receive other benefits like scholarships and monetary prizes) but it is important not to overlook the costs of such intense drive.

If youth learn now that more time should be put into work, then nothing will change as they become adults (especially females) working in organizations. Perhaps they will put in more time and effort, and they may even receive promotions or recognition for it, but it may be at the cost of family or leisure. In addition, if youth feel compelled to make their families proud via high status work, but do not enjoy that work or do not wish to put in the amount of time such a job entails (i.e. if they do not wish to perform the ideal worker) they may also experience negative consequences from conflict created between what they want and what they feel they should do.

Finally, the last theme explored in this chapter has been discourses of work as ways of doing family, the implications of which are overwhelmingly positive. Though there has been research demonstrating the dangers of youth working as a ways of doing family (Rothenberg, 1999), in the context of this research, the implications seem relative positive. By working side by side with parents, youth are not only able to spend more time with their families, but these times serve more opportunities to be socialized into work. From these unique experiences, youth may learn new skills, from technical skills to interpersonal and business skills that will aid them in their futures in school and/or work. One of the most common complaints youth reported hearing from their parents about work was dealing with a difficult boss or coworker. Perhaps witnessing work interactions might help youth learn these skills to become better colleagues and bosses in the future.

Additionally, seeing their parents engaged in work allows youth to witness the work that their parents are doing and potentially develop more of an appreciation

of the work that is required to provide the things for their families that youth talked about above. Moreover, in the case that parents jobs are more of a career or calling, witnessing their parents "in their element", succeeding at work may bring some type of legitimacy to work that they do (Kauffman, 1992) and to the skills that they have that their children might not otherwise see.

Of note in this research is that each of the examples cited by children of working with their parents as a way of doing family is in the context of fathers' work, and the work they describe is physical labor. Work seems to be a way to get to know or strengthen a relationship with one's father in a different way than one would with a mother. Perhaps this is a result of social discourses about what it means to father (i.e. to provide for a family financially through work, rather than with emotional support) or perhaps physical labor, not done in a professional workplace, that is relatively self-directed is more conducive to doing family than other professional or service type work. Still, we cannot ignore that perhaps many of these children have also worked side by side with mothers and other family members performing care work or domestic labor, but because this work is unpaid, or done in the home or performed for family members, youth fail to talk about this as work.

The theoretical importance of this research should not be understated. In the limited discussions about meaningful work that have occurred in the organizational communication discipline, meaningful work has been constructed in a somewhat narrow fashion, establishing "work-based meanings as the privileged and primary source of organizational meaning" (Lair, et al., 2008, p. 175). When we think of meaningful work, we think of characteristics of the work itself that render it

meaningful. Lair et al. address this critique, suggesting that "preferential meanings of work often marginalize alternative meanings derived from more 'private' realms of life" (p. 175), which marginalize the private, including bodies. But we must consider how work can be experienced as meaningful, not necessarily as a result of the work itself, but when considered in terms of other aspects of ones' lives or identities. In the case of the current research, the meaningfulness of the work transcends the job that is being done and becomes meaningful in the way it allows family members to better engage in their familial pursuits. For example, work has allowed participants in this study a way to connect and get to know their family members in ways that would not be possible without the work. For other participants, the meaningfulness of their work is in the way it enriches families and recognizes/repays the hard work done by their parents to provide such opportunities (and we might surmise that in this way parents' work becomes meaningful in the way it provides opportunities for children).

Perhaps the most theoretically useful implication of this research is the way that work-as-doing-family potentially de-centers the importance of work in our lives. Working in a way that incorporates family time brings a new focus to family and community and serves as a model for another way of being where work is not the main standard by which we organize our lives. Throughout history, societies and cultures have existed (and still do) where work is not as central to one's life or identity. Aristotle claimed that "leisure is more valuable than work" (Anthony, 1977, p. 20). In monastic societies, it was common for monks to claim that "their energies were better put to use through prayer and contemplation" (Clair et al., 2008, p. 19).

In such societies, "any excess wealth that resulted from monk's manual labor was distributed to the poor" (Clair et al., 2008, p. 19); the creation of excess wealth and consumption were not the goal of work. But the reexamination of the value of work is not unique to past societies or other countries. At one time in America's recent history (in the 1960s and 1970s), the number of hours worked by Americans actually declined, to "the equivalent of a half-time job" (Schor, 2010, p. 165). And the same decline of hours worked spread across other countries as well, including, the UK, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Japan. Even today, the number of hours worked in those countries has decreased. But since that all time low in 1973 the number of hours worked in the United States has continually risen (Schor, 2010) and with it has come the urge to define ourselves in terms of our work.

The research presented here highlights the existence of alternate discourses about work and highlights the ways that extant research examining work has been dominated by adult- and organization-centered notions of work. As organizational scholars we must consider what discourses construct work from youth's perspectives and how those discourses inform our understanding and practices of work.

Chapter 6

EXPERIENCES OF WORK-LIFE NEGOTIATION FOR YOUTH

In this final analysis chapter, I examine "work-life balance" as a macro-level discourse that has grown in popularity in both scholarly and popular conversations as a response to the prominence of work in individual's lives. In many ways, youth have already latched on to the idea of work-life balance and talk openly about navigating work among other elements of their lives. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate the ways that youth take up discourse of work-life balance and to refocus our attention on youth as important context for future work-life research. I point to youth's micro-discourses in the context of our interview to provide an important space for youth to disrupt their own assumptions about work and family.

Theoretical Framework

Work-life research is a topic that has captured the interest of scholars in a variety of fields including communication (Cowan & Hoffman, 2007; Golden, 2009; Hoffman & Cowan, 2008; 2010; Jorgenson, 2006; Kirby, 2006; Kirby & Krone, 2002; Kirby, Golden, Medved, Jorgenson, & Buzzanell, 2003; Kirby, Wieland, & McBride, 2006; Polk, 2008), family studies (Baxter, 2009; Hill, Hawkins, Ferris & Weitzman, 2001; Tausig & Fenwick, 2001), law (Arnow-Richman, 2010; Karin, 2009; Karin & Onachila, 2012; Mason, 1999; Mason & Ekman, 2008; Williams, 2001), management (Ashforth, Kreiner & Fugate, 2000; Clark, 2000; Desrochers & Sargent, 2004; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), psychology (Hewlett, 2005), sociology (Crompton, 2006; Doucet, 2009; Ehrenreich & Hochschild, 2004; Gerstel, Clawson & Zussman, 2002; Hochschild,1989; 1997; Jacobs & Gerson, 2004), social work

(Fredriksen-Goldsen & Scharlach, 2001), political science (Gornick & Meyers, 2003), and women & gender studies (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Still, there are important gaps in the body of research, such as the role of youth that the communication discipline is poised to address. From a communication perspective, work-life scholars may begin to consider the *processes* involved in the construction and persistence of work-life challenges. By this I mean the way in which work-life issues come about or come to occupy a place of significance in our experiences of work.

In existing work–life literature, youth are often theorized as occupying a role as children – as recipients of care and the responsibility of adults. Youth are included and addressed in existing work-life research as an element of the larger concept of "family" and as such youth are typically theorized either as a source of stress for their caregivers or in some cases as a source of enjoyment and balance (Wayne, 2009). In the recent *Handbook of Families and Work*, youth were accounted for as the subjects and objects of parental stress (Moen & Kelly, 2009; Repetti and Saxbe, 2009), the subjects and objects of work-family support and facilitation (Hill et al. 2009; van Steenbergen, Ellemers, & Mooijaart, 2009), parents' responsibility and outcomes of their work-life practices (Bianchi, 2009; Chaite Barnett & Gareis, 2009; Crouter & Goodman, 2009; Han & Waldfogel, 2009; Ruhm, 2009), and as the focus of work and family health in a global context (Heymann, 2009). Missing from this conversation is the role of youth as workers, family and community members, already engaged in work-life practices of their own. Despite the truth to Hill & Crane's (2009) claim that "no handbook can cover all of the important issues related

to families and work," the lack of research available is an important indicator of the oversight in the field in general (p. 5).

In their edited volume, Gerstel, Clawson & Zussman (2002) identify what they perceive to be lingering outdated assumptions about work and family including assumptions about the division of labor based on sex, the impossibility of work and family as a conflict-free relationship, the nuclear families as the definition of family and paid work was the only legitimate form of work. Gerstel et al. characterize these assumptions as, "celebrated in popular culture and without challenge from the social sciences" (p. vii). Despite the fact that their volume, like many others, claims to challenge or expand the boundaries of research on work-life negotiation, there is still one important assumption that remains unchallenged – the assumption that work-life negotiation is something experienced only by adults. Thus far, youth have been positioned as objects of work-life negotiation, rather than as agents of it.

Rarely, if ever, are youth theorized in the work-life literature as individuals who engage in work-life negotiations of their own. When youth are studied empirically in regard to work, it is most often in research conducted on youth in other (typically nonwestern) countries (e.g. Morrow & Vennam, 2010), as though working youth do not exist here in our own country. While youth are seldom considered the domain of communication research -- even more rarely the subject of organizational communication research (for exception see Myers, Jahn, Gailliard & Stoltzfus, 2011), there are a number of important ways that youth are implicated in the process of work-life negotiation. For this reason, the following research points to the ways that youth already experience work life tensions and negotiate competing

work-life demands in their quest to construct a satisfactory and meaningful life. Considering how youth are implicated by and actively engaged in work-life negotiations is an important way that organizational communication might increase its relevance and impact as well as pushing the boundaries of the field.

Practices of Work-Life Negotiation among Youth

At the meso-level of discourse we see youth engaged in their own work-life negotiations within the context and confines of the organization. Just like in adult work organizations, youth in the YL program must work a specific number of hours set by the club (usually 40 hours per week) and are scheduled for a particular shift. It varies by club whether everyone works the same shift (i.e. from nine to five), whether a YL is assigned to one of two shifts (either in the morning or afternoon), or whether each YL has their own set schedule that varies slightly from everyone else. These decisions are based on the needs of the club and are at the discretion of the Teen Advisor, who, for the purposes of this program, serves as a boss and instructor to the YLs. When I asked Olivia if she chose her hours or if they were set by her Teen Advisor, she explained,

> We fill out what the hours we want to do on our application, and so I picked those hours because they're easier for me. I don't have to get up as early and I can stay longer. And normally you get all the points at the end of the day 'cause there's more things that need to be done. And also because, like, coming in in the morning at like 7:00, there's like no one here.

Even though there is not much flexibility in the hours she is required to work, Olivia is able to give some input into what type of schedule best fits her needs. David describes a similar experience of being able to choose his hours, explaining, "on the application, you can circle hours, and I chose eight to four, so I usually keep to that," but still noting that the choices are determined by the Teen Advisor. Once their schedules are set, however, YLs are expected to stick to that schedule for the rest of the summer.

At most of the clubs, scheduling did not seem to be much of an issue. YLs were scheduled to work a particular shift and for the most part showed up without any problems. If a YL had a scheduling conflict, it was worked out between the YL and the Teen Advisor without incident. Olivia explains that some people work earlier than others, which is not her preference, but explained, "I had to do that for the past two days 'cause I had to leave at 3:00 for a doctor's appointment and dentist appointment." By showing up to work early for a couple of days, she was able to fit her appointments into her schedule. When I asked David if the club he worked at was flexible about scheduling appointments, he explained, "Yeah, they're really flexible. They just care about the kids being looked after. So them being looked after, that's fine."

I recall hearing conversations about certain YLs having a class or being on vacation without much fuss about it. Luisa, 13, actually only works a half day at a club where all of the other YLs work a regular nine-to-five shift because she is taking summer school classes and cannot be at the club until after lunch. "Well, usually I have to go to school… so I get here at 1:00, 1:20, because I have to take the bus. But

I take the bus, and the bus gets here at 1:20." While this schedule does fit her needs, it also penalizes her in some ways too – if not with the Teen Advisor, then with the other YLs, as demonstrated in the excerpt from our interview:

> Luisa: A lot of the YLs…they see that only that I don't—like, "Oh, you don't work the full hours like we do." But I'm still basically working at school. I work at school, then I come here. So it's like I do different types of work, but I still work all the time. I'm not fooling around. But they see it as if, like, we deserve it 'cause we worked more hours. So it's kind of like an argument there. Like they argue a lot about…
>
> AW: Do you care?
>
> Luisa: Like I don't necessarily care about the winning prize or whatever. I just did it for the experience. But they, on the other hand, it just makes me mad how they say I'm not working. It makes me mad, because they shouldn't be saying that because it's not true. And like, they're all making fun of me—well, I don't really care about that.

Even though Luisa has worked out this schedule with her "boss" to accommodate her educational needs, she feels misunderstood by her coworkers. From my experience, observing these programs, YLs either work out their scheduling conflicts with the Teen Advisor or they exit the program.

For some participants, however, others' perceptions about their commitment or dedication to work are not of concern. While Luisa has established her priorities

in regard to work and school, and experiences some unease about it, Thalia sets boundaries without any concern for performing the ideal worker (Williams, 2000). Thalia, who is in last place for YL of the summer at her club, does not care about impressing anyone by putting in more hours than what she is scheduled. She explains:

Thalia: I work till 4:00. No, 3:55.

AW: 3:55.

Thalia: 3:55. I don't want to spend a minute here that I don't have to be here.

AW: *(laughs)* Okay. Why don't you want to spend a minute here that you don't have to be here?

Thalia: Cause—okay, when my shift stops, I'm off the clock. Victor says, "Thalia, go do this"… "I'm off the clock, Victor."

AW: You're not doing it.

Thalia: "You should have assigned me till 5:00," you know?

AW: Because some of the people say, like, they'll just keep working and working, even if…

Thalia: I don't want to work if I don't get extra points, 'cause I see no point in that. I'm not in the top two, three, five, six, or seven. I'm in the top last.

Based on my conversation with Thalia and the other YLs, it seems that those who are not considered one of the top workers or those that claim not to care about the competition have an easier time asserting their boundaries.

For those who can let go of the ideal worker norm, the psychological strain of trying to compete with others seems to be lessened. And yet, these individuals will not be rewarded in the same way that others are either.

At one club, scheduling became more of an issue when a few of the YLs took it upon themselves to adjust their schedules to their needs or preferences. At this club all YLs work the same shift, typically from 9am to 5pm. Somewhere, midway through the summer, however, a couple of the YLs began coming in earlier, when the club opened at 7:00 so that they could leave earlier at 3:00. Though the Teen Advisor did not explicitly approve this practice, he seemed to accommodate it since the YLs were technically working the same number of hours as all of the other YLs. In our interview, Eduardo, 14, explained how he and Joaquin worked out their own schedules that better suited their preferences,

> Eduardo: Well, my normal schedule's supposed to be from 9:00 to 5:00, but I guess I found that too long because I don't really want to work all the way till 5:00. So we talked to Victor, I guess, if we could, like change it, but he said we can't. So I guess me and Joaquin come in at 7:00 and we get off at 3:00.
>
> AW: So he's okay with you coming in early and leaving early.
>
> Eduardo: Yeah, 'cause he noticed that we're here early, but he doesn't say anything.
>
> AW: Oh, okay.
>
> Eduardo: So like we just come in at 7:00 and we get off at 3:00.

AW: So you just made the decision to come in early and leave early?

Eduardo: Pretty much.

AW: And he's never said anything to you about it?

Eduardo: He's never said anything, so I mean, we're not sure if he's okay with it or not. I mean, that's pretty much the schedule that we have.

Eduardo even acknowledges that he spoke with the Teen Advisor and asked if he could formally change his shift, but did not get approval to do so. Instead, Eduardo and Joaquin decided to change their schedules in practice by coming in early and leaving early. Victor's silence regarding this change in practice seemed to serve as some sort of approval.

Joaquin explains how the informal policy of coming in early and leaving early came to be a norm at this club. Two days a week he walks his mother to her job at the town hall, which is right next door to the club, which he has parlayed into an earlier start time for his shift,

> Yesterday, 'cause it was a Tuesday, I came around 8:00, but I was supposed to come at 7:00. But like my hours are from 9-5, but I was supposed to come with my mom, drop her off at the town hall at 7:00, sign in, and then sit down for a while, and if a kid needs help, they'll be like, "Hey, Joaquin, I need help," and I'll go over there and help them.

The two days a week that he walks with his mother to the town hall, he arrives at the club two hours before the start of his shift. Because the staff and other kids at the

club know him as a YL, Joaquin gets pulled in to helping out around the club, which he interprets as starting his shift. By starting his work for the club at 7am, he has justified for himself an earlier start time. Thus, Joaquin also feels like he should be able to leave earlier and has done so without any real disruption to the club. Joaquin says he leaves at 3:00,

> Because it kind of gets boring. The YL program gets boring because there's never really anything to do after a while, 'cause you know the kitchen needs cleaning, you know the rooms are clean. Some staffs need help, and then there's those days when no one really needs help. And most of those days are on Tuesdays and Thursdays. So I like to leave early.

It seems as though the Teen Advisor has informally approved the policy by letting Eduardo and Joaquin continue the practice of coming in early and leaving early, without ever talking to them about it. At the very least, Victor had not done anything to stop Joaquin and Eduardo from shifting their schedules to better meet their needs or preferences. In our interview, Joaquin claimed that he had asked Victor for permission to change his schedule, "I told him, 'I walk my mom here at 7:00. Can I get off at 3:00?' And he's like, 'No.' And I'm like, 'For real?' And he's like, 'No, I'm just playing.'" It is unclear whether or not Victor was ok with Joaquin and Eduardo switching up their schedules in this way, but without an explicit "no", Joaquin and Eduardo felt ok to continue changing their hours to meet their needs.

A few weeks later, when I was at the club for a YL meeting, it seemed that word had gotten around about Eduardo and Joaquin's informal policy of coming early and leaving early and other YLs were trying to do the same thing.

> As we are trying to finish up the activity, the YLs are asking what time it is. We got a late start today and the YLs are rowdy, talking loudly over one another, tossing pens across the room and moving chairs around to sit next to their friends. Victor is yelling at them to quiet down, saying, "We have a lot to get through today!" Eduardo calls out, "I'm leaving in 30 minutes". When someone asks why, he says, "Because I've been here since 7:10". Reggie responds by saying, "I came in at 6:51, so I should be done in 10 minutes". Though they never explain it outright, I suspect they are making a stand because they have put in their eight hours for the day and they don't want to be here any longer. As we finish up the final activity, we are past the time that class usually gets out. It's already 3:15 and both Eduardo and Reggie are still here, but they are making their presence known with some huffing and puffing and smacking of their lips as the others try to answer Victor's question. As soon as Reggie finishes his worksheet, he puts it on the table in front of Victor and rush out the door. Victor doesn't say anything and watches him go.

The number of YLs who were working slightly different shifts and leaving at 3:00 every day had increased to three. Week after week, as I returned to the club it seemed like Victor was getting more intolerant of the YLs making up their own

hours. His comments went from casual jokes about the YLs leaving early and being "slackers" to the following situation where he seemed quite frustrated,

> As Roberto is getting things started he asks everyone to be quiet so they can "get out of here on time today". Victor is still in the room and yells at the group about leaving early. 'We can't have everyone leave early and have nobody here in the afternoons!' Joaquin and Reggie mumble something about coming in at 7:00 and that they've been here for eight hours. This is all Victor says before leaving the meeting to Roberto.

This instance seemed like the tipping point for Victor. He let the informal practice of coming early and leaving early slide when it was only one or two people, but as more of the YLs tried to take advantage of this flexibility, he felt like he had to put a stop to it. Still, based on the rest of my time spent in the club, it seemed that the three boys who had taken the liberty of setting their own schedules, continued to do so without reprimand.

Negotiating Family

Work is not the only place where youth are negotiating a balance between work and life, outside of their work at YOC, a number of participants talked about the types of care work they engage in for their families. Youth are often socialized into work (and family) through the types of care work that they chose or are asked to take on by families. Twelve year old Brittany explains, "I have five siblings -- three step-siblings, two half siblings -- and I'm the one that usually babysits the kids when [my parents] have to go out somewhere." When I asked Brittany if she gets paid for

watching her siblings, she said, "My dad gives me ten bucks, even though I go, "Dad, you don't need to do that." Because we're kinda low on our money right now, so I don't like him giving me money."

Often this type of work is paid, but some participants do care work for their family members simply because they're expected to or because they want to. Delilah, 18, laughs and tells me "I always take care of kids, and like when my brothers and sisters come by, they always ask me to watch their kids. I don't know if it's a habit or I just don't know how to say no." Brittany and Delilah (and many others) seem to get some sort of pleasure from either interacting with their siblings or from helping out their families. When I asked if she was asked to babysit or offered to do it, Brittany playfully responded by saying, "Well, I offered, pretty much, because you know, it's fun. They have to listen to me then. So they're listening to everybody else. It's like, all right. Listen to me! You can't listen to anyone else than me. And they kinda get to just hang out." Whether through a sense of obligation to the family or purely a desire to be with younger family members, it is a common practice for youth to begin working inside the home taking care of family members.

Jesse, 13, is an example of a participant who feels some sense of obligation to care for her siblings, but it is only through working as a YL that she claims she has matured and taken on other responsibilities as well, including care work,

> Before I worked here, I was like, I really just wanted to do whatever I wanted, because it was like I didn't have anything to do…But now I realize my dad needs help 'cause he has a new baby in the house, and

> I need to start helping around the house because my brothers don't do anything. They just sit there and play video games.

As youth get experience caring for family members, it often can lead to other opportunities outside their own homes (and inside relatives, or neighbors' homes) to engage in paid care work. Luisa is quitting her job at YOC after the first half of the summer because she is being offered a paid job with her uncle to care for her cousins. She had cared for her cousins for a few weeks in the previous summer, but as she explains, this summer her uncle is paying her more because her responsibilities will increase.

> Well, like, [my uncle] wants me to study more. His oldest one is turning five on July 10th or something, so because he's going to school, so he wants to get him ready, so that means I have to work more, rather than watching TV and watching cartoons, I have to study with him more, watch his ABC's. Like he wants me to help him know his number in Spanish. He already knows them, but he wants him to, you know, master them. He wants him to know 2+2's. So he wants me to get him ready for that. He wants me to—just he said he wants me to practice with his older brother so he can be ahead of the game or he can just be smarter when he goes into kindergarten.

With enough experience and skill, youth can often parlay their family obligations for care into paid jobs later on.

Though it may seem that the care work that youth engage in is primarily done in their "free time" and thus does not involve much negotiation, several of the

participants' experiences tell a different story. Not only are youth negotiating paid and unpaid care work in their free time, but they are also taking on care responsibilities during the course of a normal school or work day. This means that youth – even those who are not legally old enough to work for pay – are engaged in the same complex process of negotiation of their work and non-work lives as adults. And yet, this is not something that is not broadly discussed in the work life or communication literature.

Ava, 21, must care for her nine month old daughter while trying to attend school and now working at YOC. Her work-life negotiation has gotten more complex since she moved her daughter from being cared for by family to a childcare center.

> It's just a matter of trusting, you know? I've had some family members that I couldn't trust with my daughter because they didn't really watch her. I've been at the daycare center, you know—like while I'm in school, the daycare center's just right there by my school, so I go in there and check on her. You know, like I kinda built some trust with them so they're always watching her.

So, while it is more work to enroll her daughter in daycare and make trips to check on her throughout the day, it is a sacrifice Ava is willing to make to ensure the best care for her daughter. At 21, Ava is technically an adult, but other club members who are much younger juggle the same obligations to work and family.

Jake, 16, describes what he considers a typical work day, "I got here probably around 7:58 and my niece and nephew had their first day here, so I checked on them

a lot, but so I left my group to go check on them to see if they were okay." From his own accounts, Jake performs a good bit of care work for his niece and nephew, which he does not seem to mind. "I got my niece and nephew and they're like my own kids 'cause I take care of them so much and I love them so much." Though "checking in" on his niece and nephew did not appear to be much of a burden for Jake, he is still trying to engage in his job and care work at the same time.

When I asked Olivia what kinds of care work she was doing during the course of a normal work day, she responded by saying, "well, just like during the day, like I'll call my mom and ask her if she needs someone to talk to, 'cause sometimes she does. Like she gets kind of alone sometimes." Olivia's care work does not require her physical presence like Jake's does, but it does require emotional energy.

Interestingly, much of the "care work" that youth are engaged in is actually in showing care for their parents or other family members. Olivia went on to give another example of doing care for her family. "Like my dad, like when I was in Maui, actually, he had this problem with my grandpa and so he needed someone to talk to, so we just talked about it." Jade, 13, shows care for her mother (who is no longer living with her father) by choosing not to work longer hours that might take her away from some of her family responsibilities. "Well if she wanted me to work more hours, and I wanted to work more hours I could ask, but I don't want to ask right now because my mom needs me a lot." Though she isn't specific about what types of activities she performs for her mother, it is clear that Jade feels her mother relies on her at home. In choosing she has had to negotiate the cost/benefits of staying at the club to work longer hours versus helping her mother at home.

For many of these youth, balancing their work and non-work lives does require some sort of sacrifice. Trinity, 14, anticipates how difficult the decision will be in two years when she is legally old enough to work.

Trinity: Yeah. I told my sister I wanted to get my first job when I was 16, but I do a lot in school so she told me I have to pick because I can't do both because it's a lot of work and it's hard and 16 year olds have a curfew...like of the state so she said I have to choose.

AW: What do you think about that?

Trinity: It sucks because I still want to do cheer and stuff but it's going to be impossible for me to go to cheer practice and then go to work and still do school time 'cause part time...that's not really even like a job so...

Already youth are experiencing multiple demands on their time and are being forced to make choices about which activities to engage in and which to cut out of their lives. Brittany chose to sacrifice her spring break to help her father and care for her three year old half-sister. She explains, "It was a week. And it was like, 'Eh, I'll do it. I have nothing better to do.' So I got to sleep there a week." The choice for Brittany seemed like a relatively straightforward one, but the choice between responsibilities is not always so easy. Joaquin wants to attend a program for Hispanic youth being hosted by the local university, but must make a tough decision because of a family obligation.

> Yeah. I want to go to college. There's this thing that the old [Teen Advisor] told us. She said she signed me and Sabrina up for this Hispanic college thing at [the university]. It's on the 16th. I want to go, but then I kind of can't because my family—my cousins are having a quinceañera. And I never really miss one, and I kind of promised them. And it's kind of disrespect for me to miss those, 'cause I barely talk to them and we're finally getting along.

The program being offered at the university has the potential to improve his future prospects by providing him access and resources to the university. I could feel Joaquin's excitement as he described each day of the program to me and the piece of artwork he was going to bring with him to present. Joaquin, who will be a first generation college student if he attends, acknowledged the importance of this program, even if only to "know how it kind of feels to talk to the other college kids", but it seemed that his family obligations were just too strong and that he would likely have to make the difficult decision to miss this opportunity that he was excited about.

Joaquin's decision to choose family over other opportunities is understandable when we consider the cultural context, where "family is one of [the] most distinctive and enduring cultural characteristics," in which he makes his decisions (Cortes, 1995, p. 250). Hispanic families are characterized by a commitment to family, including more contact with extended kin (Freeberg & Stein, 1996; Valenzuela & Dornbrush, 1994) that is unmatched by White families (Burr & Mutchler, 1999; Kamo, 2000; Sarkisian, Gerena & Gerstel, 2006). This "familism"

provides a unique discourse of its own, prompting Joaquin to "value the provision of support among family more highly than Whites" (Sarkisian, Gerena & Gerstel, 2006, p. 333) in a way that competes with his commitment to his education.

The choice can also be difficult, even when youth are choosing to do what they truly want to do. Luisa describes the difficult consequences of choosing to work as a YL for the summer,

> Like my brothers, my younger brother, he stays home all day, so he kind of like is sad that we don't hang out with him as much anymore. Like he started crying yesterday. I feel so bad. 'Cause he, like, loves—we're tight. We're like really close. And when we're gone for months at school and work and we never see him and we have to stay home at my tia's house, 'cause she's like a college person—a college student—and she knows. It's like similar to her. So she helps us with it, 'cause it's hard for us to understand it. So we stay at her house until like 9:00p.m. And so we don't see him in the morning, and we leave at 7:00a.m. and then we go to school. It's the same process every day, so we never see him. The only time we see him is on Saturday, and like last Saturday I didn't really see him 'cause I was at my friend's house. So it's like we never see each other, really.

The lost time with her brother is clearly a difficult experience for Luisa. And yet, the opportunity to work is a strong draw. "I'm out of school now, but then I'll be working and I won't see him on Saturdays. I probably won't be seeing him 'cause I'll

be working at another job." Despite the emotional difficulty that comes with missing her brother, Luisa chooses to take on more work.

Future Expectations for Work-Life Negotiation

Work-life balance has become popular enough (at least in the US) to operate as a macro-level discursive frame to give meaning to people's experiences with work (Corporate Executive Board, 2009; Drago, 2007; Ludden, 2010; Weiss, 2009). Perhaps the idea of "balance" has gained popularity as it describes people's expectations for the role of work among other activities/identities in their lives. Or, maybe the popularity of the work is in noting a particular lack that exists for today's worker – the lack of balance between work and other areas of life. Whatever the case, the desire for "balance" has come to characterize discourses of work and is certainly a discursive resource for youth as they anticipate their future lives as workers.

In the course of our interviews, I intentionally did not use the word balance because I did not know if participants would know what I meant by balance and I wanted to avoid prompting them in one way or another when asking about their expectations for work. As such, I was surprised when some of the participants, on their own, used the word balance to describe their expectations for themselves as future workers. When I asked sixteen year old David, who anticipates a job as a physician, if he would be willing to bring work home with him, he explained, "I don't think so. I need some time with the family, too, as well" and then simply stated, "I want balance." David seemed strangely attached to and fearful of a need for balance in his life. I found this an interesting fixation and was curious about the

why this was such an influence in the way he thought about work. David's parents both work at the Dollar Store. Though it sounded like his parents worked hard, David told me that they never brought work home with them and hardly talked about work at all with David. Perhaps his older sister, a biochemistry major still in school has influenced his ideas about having a job in medicine. Balance was David's response to many of questions I had about work, including what might be a deal breaker for him in accepting a job, "I don't know. Like, "Oh, you have to work this many more hours" and that's not…I need a balance" and the thing he dreads about having a job, "That it might consume so much of my time, and like the balance might not be there at all".

The interview with David, which was about halfway through the 49 total interviews I would complete was the first time I had heard a participant specifically use the world "balance" to describe their future expectations for work. But it was not the first time I had heard similar ideas about negotiating work and other areas of life and it would not be the last time participants spoke directly of balance. When Olivia spoke about work, her thoughts quickly turned to family. She explained, "it's just like if you don't have a good relationship with your family, it's kind of hard to have good relationships outside of family. 'Cause, like if you're not balanced at home, it's hard to be nice to other people outside of home, 'cause you kind of take problems out on them." It seems like both David and Olivia, both of whom are motivated by working hard in school and the potential for impressive careers, point to the same concerns that researchers have about the implications of having identities and time outside of work.

But even when participants failed to use the word "balance", their ideas and expectations echo a similar need for multiple areas of investment in one's life. When I asked Jade, 13, what she would be doing in ten years she said, "um, going for my dream," which she described as,

> To work, have fun, play, like I don't want to be like those busy, busy workers where they have no fun because my mom said that she did that her whole life and she never got to have fun and now she regrets it. So I'll try to like figure out the time to have fun with my friends and a time to work and a time to stop and a time to have a break and not take too long.

Though she never used the word balance, Jade described a desire for a full life and paid careful attention to not getting too wrapped up work to the exclusion of other aspects of her life.

It seems that in many cases, youth learn about the need for balance from the mistakes of their parents. In the quote above, Jade mentioned the regret her mother expressed in not having enough fun, while Thalia seems to have learned from the mistakes of her father. Thalia anticipates the need to change her work schedule when she has children in order to spend more time with her family. When I asked why this was important, she told me "Because you need time for them and you need to, like, spend time with your family. 'Cause my dad really didn't do that, so you know, it's important for you to spend time with your family 'cause you can miss out on important moments."

For the youth in this study, the example set by their families or communities provide an important resource about how they too will navigate work life demands. When imagining his life as a working adult, Orlando's discourse is reflective of larger social norms that exist in his community. Orlando states that he would not want his wife to work, "I'd rather her be a stay-at-home mom with the kids. So she can spend more time with the kids. And that—that's how it is in my family, it's traditional. The guy works and the mother stays at home." This common scenario has provided a script that has shaped how Orlando thinks about his future as a worker and a father and in some ways has made negotiating work life decisions straightforward. Brittany also draws on a gendered model for how work inside the home and outside the home is accomplished when she talks about her responsibilities if she has children. She explains that even if she were in a relationship where she worked and her husband had primary responsibility for care, she would still have to come home to make dinner, "because if the dad made dinner, it would be like he's the mom, or I'm the overworked dad. So I have to make dinner and clean the rooms 'cause I'm the mom."

Despite the fact that these highly gendered ways of engaging in work and family are antiquated, they serve as an important macro-level discourse about how to do work and family. When I asked Luisa whether she would have to cut anything out of her life once she had a job as an adult she first said "no" and then realized that having a family might complicate her plans. "No, but if I have a family then, then that's different. Like I would have to focus on the family and I would have to get dinner and, you know, I would have to clean and do motherly things." Luisa, the

girl who minutes before was telling me about working three jobs and planning fundraisers for her church group falls back on popular discourses of mothers engaging in care work. Perhaps Luisa will change her focus to more "motherly things" when she has children, or perhaps this script is one that she has drawn upon without much reflection.

Among the many gendered assumptions about how work and family present in youth's talk, there are also alternate discourses present that offer some potential for disrupting norms. When Kendall, 13, spoke of balance, his perspective was not one of being overwhelmed by work, but rather the benefits of work as a way of balancing one's life. Kendall said that he anticipated having a wife and children at some point in the future and that he imagined his wife would have a job outside the home. When I asked why it would be important for his wife to have a job, he said, "Well…um…to keep balance, I guess." For each of the participants, who explicitly talked about balance in answer to questions about their future work lives, there seems to be an understanding that too much of a good thing (either work or family) can have negative consequences in one's life. I offer Kendall's account as a different notion of balance than what is often heard in work-family research (Alberts, Tracy & Trethewey, 2011; Tracy & Rivera, 2010). Typically research shows that for men, having a wife who does not work seems to create balance, but Kendall offers another, important way to think about what might be best for a family.

Kendall is not the only example of youth taking up alternate discourses of work-family negotiation. Even Orlando, who had been up front about his family's traditional values, spoke of other possibilities. Without any prodding from me,

Orlando began to think about the "traditional" values that he espoused regarding engaging in work outside the home while his future wife stays at home to care for their children. He reasons, "my family is old fashioned, its just—I don't know, new times are coming. Maybe she wants to work or something?" As he began to question the normative discourse of work and family on his own, I pressed:

AW: Would you ever stay at home with the kids?

Orlando: Like and have her work?

AW: Mhmm.

Orlando: So have her be like the dominant one?

AW: I don't know.

Orlando: I don't think I could do that.

AW: You don't think you could do it?

Orlando: Like I could, like they're my kids, but I don't think I could just like stay at home for like forever.

AW: Yeah? What do you think some of the challenges are staying at home?

Orlando: Um changing diapers? No, it's just like feeling like in your house like locked up because you have our kids and you can't go—you can't do anything, but… I mean that's how like feels

In the space of our conversation, Orlando has realized that in practice, work-life decisions are not so easy. He has also created an important space for himself to imagine how it could be otherwise. This realization is somewhat troubling for

Orlando and he acknowledges, "but I just like messed myself up right there". The point is not whether Orlando "messed himself up" by claiming that he wants his wife to stay at home while he would never consider the reverse. Orlando's realization reveals that many work life decisions seem easy in theory or when considered in the abstract, but when asked to account for the specific ways to achieve balance, the solutions appear far more complex or downright unworkable.

Traditions or norms that have worked for families are not always easy solutions in the context of the current social milieu, where families often need two incomes to survive, women are taking on more labor outside the home, and care requirements for children and aging adults are increasing. Even when families engage in relatively traditional gender roles that put one parent in charge of earning an income and the other the provider of care, these arrangements may not be totally desirable. Despite his original adherence to traditional family arrangements, Orlando goes on to say "I don't want to be one of those parents that come home at night and just see their kids for any hour and just go to sleep, you know?"

But popular narratives regarding work and family are compelling in some ways. They provide an accepted solution, one which youth have experienced themselves through the models provided by their families. Ava, 21, has a nine month old daughter and is already learning how to balance her work with caring for her daughter. She explains that the models she has for work-life are not ones that work for her, so she is now working to create a different reality for her and her daughter.

> And I don't like—like some people, they can't get much help. Like they try, it's just not possible. You know, like the food stamps stuff and that money. I don't want to be the type that relies on that, you know?...Because that's kind of pretty much all I've seen on the res. And most family friends kind of thing, like that's how their income is. Like very few, you know, like my family, like my aunt and whatever, they have jobs, but most of them, it's just like rely on that. It's like I don't want to be that.[1]

Even though they are engaged in work-life negotiations now, as they work and find time to care for families and spend time with friends, the thought of work-life negotiations in the future are a source of uncertainty.

But the best way to achieve balance is not always so clear. Kendall is realistic about how having a career as an astronaut would be difficult on his family,

> 'Cause like if I was an astronaut, I would probably have to not spend as much time in space as most time, 'cause I'd probably have to come back and like visit them and stuff. They probably won't even

[1] Ava's narrative presents a challenge for me as a critical qualitative researcher. I am torn between the responsibility to keep her words intact and to represent her in an ethical way. I wrestled with the decision to leave out the part of this quote that identified Ava's experience as one of growing up on a reservation– unsure of whether it made any difference in positioning her as a young worker in this country and fearful that it would evoke and potentially reinforce stereotypes. Though I recognize that every choice we make as researchers is political and partial and one that transforms the data in some way, Ava's narrative is an exemplar of my concern for bearing the burden of representation (Fine, Weiss, Weseen & Wong , 2000). I am grateful for the diverse perspectives of the participants in my study and yet concerned for how others will interpret and appropriate their words. But Ava (and the other participants) are not just objects of this research, they are agents performing identity and actively positioning themselves in certain ways too. As qualitative researchers we constantly make choices about which quotes to include and where to begin and end them, but ultimately I decided to let Ava's quote speak for itself (to the degree that it can) and to hopefully address the complexities of her situation in my writing.

see me, 'cause you stay up there for months at a time and I'd miss my kid's birthday or my wife's birthday.

He starts off by saying that having a family would mean that he would not be able to spend as much time in space, but as his thinking progresses he realizes that choosing a career in space may mean missing out on important family time. I press further asking him if he thinks he would miss his family's birthdays or if he would plan his schedule to be around for them. His response indicates the difficulty of such a decision. Finally, he responds, "I would…that's a hard question. I would miss it, I think." Scheduling is not the only difficulty, however; the pressure to provide for a family and simultaneously spend time with them is a complicated matter as well. I ask Kendall to tell me how he will have to change his work when he has a family and our conversation reveals the complexity of caring for a family and having a career.

AW: How would you have to change how you work when you have a family? What would be different?

Kendall: Hours, maybe? Like more pay. All those things when you support the family.

AW: So you'd need to make more money?

Kendall: Yeah.

AW: Okay. Anything else?

Kendall: Lesser hours.

AW: Okay. Why would you need to work fewer hours?

Kendall: 'Cause if I wanted—like I might have to pick them up from school, or like drop them off and stuff.

Kendall expresses both a desire to make more money for his family and to work fewer hours to be able to spend time with them and provide some care. Thalia's response to the same question also demonstrates the challenge of balancing competing work and family demands.

Thalia: I'd have to make more time for them, and yet I'd still have to have more hours for work to pay the bills.

AW: So how do you balance that? You have to have more time for them but you'd have to work more?

Thalia: Yeah, I'd have to go in earlier and open earlier and I'd have to get off earlier or later, probably.

Both Thalia and Kendall seem to understand the demands they will be faced with, but have not yet worked out a satisfactory solution. And the challenges they wrestle with here assume total control over one's job and schedule, a luxury not often available to most people as workers or as parents.

For many of the youth, the choice about how to accommodate work and family is relatively clear. But when asked to consider the details of work and family arrangements in practice, the only thing that is clear is the uncertainty around making it work.

Implications

First and foremost, this research does important work to demonstrate the ways that youth are *already* experiencing and negotiating their own work-life balance. Whether that work is paid or unpaid, youth are engaging in labor and simultaneously navigating the demands of their personal, social and family lives. The work-life

experiences of youth are not vastly different from adult experiences of work-life negotiation that we currently theorize. There is no doubt that youth are the objects of discourse in the same way that adults are as well as agents in the construction of such discourses and warrant being a primary focus of research. But as we look at these work-life experiences of youth, we must remember that youth are not yet adults and consider that part of work involves navigating some adult situations as well. Work does not stand alone in our society, but is wrapped up in the ways we live. One cannot engage in work without also engaging in all of the complexities that surround it. And young people who are learning about work are also experiencing the difficulty of what it means to do work in this country – which, in many ways, is to sacrifice other things, like family or leisure, or the work of being a kid.

Creating Flexibility at Work

Participants' talk about work pushes us to consider the ways that the ideal worker norm is based on one's present commitment to *one* organization. The ideal worker norm does not consider the worker as an entire person with other roles and obligations (whether family, education, community, or another job), but only cares about the work that one is doing in that organization at that moment. Luisa's frustration about not being considered an ideal worker (YL of the summer) because of her summer school obligations points to the ways that workers are thought of as just that, workers – and nothing else. It makes no difference if one is working three jobs or going to school or caring for a family, the only work that counts is the work that is done here and now and is visible to others.

It should come as no surprise that workers (including youth workers) have difficulty in finding balance in their lives, as that balance must compete with being a good employee. The notion of the ideal worker makes work-life balance nearly impossible because it sets up a system where workers are not at all recognized for their entire body of work – or more appropriately the entire contribution made to community, family, society. Since organizations are the ones that reward us, they of course reward that which impacts their bottom line – anything else is deemed to detract from that is bad and positions the person as less of an ideal worker. In some ways, less is more – the fewer responsibilities (outside of one job) a worker takes on the more s/he fits the model of the ideal worker. This is why women (who take on more part time work and more family responsibilities) and low wage workers (who often have more than one job across which they must divide their time) are not the ideal worker.

Those who can let go of the expectation of being an ideal worker (those YLs who are not as concerned with winning) seem to be better able to balance work with other aspects of their lives. In this study, it seemed like a few of the participants were not interested in fulfilling the expectations of the ideal worker and thus felt less pressure to perform ideal worker by taking on more work or engaging in tasks they did not want to do. It could be that rejecting or resisting the performance of ideal worker made their experience easier – this would certainly be an interesting question for future research.

For others, the solution to finding balance seemed to come with adjusting their work to better fit their lives. The situation at the Worker Bee club, where YLs

were manipulating the schedule to better suit their own needs, is no different from the struggle for flexible work arrangements in other workplaces. Very often, flexibility in work is allowed in the workplace when it is the exception to the rule, when just one or two workers are doing it. But when more, or all, employees want such privileges, organizations and their members get nervous (Barker, 1993; Barker & Cheney, 1994) and seem resistant to such flexibility for fear that the needs of the organization will not be met.

Of note in this research is that workers who were setting their own hours and thus creating their own flexible work arrangements were all boys. It would seem in this situation that the boys, for one reason or another, felt more empowered or compelled to create flexibility in their work and thus benefit from fuzzy boundaries set by the organization. Whether or not men tend to benefit from self-created flexible work arrangements or unclear boundaries is not the subject of this research but would also be a fascinating subject for future research.

Discursive Openings and Flickers of Transformation

These findings are important in that they show the process of work-life negotiation for youth. In many cases, decisions have already been made about which activities to engage in and which to cast aside, but in the context of our interviews, youth were also asked to imagine their futures and construct a narrative of how they intent negotiate work-life challenges. It is not the goal of this research to determine the health or utility of children's work-life negotiations, but rather to illuminate the factors that play into such decisions – essentially how work-life balance is discursively constructed for and by youth. Participants' micro-discursive practices –

the process of imagining their reality that they imagine for themselves in ten years – serve as discursive openings where their talk about work-life practices serves to expand the possibilities available to them. Instead of only drawing upon organizational and family (meso) level discourses and larger social narratives (macro-level discourses) about how to engage in work-life balance, youth are considering the limitations of these discourses and engaging in micro-discursive practices to imagine how it might be otherwise.

Thackaberry (2004) points to "organizational self-study" as one place in which to encourage discursive openings. According to her argument, when an organization engages in self-reflection it provides a space for the organization to think about alternative ways of being. As a qualitative researcher, I would also point to the interviews conducted for this project as another example of contexts which encourage or stimulate discursive openings for youth about work-life practices. Just by having the space to think about these issues (a space which may not have otherwise been provided without the context of the interview) has spurred youth to think of ways that life could be different than they expected or anticipated. These are spaces where youth might escape the popular discourses for long enough to question how it might be different or how they actually have the power to transform or reshape the dominant discourse in ways that are more appealing to them. Thackaberry explains the power of such reflection is in the potential for new voices to "appropriate and shape emerging discourse in unpredictable and even creative ways" (p. 324). Though they are influenced by the discourses available to them, youth are able to imagine and play with ideas that may seem impossible or

unrealistic. By thinking about these possibilities, they begin to expand the discourse around issues that may otherwise feel sedimented.

In some cases discursive openings can reveal potential for transformation in deeply sedimented and largely unquestioned social discourses that impact our lives. To the extent that the interviews provided a space for youth to reconsider and question their taken-for-granted assumptions – these discursive openings might also represent "flickers of transformation" in participants' lives (Tracy & Rivera, 2010). Tracy & Rivera describe flickers of transformation as important in "demonstrating how talk can both reveal and disrupt enduring scripts" (p. 3). I suggest that discursive openings point to a space for examining traditionally unquestioned norms, where the flickers of transformation referred to by Tracy & Rivera represent micro-discursive moves to actually disrupt or counter deeply sedimented norms.

In Orlando's case, my line of questioning allowed him to work through his assumptions by saying them out loud. As a result, he appeared to recognize a narrative that he may not be totally comfortable with, namely that he expects his wife to stay at home, but would never want to be asked such a thing for himself. His claim "I messed myself up" points directly to the interview as a discursive opening where he realized his assumptions and has contradicted himself. It may also represent a flicker of transformation where he has considered the implications of his assumptions and may change or chip away at the firmness of his unquestioned beliefs. In either case, the potential for acknowledging and rewriting the sedimented discourses that shape our lives in meaningful ways is an important discursive move that highlights the process of meaning making and the potential for change.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this project was to explore the discursive processes at work in the construction of youth's identities as current and future workers. I conducted a multi-level discursive analysis in order to consider the complex processes by which youth construct identities. In this chapter I begin by answering each of my research questions, which served as analytical tools that allowed me to artificially and temporarily make distinctions among micro-, meso- and macro-level claims for the purposes of analysis. After addressing each level of discourse as it stands alone (to the extent this is possible), I build toward larger theoretical claims by considering youth's constructions of work as they are constructed in practice, across multiple levels of discourse simultaneously. It is here that my discursive analysis becomes messy, but far more interesting and more illustrative of the multiple and competing processes that are at work in youth's identity construction in regard to work. I begin by summarizing relevant findings from each of my three research questions.

Summary of Findings

The first research question posed in this project was directed at the intra- and interpersonal interactions of participants about work as these are appropriate sites to access micro-level discourses. My interest was in accessing the mundane talk, performances and practices of youth that worked to shape the constructions of their identities. Thus, I posed the following question:

RQ_1: How do youth perform, describe and enact meanings of work in everyday micropractices? What do those meanings reveal about youth's the construction of current and future work(er) identities?

Following Fairhurst & Putnam (2004) micro-level discourses point to the context of the interview as a rich space for youth to perform and negotiate worker. Simply by conversing with me, participants were engaged in their own micro-discursive practices of constructing worker identities for themselves. Specifically, they described what they conceive of as work. According to participants' own responses, work when it is paid, requires time and/or effort, involves helping others, provides something useful for the person doing it, and sometimes has a formal classification or title such as a "job" or "chore". They also describe their notions of good workers. By answering my questions about whether or not they could possibly be named one of the top performing YLs and who of their peers would win such a distinction and why. When they answered questions about their future work and family goals and expectations, participants were engaged in a process of constructing a worker identity (likely based on their understandings of the YL program, their hopes and expectations of themselves and their families, and their perceptions of what they thought I wanted to hear). Our interview served as a place where youth could rehearse and perform a worker identity.

Micro-level analyses also demonstrate interpersonal negotiations between YLs and staff members about what it means to be a worker, specifically the ways that youth and worker identities were cast as mutually exclusive. When participants engaged in certain youthful behaviors such as playing too rough during a dodge ball

game or kissing by the dumpsters, their behavior was deemed that of a teenager and not of a worker and they were "fired" from the competition. Additionally, with few exceptions, there were rarely opportunities for YLs to perform their identities as youth while performing as workers. The expectation was that when YLs were performing as workers, it would be by sacrificing or hiding their identities as youth. Trinity even explained that in the space where she performed youth (at the club once her shift was over), she was explicitly told not to wear her YL t-shirt for fear that her behavior would reflect badly on the YL program. In other words her performance as worker was not to be confused with any performance of youth.

According to psychologist Erik Erikson, youth are in a stage of psychosocial development which he identified as "Identity Achievement vs. Role Confusion." In this stage, which Erikson suggests lasts from adolescence to early adulthood, individuals engage in a process of information gathering and decision making about who they are and how they will identify. Matched only by one's interest in her/his own sexual identity, this stage is characterized by a person's motivation to settle upon an occupational identity. Combined with a relatively egocentric worldview (Elkind, 1967), Erikson explains that most youth engage in a substantial process of struggle before exiting the sage with a stable sense of who they are. This "moratorium" (Erikson, 1968) or "identity crisis/exploration" (Marcia, 1994) describes the process by which individuals struggle to integrate previously formed aspects of their identities into a cohesive future identity as an organizational member.

In the context of the YL program, interactions between youth and their supervisors reveal that, despite their engagement with and contribution to

organizations, youth becomes a marginalized identity that must be managed or hidden from view, echoing and extending previous communication scholarship on passing (Spradlin, 1998, Myers, 2008; Trethewey, 2001). For instance, youths' explorations of sexuality are prohibited in the context of their everyday interactions as YLs. Thus, youth are learning that there are aspects of their identities that are problematic and that their interactions must be performed with that in mind. With few exceptions, there were rarely opportunities for YLs to perform their identities as youth while performing as workers. By being punished or dismissed for acting like youth when performing as workers, may cause internal conflict for youth who feel they must segment parts of their identities in order to be successful as workers.

Thus, at the micro-level of discourse, my most important finding is the way youth are being prepared to hide or remove aspects of their identity to be successful, which is no different than the discrimination against marginalized identities many adults experience when performing worker. Youth (like sexuality, gender, and age) becomes the target of marginalization, when it should be celebrated for its potential.

My second research question accessed the organizational and institutionalized discourses that work to shape youth's expectations and practices of work.

RQ_2: How do meso-level discourses serve as resources for youth to form expectations about work in the construction of work(er) identities?

First, at a meso-discursive level this study provides empirical support for the claim that discourses and discursive resources operate on largely an implicit level.

Unique to this study is its focus on how the process of implicit socialization into worker identities unfolds for youth, even in the context of programs that are explicitly designed for their socialization into work and their training in relevant job skills. Much of the socialization that takes place in organizations is learned via incidental learning. The majority of what individuals draw upon to form worker identities does not come from formal policies and procedures, but from the daily occurrences and interactions that leave a lasting and memorable impression (Way, forthcoming). Thus, while the YL and Job Skills programs are both important experiences and sources of information for youth about work, their process of constructing worker identities is not shaped by the lectures or activities (e.g. how to write a resume or how to clean up after lunch). Rather, it is shaped by implicit lessons about what it means to look like a worker and who gets rewarded for what types of work (e.g. more face time and fewer other obligations) that are a result of the structure and design of the program.

Many of the participants, who were not offered the Job Skills program, did not have a curriculum or formal lessons to draw upon, and yet they were able to articulate clear ideas about what it means to do work and to be considered a top performing worker because the clubs practiced YL in a specific sort of way. Consider how YL's at the Apprentice club drew on being liked or being popular with staff members as a key to their success. Though there was never an explicit lesson or discussion about the importance of being well-liked, YL's in this program picked up on its importance. Thus, youth learn that organizational politics and power relations

are a critical component of their future lives as workers (Fleming & Spicer, 2003, Mumby, 1987; 2005; Trethewey, 1997).

Additionally, a meso-level discursive analysis necessitates a rethinking of the focus on memorable messages in organizational communication (Knapp, Stohl & Reardon, 1981; Medved, Brogan, McClanahan, Morris & Shepherd, 2006; Stohl, 1986). This project indicates that specific messages are important only in their specific organizational contexts. The exchange of specific messages is a micro-level activity, but it is the backdrop of the organization and its unique programs, practices and policies that brings that message to life. Absent a context, the focus on message misses the implicit understandings that make a particular message memorable.

A focus on the meso-level or organizational context in which messages are communicated illustrates the way different resources prepare youth differently. A program or policy, no matter how explicit or standardized, is rarely the same across all organizations. When individuals are provided different resources, even in the context of the same program, they walk away with a different way of organizing that differently impact their ability to succeed in the world. At the Apprentice style program, YLs were provided with resources about how to successfully construct a performance of worker that drew on managerialist discourses by performing confidence, and even smiling. While at the Worker Bees programs, internal satisfaction and motivation were resources upon which participants constructed a worker identity. Though both are certainly useful resources, each club's participants are being groomed for very different ways of acting in the world.

Unfortunately, in the case of work, the different access to resources tends to reproduce class differences that disguise inequality as natural. Because youth at more affluent clubs are encouraged to construct a worker identity seemingly based on managerialist and entrepreneurial discourses for professional work, while youth at working class clubs are taught to work for internal satisfaction, it may appear to organizations as though youth are essentially or naturally more inclined toward or deserving of such types of work. When in reality, they have simply been exposed to the types of resources that teach them to perform as worker in different ways. This finding points to the need for a great deal more research on how class based identities are constructed and resisted through organizing (e.g. Lair, Sullivan & Cheney, 2005; Langellier & Peterson, 2006; Lucas, 2011; Romero, 2011) as well as the ways that social class is largely reproduced through incidental learning.

Thus, the meso-level of analysis begs the question of context and how it plays a role in the process of identity construction. Policies and programs, even individual messages are not fully understood without the context in which they take place. It is this context that makes a message meaningful and particularly memorable. Message recipients are not passive beings upon which a message is bestowed, instead the role of context allows for the agency of the individual to take meso-level factors into consideration to make sense of particular messages as meaningful and memorable. The organizational circumstances under which communication takes place must not be underestimated as an important resource.

The goal of my third research question was to consider the ways that larger social discourses influenced youth's conceptions of work and their identities as workers. Given this, I posed the following question:

> RQ_3: What macro-level discourses inform youth's conceptions of work? What is the impact of these discourses on their construction of work(er) identities?

At the macro-level this project demonstrates the way youth are already subjects of organizing and drawing on macro-level discourses in the process of identity construction. Given the design of this study as drawing from interview and observational research, macro-level discourses are the most difficult to access. Still, they are not absent from youths' talk about work. This project does show how youth are informed by macro-level discourses including: the separation of public and private spheres, gendered division of labor, managerialism, and work-life balance. This is particularly meaningful given that most organizational communication literature neglects youth as subjects of organizational research.

For many participants, traditional gendered notions of work and family caused them to speculate about traditional gendered roles in the family, despite their participation in non-traditional gendered activities as teens. Recall Luisa who anticipates that despite her current schedule working several jobs, if she has children in the future, she will have to change her lifestyle to do "motherly things" such as cooking and cleaning. And Brittany, who suspects she might be open to having a husband who takes care of their children while she works outside the home also explains that she would still need to cook and clean because she would be the mom.

Traditional gender roles for work and family serve as a powerful resource for youth about the division of labor. There are many other macro-level discourses that we can trace from social and cultural into participants' every day talk.

Without my use of the word, participants on their own drew on discourses of work-life balance to talk about their future lives as workers. Those who did not actually use the word "balance" still referred to it by explaining that having enough time to spend with family or to engage in leisure activities were of concern. Often the idea of balance was communicated by participants' description of what they do not want, such as Jade who explained, "I don't want to be like those busy, busy workers where they have no fun," or Orlando's claim, "I don't want to be one of those parents that come home at night and just see their kids for any hour and just go to sleep. Balance seems to be a powerful discourse guiding youth's thinking and potentially their decision making about work.

This project, like others in organizational communication that are interested in the discursive construction of identity (e.g., Duckworth & Buzzanell, 2009; Kuhn, 2006; Medved, 2009), demonstrates how youth, in particular, take up, try on and sometimes refute the broader narratives that shape our collective conversations. That these youth often used the word "balance" to describe the lives they anticipate as adult workers indicates that they, too, are influenced by the media and its focus on work-life challenges, their specific cultural renderings and enactments of work and family, and perhaps even scholars who have brought this issue to the fore.

At the Apprentice style club, discourses of managerialism, professionalism, and entrepreneurialism served as resources for participants to construct worker

identities (Costea, Crump & Amiridis, 2008; du Gay & Salaman, 1992, Trethewey, 2001; Tyler, 2004). In many ways, participants came in with well-developed understandings of gendered expectations for professionalism. When the thought of being fired caused Lexi to tear up, she immediately apologized for an "overflowing" body that gave her away as feminine and disrupted her performance of worker in a professional environment (Trethewey, 1999, p. 437). Further, when participants failed to conform to such gendered expectations, they were given explicit instruction to do so. When she was fired, Blake explained to Grace that she should smile more – a command for her to learn and master gendered bodily comportment to better fit into a professional organization where there are clear expectations for women's emotional expression (Trethewey, 1999).

Together, these data indicate that youth are already the subjects of macro-level discourses and clearly show how higher level concepts that permeate the social milieu also find their way into the everyday talk and experiences of youth. When they become adults, youth have already long been socialized into macro-level discourses that organize their thinking and actions in ways that tend to reproduce dominant discourses of gender, work, and family. To disrupt such discourse may require intervention that goes beyond what can be done in the scope of adult organizations and thus points to youth as an important lever for change.

Embracing Complexity: Findings from a Multi-level Analysis

In the previous section, I have answered the research questions I originally posed regarding micro-, meso-, and macro-levels of discourse, but simply holding each level of discourse in isolation fails to capture the complex process of identity

construction. Pulling each level of discourse apart for analysis misses the beauty of a discursive synthesis. In the following pages I account for a complex and multifaceted process of youth socialization. I consider how each level of discourse is informed by, sometimes exacerbated, sometimes tempered by the others is an important step in understanding the process of identity construction. As such, the fourth research question considers the impact of discourse across all levels in order to make more interesting and potentially more impactful theoretical claims.

> RQ_4: How does a multi-level discursive approach inform the process of worker identity construction for youth?

Below, I move away from separate levels of discourse (without dismissing their utility) to weaving these levels back together to form a more coherent and complex story that is representative of the ways that discourses work in concert with one another at each level.

Interviews as a Space for Discursive Opening

A micro-discursive finding from this project is that interviews provide a space for participants to perform identities as workers. But by focusing only on micro-level discourses we miss the ways that voicing assumptions out loud actually creates a space for understanding those assumptions and potentially renegotiating them.

Often, as we continually (re)construct and sometimes transform our identities, we draw on macro-level discourses to inform and explain the particular way we position ourselves (Ashcraft, 2008; Ashcraft & Flores, 2003; Holmer-Nadesan & Trethewey, 2000). A defining characteristic of macro-level discourses is

their existence as social norms or systems of thought that operate on a daily basis without much interrogation or questioning (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004). In other words, these macro-level discourses which serve as a shorthand to organize our thinking are largely taken for granted. However, interviews provide a unique space that other interpersonal conversations often do not. Asking participants to explain their reasoning or provide more detail or examples about how a particular thought is put into practice provides a moment of reflexivity and repositioning. In this way, interviews provide an important space for participants to have to articulate assumptions that were previously taken for granted.

This project shows that it is not until participants have the opportunity to hear themselves talk that they truly begin to understand what they have previously taken-for-granted or left unquestioned. The interview provides a space of instantaneous retrospective sensemaking that provides a unique way of knowing for participants. As Weick (1989) articulates, "how can I know what I think until I see what I say?" (p. 247).

For example, our interview may not have been the first time that Orlando had considered or even been asked about the division of labor he anticipated in his future household, however our interview may have been the first time that he was asked to justify why a traditional household where his wife would stay at home and he would work would be important to him. When he heard himself explain that this is the arrangement that is traditional in his culture, he thought aloud, "I don't know, new times are coming. Maybe she wants to work or something?" Orlando's initial realization came to him on his own without my prompting, but this shows that it is

only when participants are required to articulate and account for the macro-level discourses that inform their assumptions that they can begin to fully comprehend the implications of their beliefs and sometimes engage in the micro-discursive process of renegotiating their thoughts on a subject.

The opportunity for participants to talk about these issues gave them a space to consider how they would like their lives to be and in some cases even to reconsider such decisions. The space of interviews, where participants were asked to consider complex issues about work and life, sparked participants to think in new ways and to question some of the taken-for-granted assumptions that had previously functioned as a resource for structuring their lives.

As a result of the interview, some participants even showed "flickers of transformation," spaces where "talk can both reveal and disrupt enduring scripts" in disrupting some of the gendered assumptions they held about work and family (Tracy & Rivera, 2010, p. 3). This, of course reminds us of the power of research as intervention, but it also points to the power of discourse to shape our lives in ways that can remained unexamined or unquestioned. Discourses operate most powerfully, when they seem natural and portray life as exclusive of any other alternatives (Mumby, 1982). But we know this is not the case and there are always other ways of being (Ashcraft, 2001; Eisenberg, 1984; Martin, Knopoff & Beckman, 1998; Mumby & Putnam, 1992; Tracy & Trethewey, 2005; Tracy, Myers & Scott, 2006; Trethewey, 2001).

For youth and those advocating for youth, this finding shows the importance of providing youth a space to articulate and work through beliefs and assumptions.

Until they find a space to articulate their beliefs these they may not think critically about them. Left unexamined, these macro-level discourses which serve as a heuristic or for identity construction may be a source of stress later on when individuals find themselves enacting a belief system they do not espouse (Tracy & Rivera, 2010).

Youth Constructions of Care

Another important finding that becomes meaningful when it is understood across multiple levels of discourse is that youth largely do not view care as work. This is certainly not the case for all youth. In fact, 19 of the 49 participants did categorize watching a brother, sister or other family member as always work. However, the majority of participants did not seem to characterize care as work. Among others, Javier explained that spending time with children is, "not really work because it's your kids so it's a normal priority you have to—not have to, but almost always do it." Providing care for children is something that participants construct as either an obligation (often when they are the ones providing care for family members) or a choice, something that you want to do – in the case of parents caring for children.

In order to understand the complexity of the claim that care is not work for many youth, as well as its implications, a multi-level discursive analysis is necessary. Participants' micro-discursive practices about work are informed by their family's meso-practices as well as larger cultural and social macro-discourses about family and what it means to do family. For example, Brittany's willingness to care for her step-

brothers and sisters without pay has become a norm in her family and many others and operates as a meso-level discourse.

Joaquin, who had to sacrifice attending a college exploration program for a cousin's quinceañera celebration, comes from a culture where family is highly valued and one's commitment or obligation is demonstrated through physical presence and closeness. This macro-level cultural discourse informs Joaquin's micro-discursive practices in ways that may challenge the assumptions of anyone who comes from a different culture. Most importantly, each of these meso- and macro-level discourse operate in the same time and space as other macro-level discourse which generally devalue and marginalize care work in our society. Thus, just hearing others portray care work as something other than work (for whatever reason) feeds into and reinforces participants' notions about whether care work counts as "real" work.

The finding that youth do not consider care as work helps to conceptually explain the link between care and work by providing another piece in the puzzle of why care work is marginalized in our broader culture. As of now, existing literature claims that care work is not valued because it is marginalized as feminine, dirty, and private (Ehrenreich & Hochschild, 2004; England & Folbre, 1999; Gerstel, 2000; Hochschild, 2003; Tracy, 2008; Twigg, 2000). My data complicate this argument by providing another reason why care work is not valued. To participants in my study, care is expected and characterizing it as work potentially threatens the relationship of caregiver to receiver. This finding helps to explain why such a problem exists and what discourses will have to be overcome in order to solve such a problem. For example, if youth understand care to be an obligation or a way of doing family, they

must come to learn that characterizing something as work does not taint the task or make it any less meaningful. Understanding the ways youth construct care as obligation or choice as exclusive of work provides what quantitative scholars call "unique variance" in that it provides another reason for the marginalization of care that is not explained by other data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Co-constitution of Work and Family

From my data and a multi-level discursive analysis, I argue that discourses of work and family are not just intersecting or overlapping, but for many, work and family are constitutive of one another (McPhee & Zaug, 2000). In other words, work is part of what is means to do family and family is part of what it means to do work. In the talk of the youth who participated in this study, family calls work into being, makes work what it essentially is and vice versa. Understanding work and family as constitutive of one another is something different than saying one overlaps with the other or informs the other or is interconnected with the other, but instead one makes the other possible. Family does not just impact work, it gives work meaning and work even provides a space to "do" family. Work and family are not just interconnected, but rather constitutive of one another.

Like the previous claim regarding care work, this finding starts in a micro-level analysis and becomes more important and interesting when a multi-level approach is taken. What constitutes work or family are often debated and politically charged macro-level discourses (Floyd & Mormon, 2006; Floyd, Mikkelson & Judd, 2006). Additionally, work and family norms operate at the meso-level to structure our everyday lives. Certainly, participants' notions of work and family are informed

by existing meso- and macro-level discourse, but as this study demonstrates, they also powerfully challenge them.

Orlando, David, and Sabrina reveal the complexity of discourse practicing at multiple levels. In their accounts, work becomes a way to fulfill the American Dream, to bring pride, repayment, and sometimes legitimacy to families that have sacrificed for future generations. In these cases, youth see work as a way to bring meaning to their families, to represent the sacrifice and hard work that has allowed them to flourish. By bringing acknowledgement to those contributions the meaning of one's work is in how it brings multiple generations together as family. Brittany, Roberto, Sebastian, Orlando and Dean's experiences of working with their fathers demonstrate another way that work constitutes family and vice versa. These participants are not simply talking about the ways work and family intersect, as it might with a family business or when parents work in the same space as their children, but instead work is one (and sometimes the only) way of spending time with their fathers. In Joaquin's case, working side by side with his estranged father is the only way he knows how to perform the role of son, and the only way his father knows to perform father.

This finding explains why and how work and family come to be defined and have meaning in our lives. It complicates current notions of work and family as separate/overlapping/intersecting spheres. Most of our solutions to work and family negotiations rely on boundary shifting, based on Acker's (1990) claim that a job "assumes a particular gendered organization of domestic life and social production" (p. 149). Our solutions and best practices assume separate spheres to some degree.

But if we take seriously the notion that work and family are constitutive of one another, then responses to gender inequality including the division of labor begin to break down. Existing theories fail to adequately capture the range of experiences of work and family and are thus limited in their utility. This is not to diminish Acker's (1990) claim; in fact I would agree that organizing is inherently gendered. My finding that work and family are constitutive of one another only means to complicate notions of organizing to consider how it might be otherwise.

Some might argue that youth's discourse about work are meaningful in the way they uplift and enrich and provide a space to do family is actually one way of articulating the meaning of work in their lives, "the role work plays in the context of one's life" (p. 173) and not the meaningfulness of the work. But the discourses employed by participants in this study reveal something different. If work is to be understood as meaningful, "when that work contributes to self-worth and self-actualization" (Kuhn, et al., 2008, p. 165), then we must consider how different notions of work and family actually help us to understand family and community as a form of self-actualization.

For participants in this study, the realization of one's full potential is in part made by making a life that is somehow better that what previous generations had, which is largely measured through work. So if working in a prestigious job that brings pride and honor to a family or if working side by side with family allows workers to engage in the fullest potential of family, then work is meaningful in that it allows individuals to better become the full measure of themselves. As such, we have to call that work meaningful, even if it the meaningfulness is not derived from

the organization or the function of the work itself. Lair et al, raise an important, but easily overlooked point: the meanings of work are assumed to lie within the work itself and alternate narratives are considered outside of the realm of work or not given the attention they deserve, outside of demonstrating examples of alternate narratives. The research presented here is an important reminder and an attempt to fuel future discussion about notions of work that lie outside of work and outside of the organization. We must bring attention to these discourses and consider what they bring to our understanding of work.

By first recognizing that our standard treatment of work "privilege[s] 'work' as the primary source of meaning in organizations… and preclude[s] values and practices associated with other realms of life" (Lair, et al., 2008, p. 175) we can begin to think about notions of work as they are experienced in alternate ways, not bound by the organization. Organizational communication scholars have addressed the process of identity construction in relation to work (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; du Gay, 1996; Fournier, 1999; Kuhn, 2006), but research in this area has largely been done on professional workers, and privilege the organization as a source of meaning. As scholars of organizational communication begin to consider a broader range of workers, we provide space for other discursive resources which may actually decenter the importance of the organization.

This is not to say that when we look to another sampling of workers (such as youth workers or low wage workers, etc. that individual identities are not aligned with organizational goals – in fact many participants did make micro-discursive moves to align themselves with YOC. Instead, I point to another way that discourse

shapes worker identities – which for many is through the relationship of work and family. This is an important distinction because it allows us to the see a different set of values around which individuals might identify and other ways (aside from profitability) that we might make work meaningful in our lives. This is also important, because discourses work both as a resource to draw upon and as a lever for change. Discourses of work not only shape workers, but workers employ discourse to shape the work itself. And giving voice to a variety of ways of being a worker might also give space to a larger variety of ways to do work. "Reconsidering how individuals communicatively constitute what work is and what kinds of work are meaningful forces scholars to also consider diverse sites of communication labor and work such as the home, house of worship, backyard studio, and playground" (Broadfoot, et al., 2008, p. 154).

Such a finding turns our means and ends assumptions about work and family on its head. Existing notions of work as a means subjugates work(ers) in some sense, by positioning work as a necessity or a resource for engaging in other areas of their lives. It positions work as a necessity for subsidizing other more fulfilling activities, but my conception of work and family as constitutive of one another, gives work new meaning and positions work as meaningful for what it is, not what it provides access to. This notion of work differs from past research by decentering the importance of the organization in organization studies. I use this finding to point to the ways we have privileged the organization in organizational communication studies and marginalized other ways of organizing and call for a revisioning of work that is potentially more empowering to workers.

Early Work-Life Experiences

Finally, by considering the multiple levels of discourse, it becomes evident that youth are not just the objects of organizational discourse, but are also the subjects, agents actively shaping organizational norms based on their interpretations of the rules and expectations, their needs as individuals and sometimes their preferences. This is significant given that existing literature has framed youth only as objects of work-life negotiation and not active agents involved in their own work-life negotiations. The experiences of these participants demonstrate that youth are already engaged in both paid and unpaid work and while engaged in this work they must negotiate care for family members as well as find time to engage in school, sports, volunteering, leisure and other jobs simultaneously. This is no different from majority of adult workers who balance multiple jobs and family responsibilities during the course of a normal day.

Just like adults, youth worry over decisions about how many hours to work, how their younger family members are faring during the day, and how to spend more time with their families. They struggle with choices about which leisure activities to pursue in the limited time they have and about whether to prioritize work, school or other extracurricular activities they are involved in. Plus, just like adult workers, youth worry about the future and consider how they will manage to find balance when their work-life responsibilities and needs change. What cannot be determined at this point is whether experience of work-life negotiation affect youth in the same ways as adults. Whether or not youth experience enrichment, spillover and other factors of work and life in the same way that adults do is an important question for

future research. By understanding that children struggle in terms of work-life the way adults do, we see the ways that youth are already actively constructing identities as workers, informed by macro-level discourses such as balance. Adult patterns of work-life negotiation are not new to adult workers, but are instead learned behaviors from childhood. With this knowledge we may begin to consider work-life skills and strategies for youth, instead of waiting until they reach organizations as adult members. Additionally, we can begin to understand the ways that work-life negotiations of children compete with or potentially complement parents' and vice versa.

This study also demonstrates the work-life negotiation practices and strategies that youth use to negotiate their own integration, which have come to define the lives of youth as much as adult organizational members. Though there are likely countless examples of the ways that youth as the objects of the YL program impact and change the policies of the club, the two examples stand out in this study.

First, the boys at the Worker Bee club who wanted a more flexible work schedule shows how a lack of explicit policies left room for workers to implement their own norms about how work would be scheduled and the latter demonstrates an unanticipated response from workers. In either case, it would be interesting to know the extent of the changes. At the conclusion of my observations, no formal rule was ever made, but tensions were high as more and more YLs began creating their own flexible work schedules and the Club Director grew increasingly frustrated. Certainly there was the potential for this conflict to reach a point where the Club Director or the newly appointed Teen Advisor feels the need to create an explicit policy.

Second, the entire group of YLs at the Apprentice club who, through their diminished effort after being fired, caused the Teen Advisor to implement a new "redemption" policy, literally a new rule to the game that and demonstrated the ultimate control of the organization to change the game at any time. Though this is not necessarily a new finding, we must not lose sight of the ways that organizational members have just as much impact on organizational practices and policies as these discourses have on them (Ashcraft, 2005; Fleming & Spicer, 2003; Mumby, 1987; Trethewey, 1997; 2001).

Finally, by examining youth's work-life experiences, I can also claim that strategic ambiguity, "those instances where individuals use ambiguity purposefully to accomplish their goals" is one of the most effective practices for negotiating flexible work arrangements and one of the few resources youth have for negotiating work-life issues (Eisenberg, 2007, p.7). Without ever getting a direct answer whether it was acceptable, Eduardo and Joaquin took it upon themselves to change their work schedule to accommodate their preferences. Though their Teen Advisor did seem annoyed at times with this practice and even joke with them about not being ok, they never received a direct order to stop and so they were able to have control over their work schedules. Eduardo and Joaquin use the ambiguity created in their situation to their own advantage. Thus, those who feel most comfortable with ambiguity, but are also willing to take advantage of any ambiguity in their workplace will be the most successful at creating flexible work arrangement. Strategic ambiguity becomes especially important for youth who otherwise have very little legitimate power in an organization to negotiate flexible work arrangements.

My findings also reveal a potential gender gap in the ways that males and females are comfortable with and willing to capitalize on ambiguity. In my research, I never witnessed any of the girls informally creating their own flexible work arrangements in the way the boys did. Another of the boys, Reggie, saw how Eduardo and Joaquin were able to informally create their own flexible work arrangements and began to do the same. And while the girls would complain about having put in 8 hours, they never got up and left like Reggie did. This demonstrates that for those who are empowered to use ambiguity and lack of clearly defined policies in their favor, this can be an important and effective way of creating flexible work arrangements.

Ultimately, my investigation of youth's construction of worker identities resulted in four theoretically significant findings: interviews provide a space for individuals to hear themselves articulate taken-for-granted assumptions in ways that motivate them to change their micro-discursive practices, youth construct care as obligation or choice instead of work, work and family constitute one another, and youth are already engaged in work-life negotiation practices. As scholars we are not simply interested in easy answers, but rather in accounting for the complexities of human nature. These findings demonstrate the importance of looking across and among micro-, meso-, and macro- levels in order to theorize and practice in more nuanced and complicated ways.

Theorizing across multiple levels of discourse, however, does not eliminate the utility of and need for more precision in our discursive methodology. In fact, if we want to get at complex interactions among levels, we also have to think about

how we can do this research in interesting ways. In the following section, I discuss the methodological contributions of this project to articulating a discursive approach.

Doing Discursive Research: Methodological Implications

Methodologically, this project contributes to the practice of conducting a discursive analysis, which is so common in our discipline and yet still fairly elusive. Numerous scholars have claimed to take a discursive approach to analyzing organizational communication research (Edley, 2004; Gordon & Stewart, 2006; Kuhn, 2006; Real & Putnam, 2005; Thackaberry, 2004; Sillince, 2007; Tracy, 2000). Some have started articulating the methodological details of such a process (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004; Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000; Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004); LeGreco & Tracy (2009) have gone further and outlined a specific method to guide in the process of conducting a discursive analysis. But there are still gaps which make the process of conducting a discursive analysis somewhat of an enigma, namely how to identify various levels of discourse in qualitative data (whether those data be interviews, observations or texts). The contribution of this research is to pick up where other scholars have left off in the process of discursive analyses and articulate a more precise method (or at least begin the process) for identifying micro-, meso-, and macro-level discourses. With a more clearly articulated guide for actually engaging in the messy process of pointing to micro-, meso- and macro-level discourse, scholars who have long been conducting discursive analyses can clarify their approach. In addition, scholars who are new to the approach may be more confident in adopting such a method. Such clarity can only help us to be more

precise in our research and come to more nuanced conclusions about the importance of discourse.

The second methodological contribution is the creation of a qualitative instrument for assessing youth's characterizations and expectations of work, the YCW instrument. Though qualitative scholars do not rely on established scales to the degree that quantitative scholars do, this is not to say there is not room for such an instrument. Like any instrument, the YCW instrument can be modified to include more straightforward instructions. That said, it points to the ways we can begin to think differently about our methods of collecting rich data, especially if they allow us to me more inclusive of different types of participants (such as youth). Other fields such as psychology, family studies, and education have all had to be innovative about the ways they collect data and it has created meaningful research. Because of our reliance on convenience samples (of professors or college students) we have not had to develop other ways of conducting research, but new instrumentation has the potential to lead to rich qualitative data (e.g. Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik & Alberts, 2006). Additionally, the YCW instrument has the potential for development as a quantitative scale as well.

Navigating Multiple Discourses: Practical Implications

Finally, this project reveals important strategies for practice – primarily in the way it urges practitioners to see that each level of discourse is not separate from the others. Any program that intentionally or unintentionally prepares youth for work will compete with and compliment the micro and macro-level discourses that shape

youths' constructions of a worker identity. As such, I make the following recommendations.

Programmatic Implications. Youth is typically thought of as a time for play, possibility, and exploration, a malleable space for identity development. This project has shown how a youth identity is prohibited, narrowed, and relatively fixed in the context of worker preparation programs in ways that align with some of the more problematic constructions of adult work identities and work-life practices. Narrowing the range of possibilities at such a young age can have lasting impact on youth. If we are interested in more empowered and engaged modes of organizing, we would do well to consider strategies for enlarging the possibilities for youth in these programs. Practitioners might consider building the following practices into their youth development programs: 1) strengths-based assessment; 2) broadening the range of behaviors and performances that are rewarded; 3) "transforming" conversations.

At the programmatic level, the most important implication is for staff who lead the YL (or any similar) program to understand the ways these programs serves as a resource for the youth who participate. A great deal of time, money and research is put into the development of such programs to ensure the best outcomes for youth. Nonetheless, this research shows the implicit learning that goes on in such a context can be more impactful than any lesson or activity. This is not to say that structured lessons or activities are not important sources of information, but that the context and what happens outside of structured material can be as much of a source of information to youth as any structured curriculum.

Incidental learning is so powerful because it works through our repetitive, daily mundane interactions, rather than through any special lesson that is set aside from the context of a normal work environment. The lesson here is for program implementers to take note of the importance of implicit messages and take responsibility for what they communicate outside of any established curriculum. Outside of lessons, the way that participants are punished or rewarded and what they are punished or rewarded for, the way negotiations take place, are all impactful resources for participants to learn. Program implementers must simply be mindful of their influence over youth and recognize how their actions serve as an influential resource for youth's identity construction.

Given the importance of incidental learning, a second recommendation is to reconsider the Apprentice style approach to the YL program. At first glance, such an approach seems like a fun and timely way to draw interest in the program and motivate YLs who are otherwise not compensated for their work. On further examination, however, the approach is not as effective as the club had hoped. When YLs are fired, it is not only emotionally troubling; it causes them to lose any motivation to participate. Additionally, it encourages a model of work that is not based on things like outcomes, or effort or creativity or ethics, but on one's ability to play the part of a hard worker. Thus, it is not the contribution a worker makes to the organization, but her/his performance of an appropriate worker identity that is rewarded (Deetz, 1992). Worst of all, the Apprentice style program promotes an approach to achievement at work that seems accessible to everyone, but actually obscures the work that many people do because they do not fit the part of the ideal

worker. For example, a person with childcare responsibilities, or a second job, like Luisa, who contributes to her community in a number of ways, but does not put in extra face time in the organization is not visible as an ideal worker. Or, for someone like Dexter, who is a hard worker, but is overlooked because of his disability that makes his boss uncomfortable interacting with him. We must ask ourselves if we want to prepare youth for the world as it is or encourage them to enact a different reality.

An appreciative inquiry approach or strengths based assessment (Barge & Oliver, 2008; Cooperrider & Godwin, 2011; Cooperrider & Sekerka, 2003; Cooperrider & Srivastva,1987) recognizes a variety of approaches to engaging in work that avoids dichotomizing workers as successful or not and instead recognizes how each person can contribute in her/his own way. Similarly, rewarding other skills such as fearlessness, creativity, and persistence might provide the space for youth to engage in some play around their identities as workers that helps them to break free of symbolic indicators of success and redefine what it means to be a successful worker.

Program implementers might consider ways that they can encourage YLs to develop a work ethic based on intrinsic rewards, rather than extrinsic ones. When workers are intrinsically motivated (because they feel the work is important or they have pride in their contribution), their motivation and work may be less likely to suffer when extrinsic rewards disappear (Lepper, Greene &.Nisbett, 1973; Tang & Hall, 1995).

An intrinsically motivated approach to work is not without dangers either, however. The differences in the Apprentice and Worker Bee approaches to the YL program seem to reproduce class differences, by preparing upper class youth for professional jobs and working class youth for working class jobs. For professional workers, who will potentially have more resources and thus greater social mobility, if work is based on extrinsic rewards and those rewards disappear or are not enough to motivate work, a professional worker can more easily move on to a job that is more extrinsically rewarding (i.e. pays better or offers more benefits, perks). It is more likely that low wage workers whose jobs are characterized by fewer extrinsic rewards (i.e. lower pay) will be better served by developing intrinsic motivations for work, and yet these intrinsic motivations also serve to keep them in low paying jobs or at the very least justify low pay for the work that they do.

Finally, youth programs might consider the usefulness of simply having open conversations with youth about their futures. Asking about macro-level discourses that guide their thinking and providing opportunities for micro-discursive spaces where youth can explore their feelings and change their minds, moving transformational thoughts from flickers to flames.

The YCW instrument developed as a data collection instrument for this project could serve as a useful tool for the YL and similar programs, by asking youth to consider previously taken-for-granted assumptions. Just starting conversations with youth about their goals and expectations may create a space or a discursive opening for them to reconsider popular discourse that guide their thinking and engage in some micro-discourses that reveal alternative solutions. At least, such

conversations might reveal the power of existing norms and the challenge of disrupting them. Additionally, these conversations may reveal space to illustrate to youth the ways in which the challenges that youth will face as future workers are no different from the challenges and constraints they can expect to face as adult workers.

Policy Implications. The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) is the federal law that sets the minimum standards for child labor. According to the FLSA, youth who are 14 or 15 are typically allowed to be hired for paid employment given certain conditions about the timing of their work and the types of jobs they may have (states may conditions beyond FLSA requirements). But, since YLs at YOC are unpaid and thus categorized as volunteers, they are technically exempt from any legal guidelines or protection for the work that they do as volunteers. In order to participate in the YL program, youth must fill out an application and participate in an interview, and at least one club requires that youth clear a criminal background check to be hired as a YL to ensure the safety of club members.

But no such similar protective measures are required for YLs themselves. Because their work is classified as volunteer work, organizations are under no regulations for how youth workers must be treated. This is not to imply that any of the clubs are treating YLs unfairly. To my knowledge every YL was treated fairly and in accordance with current FLSA guidelines about youth employment (except for the fact that nearly half of the YLs were not yet 14 or 15 years old). At one of the Worker Bee clubs, I often heard the Club Director explaining to YLs that they had to take an hour lunch break because they were working eight hours (which is not

actually a requirement of FLSA). And in many ways youth are benefitting from their participation as a YL either indirectly by gaining experience and skills or directly by being exempt from the cost of summer camp that their families would otherwise have to pay. Still, it is worth considering the ways that youth's work as volunteers might be governed to protect youth from exploitation and potentially to help them to understand that policy can be a tool for their benefit (i.e. a means to negotiate for better work arrangements or accommodations).

Limitations & Future Directions

In many ways, this project raises more questions than answers. Nonetheless, the findings demonstrate the richness of this data and important future directions for organizational communication research. The suggestions below could easily (and should) be taken up by organizational communication scholars who are interested identity and organizing, work-life issues, and youth.

One of the primary limitations in this research is in the ability to assess the Job Skills program and how it serves as a discursive resource for youth. I anticipated this program playing a larger role in my observations and analyses, and yet as the research took shape, not enough of the programs followed the Job Skills program in a way that we can truly assess its implementation and effectiveness across a broad range of users of the program. Future research could do more to seek out clubs that more explicitly use the Job Skills program and other such formal job training programs and consider the ways this formal program is taken up by clubs and by youth.

A second limitation is in the way that I have theorized work without pushing boundaries and challenging the status quo. In many cases in this project, I have argued for the importance of valuing and respecting every job that people may engage in (and that many of these youth are likely to engage in), but future research should do more to consider the ways that we might adjust bad jobs to youth who have higher expectations for themselves. Instead of placing the individual as responsible for managing expectations, we should challenge organizations to do more to meet and exceed those expectations in ways that would make it a more positive experience for all workers.

Theoretically, organizational communication scholars would do well to consider youth as a rich area for organizational research. Another limitation to this project is that I have only begun to articulate some of the similarities and differences among youth and adults as organizational members. Future research should do more to determine the similarities between youth and adult organizational member and also to identify the differences that make a difference for youth and adult organizations members. Since, this project demonstrates that youth are so often the subjects of organizational interventions, a better understanding of youth as organizational members would improve the implementation and outcomes of such programs and bring a richness and nuance to our theorizing as scholars of organizational communication.

Though the YL program serves as an important and useful example of the ways that discourse works to socialize youth as workers, this program is but one area where youth learn discourses upon which they may later draw and points to another

way the project is limited. As only one instance of a discursive resource, the YL program does not paint the whole picture of the discursive resources that socialize youth and thus the project is limited in its ability to account for the way competing discourses are negotiated. Youth learn about work through myriad outlets such as family, friends, school, and the media (Jablin, 2000) and more research should be done to explore the competing discourses available and how they ultimately serve as a resource for youth.

Future research might also take up the ways that these discursive resources (such as managerialism and internal satisfaction) learned in the context of work might also serve youth in other areas of their lives. Youth make up any number of organizations, such as school, family, teams, and peer groups and certainly the discursive resources they draw from in one area of their lives also serves them in other areas. For example, Tyler (2004) explores the ways discourse of managerialism have infiltrated notions of sex and intimacy for adults. Similar research could be conducted on youth. Future research should consider the impact of discourses of work on other ways of identification as youth. What are the consequences for identity when youth are given one set of resources in their family life and a different set in their work/school lives? There are examples of research that does this important work (e.g. Romero, 2011) but communication scholars should examine the communicative processes and discursive implications of such code switching.

Additionally, this research points to the importance of incidental learning as a component of socialization and identity research. Implicit messages play just as big

of a role in the discursive resources that organize identity and more attention should be paid to them as the subject of organizational communication research.

Along the same lines, we might consider the places or ways of organizing which are accommodating of both youth and other identities. In many ways, in the YL program worker and youth identities seemed to be mutually exclusive in that the performance of one was not accommodating of the performance of the other. But, as this project has shown, youth are very much youth and workers at the same time. Programs like the one under study might consider this complexity and provide some way to accommodate for what it means to be a young person while trying on other identities.

Other implications of this project are in the popular area of work-life research. For example, the findings of this research complicate border theory (Clark, 2000) and boundary theory (Ashforth, Kreiner & Fugate, 2000) by demonstrating that for many work and family are not separate or even overlapping spheres, but are constitutive of one another. How might border and boundary theories be reworked to incorporate more diverse experiences, such as for those who do not experience a separation between work and family, but a complete overlap? How can we rework these theories to value the interpretation that they already provide for us, which accounts for the experience of a number of people, but also account for whom the theories are not always relevant or useful? Are new theories required or can we build off of the work that has already been done?

Also, this research points to the ways that organizational scholars might decenter the organization in our research. My findings highlight the importance of

families and community and other aspects of self instead of just work as a way for work to be meaningful. A number of participants described work as meaningful in the way it brings meaning to other areas of one's life, such as family. Future research should investigate the whether adult workers report similar experiences and how that changes the way we think about work as identity.

Finally, we must do a great deal more to understand youth's experiences with work-life negotiation as it is clear that they are already engaged in such negotiations and yet we treat them as though they are not. Youth who are currently negotiating work-life issues are developing habits and strategies that, by the time they become adult organizational members, become more firmly entrenched and harder to disrupt. This project has definitively shown that youth are already engaged in the types of work-life negotiations that we research in adulthood and our failure to consider this is a glaring oversight in the work-life research. Future studies should consider how youth benefit from such negotiations and where are places that they might be at a disadvantage? How do concepts of work-life interaction such as enrichment and spillover affect youth and are the effects different from that of adults or not? Finally, what are the factors that make youth's work-life experiences different or the same as adults and how might research in this area improve the policies and programs that are directed toward youth?

In conclusion, youth's process of identity construction around work reveals micro-, meso-, and macro-level discourses that help organizational scholars to better understand the process of worker identity construction and that point to youth as a rich area for intervention. As organizational scholars interested in creating more

enabling spaces for work-life identity construction, we would do well to focus our research on youth for two reasons: their rich and relatively unexplored nature as objects of organizing and their potential as a lever for change. First, our interest should be as advocates for youth who are already subjects of organizing discourse and often the targets of explicit programs to assist in the development and construction of their identities. Youth are not just future adult organizational members, but are already in the complex process of navigating their own organizational identities. Secondly a focus on youth points to an important lever for change in organizational research. A focus on youth opens us up to new ways of theorizing that is impactful for both youth and adult organizational members and in many ways youth may act as agents of organizational change as they have much to teach us about the ways we organize and ways we might organize differently.

References

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, *4*, 139-158. doi: 10.1177/089124390004002002

Alberts, J.K., Tracy, S.J., Trethewey, A. (2011). An integrative theory of the division of household labor: Threshold level, social organizing, and sensemaking. *Journal of Family Communication*, *11*, 21-38. doi:10.1080/15267431.2011.534334

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*, 278–308. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.278

Alvesson, M. (2010). Self-doubters, strugglers, storytellers, surfers and others: Images of self-identities in organization studies. *Human Relations*, *63*, 193-217. doi: 10.1177/0018726709350372

Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2000). Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis. *Human Relations*, *53*, 1125-1149. doi: 10.1177/0018726700539002

Alvesson, M., Ashcraft, K. L. & Thomas, R. (2008). Identity matters: Reflections on the construction of identity scholarship in organizational studies. *Organization*, *15*, 5-28. doi: 10.1177/1350508407084426

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (1992). *Critical management studies*. London: Sage.

Alvesson, M. & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies*, *39*, 619-644. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00305

Anthony, P. D. (1977). *The ideology of work*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Arnow-Richman, R. S. (2010). Incenting flexibility: The relationship between public law and voluntary action in enhancing work/life balance. *Connecticut Law Review*, *42*, 1081 – 1121.

Ashcraft, K. L. (2008). Our stake in struggle: (Or is resistance something only others do?). *Management Communication Quarterly*, *21*, 380-386. doi: 10.1177/0893318907310939

Ashcraft, K. L. (2005). Resistance through consent? Occupational identity, organizational form, and the maintenance of masculinity among commercial airline pilots. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *19*, 67-90. doi: 10.1177/0893318905276560

Ashcraft, K. L. (2001). Organized dissonance: Feminist Bureaucracy as hybrid form. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*, 1301-1322.

Ashcraft, K. L. & Flores, L. A. (2003). "Slaves with white collars": Persistent performances of masculinity in crisis. *Text & Performance Quarterly*, *23*, 1-29. doi: 10.1080/10462930310001602020

Ashcraft, K. L. & Mumby, D. K. (2004). *Reworking gender: A feminist communicology of organization.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(3), 472-491.

Barge, J. K. & Oliver, C. (2003). Working with appreciation in managerial practice. *Academy of Management Review, 28,* 124-142.

Barker, J. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *38*, 408-437.

Barker, J. & Cheney, G. (1994). The concept and practices of discipline in contemporary organizational life. *Communication Monographs*, *61*, 19-43. doi: 10.1080/03637759409376321

Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 781-796. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.781

Baxter, J. (2009). Mothers' timing of return to work by leave use and pre-birth job characteristics. *Journal of Family Studies*, *15*, 153-166. doi: 10.5172/jfs.15.2.153

Beder, S. (2000). *Selling the work ethic: from puritan pulpit to corporate PR*. London: Zed Books.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart.* New York: Harper & Row.

Benjamin, L. M. (2007). Account space: How accountability requirements shape nonprofit practice. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *37*, 201-223. doi: 10.1177/0899764007301288

Benjamin, L. M. & Misra, K. (2006). Doing good work: Implications of performance accountability for practice in the non-profit sector. *International Journal of Rural Management*, *2*, 147- 162. doi: 10.1177/097300520600200202

Berkelaar, B. L., Buzzanell, P. M., Kisselburgh, L. G., Tan, W., & Shen, Y. (2012): "First, it's dirty. Second, it's dangerous. Third, it's insulting": Urban Chinese children talk about dirty work. *Communication Monographs*, *79*, 93-114. 10.1080/03637751.2011.646490

Bianchi, S. M. (2009). What gives when mothers are employed? Parental time allocation in dual- and single-earner two-parent families. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 305-330). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Broadfoot, K. J., Carlone, D., Medved, C. E., Aakhus, M., Gabor, E. & Taylor, K. (2008). Meaning/ful work and organizational communication: Questioning boundaries, positionalities and engagements. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*, 152-161. doi: 10.1177/0893318908318267

Buchholz, T. G. & Buchholz, V. (2012). The go-nowhere generation. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 15, 2012 from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/11/opinion/sunday/the-go-nowhere-generation.html?_r=2&scp=1&sq=movers%20and%20shakers&st=cse

Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. 1987. Work and family. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*. (pp. 273-320). New York: Wiley.

Burr, J. A., & Mutchler, J. E. (1999). Race and ethnic variation in norms of filial responsibility among older adults. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 674–687.

Buzzanell, P. M., Berkelaar, B. L., & Kisselburgh, L. (2011): From the mouths of babes: Exploring families' career socialization of young children in China, Lebanon, Belgium, and the United States, *Journal of Family Communication*, *11*, 148-164. doi: 10.1080/15267431.2011.554494

Champoux, J. E. 1978. Perceptions of work and nonwork: A reexamination of the compensatory and spillover models. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, *5*, 402-422. doi: 10.1177/073088847800500402

Chiapello, E., & Fairclough, N. (2002). Understanding the new management ideology. *Discourse & Society*, *13*, 185-208. doi: 10.1177/0957926502013002406

Chaite Barnett, R., & Gareis, K. C. (2009). Mothers' shiftwork: Effects on mothers, fathers, and children. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 355-373). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Ciulla, J. B. (2000). *The working life: The promise and betrayal of modern work*. New York: Times Books.

Clair, R. P. (1996). The political nature of the colloquialism "A real job": Implications for organizational socialization. *Communication Monographs*, *63*, 249-267. doi: 10.1080/03637759609376392

Clair, R. P. (1993). The use of framing devices to sequester organizational narratives: Hegemony and harassment. *Communication Monographs*, *60*, 113-136. doi: 10.1080/03637759309376304

Clair, R. P., McConnell, M., Bell, S., Hackbarth, K., & Mathes, S. (2008). *Why work? The perceptions of a "real job" and the rhetoric of work through the ages*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations, 53*, 747-770. doi: 10.1177/0018726700536001

Connellan, T., & Zemke, R. (1993). *Sustaining knock your socks off service*. New York: AMACOM.

Cook, D. (2000) 'The rise of "the toddler" as subject and as merchandising category in the 1930s'. In M. Gottdiener (ed.) *New forms of consumption: Consumers, culture and commodification*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. 1984. Stress and strain from family roles and work role expectations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*, 252-260. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.69.2.252

Cooperrider, D. L., & Godwin, L.N. (2011). Positive organizational development – innovation-inspired change in an economy and ecology of strength. In K. S. Cameron, G.M. Spreitzer (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship.* (pp. 737-750). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Sekerka, L.E. (2003). Toward a theory of positive organizational change. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship.* (pp. 111-121). San Francisco, CA, US: Berret-Koehler.

Cooperrider, D.L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In W. Pasmore & R. Woodman R. (Eds.), *Research in Organization Change and Development vol. 1.*(pp. 129-169). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Corporate Executive Board. (2009). The increasing call for work-life balance. *Bloomberg BusinessWeek*. Retrieved February 20, 2012 from http://www.businessweek.com/managing/content/mar2009/ca20090327_734197.htm?chan=careers_special+report+--+work-life+balance_special+report+--+work-life+balance.

Cortes, D. E. (1995). Variations in Familism in Two Generations of Puerto Ricans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *17*, 249-255. doi: 10.1177/07399863950172008

Costea, B., Crump, N., & Amiridis, K. (2008).Managerialism, the therapeutic habitus and the self in contemporary organizing. *Human Relations*, *61*, 661-685. doi: 10.1177/0018726708091763

Cowan, R. & Hoffman, M. F. (2007). The flexible organization: How contemporary employees construct the work/life border. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, *8*, 37-44. doi: 10.1080/17459430701617895

Crompton, R. (2006). *Employment and the family: The reconfiguration of work and family life in contemporary societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crouter, A. C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface. *Human Relations*, *37*, 425–442. doi: 10.1177/001872678403700601

Crouter, A. C. & Goodman, B. (2009). Work and family conditions that give rise to fathers' knowledge of children's daily activities. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 287-304). Lanham, MD: University Press of America

Deetz, S. A. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Desrochers, S., & Sargent, L. D. (2004). Boundary/border theory and work-family integration. *Organizational Management Journal*, *1,* 40-48.

Doucet, A. (2009). *Do men mother? Fathering, care and domestic responsibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Drago, R. W. (2007). *Striking a Balance: Work, Family, Life*. Boston, MA: Dollars & Sense.

Du Gay, P. & Salaman, G. (1992). The cult[ure] of the customer. *Journal of Management Studies*, *29*, 615–33. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.1992.tb00681.x

Du Gay, P. (1996). *Consumption and identity at work*. London: Sage.

Duckwork, J. D. & Buzzanell, P. M. (2009). Constructing work-life balance and fatherhood: Men's framing of the meanings of *both* work *and* family. *Communication Studies*, *60*, 558-573. doi: 10.1080/10510970903260392

Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 781-797. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00241

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 233-256. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.233

Eckenrode, J., & Gore, S. (1990). Stress and coping at the boundary of work and family. In J. Eckenrode & S. Gore (Eds.), *Stress between work and family*. (pp.1-16). New York: Plenum.

Edley, P. P. (2004). Discursive essentializing in a woman-owned business: Gendered stereotypes and strategic subordination. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *14*, 271-306. doi: 10.1177/0893318900142003

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*, 178-199.

Ehrenreich, B., & Hochschild, A. R. (2004). *Global woman: Nannies, maids and sex workers in the new economy*. New York: Henry Holt.

Eisenberg, E. M. 1984. Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication. *Communication Monographs, 51*, 227-242. doi: 10.1080/03637758409390197

Eisenberg, E. M. (2007). *Strategic ambiguities: Essays on communication, organization and identity*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Elkind, D. (1967). Egocentrism in adolescence. *Child Development, 38*, 1025-1034.

Elkind, D. (1978). Understanding the young adolescent. *Adolescence*, *19*, 127–134.

England, P. (2005). Emerging theories of care work. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *31*, 381-399. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.31.041304.122317

England, P. & Folbre, N. (1999). The cost of caring. *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 561*, 39-51. doi: 10.1177/000271629956100103

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Erickson, R. J. (2005).Why emotion work matters: Sex, gender and the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 67*, 337–351. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-2445.2005.00120.x

Fairhurst, G. T. & Putnam, L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions. *Communication Theory*, *14*, 5-26. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2004.tb00301.x

Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2003) For whom? Qualitative research, representations and social responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fleming, P., & Spicer, A. (2003). Working at a cynical distance: Implications for power, subjectivity, and resistance. *Organization*, *10*, 157-179. doi: 10.1177/1350508403010001376

Floyd, K. & Mormon, M. (2006). *Widening the family circle: New research on family communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Floyd, K., Mikkelson, A. C., & Judd, J. (2006). Defining the family through relationships. In L. H. Turner & R. C. West (Eds.) *The family communication sourcebook*. (pp. 21-42). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fournier, V. (1999). The appeal to "professionalism" as a disciplinary mechanism. *Sociological Review*, *47*, 280-307. doi: 10.1111/1467-954X.00173

Fredriksen-Golden, K. I. & Scharlach, A. E. (2001). *Families and work: New directions in the twenty-first century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Freeberg, A. L., & Stein, C. H. (1996). Felt obligation towards parents in Mexican and Anglo-American young adults. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *13*, 457–471. doi: 10.1177/0265407596133009

Freidan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York: Dell.

Frone, M. R. 2003. Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology*: 143-162. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/10474-007

Ganesh, S. & McAllum, K. (2012). Volunteering and professionalization: Trends in tensions? *Management Communication Quarterly*, *26*, 152-158. doi: 10.1177/0893318911423762

Gerstel, N. (2000). The third shift: Gender and care work outside the home. *Qualitative Sociology, 23*, 467-483. doi: 10.1023/A:1005530909739

Gerstel, N., Clawson, D. & Zussman, R. (2002). *Families at work: Expanding the boundaries*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Golden, A. G. (2009). Employee families and organizations as mutually enacted environments: A sensemaking approach to work-life interrelationships. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*, 357-384. doi: 10.1177/0893318908327160

Golden, A. G. & Geisler, C. (2006). Flexible work, time, and technology: Ideological dilemmas of managing work-life interrelationships using personal, digital assistants. *The Electronic Journal of Communication*, *16(3-4*).

Golden, A. G., Kirby, E. L., & Jorgenson, J. (2006). Work-life research from both sides now: An integrative perspective for organizational and family communication. In C. S. Beck (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 30* (pp. 143-195). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gordon & Stewart (2006). Conversing about performance: Discursive resources for the appraisal interview. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*, 473-501. doi: 10.1177/0893318908327159

Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2003). *Families that work: Policies for reconciling parenthood and employment*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. 1985. Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 76-88.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell. G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*, 72-92.

Grey, C. (1999). 'We are all managers now'; 'we always were': On the development and demise of management. *Journal of Management Studies*, *36*, 561–85. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00149

Griffith, A., & Smith, D. (2005). *Mothering for schooling*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Grzywacz, J. G. 2000. Work-family spillover and health during midlife: Is managing conflict everything? *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *14*, 236-243. doi: 10.4278/0890-1171-14.4.236

Grzywacz, J. G., Almeida, D. M., & McDonald, D. A. 2002. Work-family spillover and daily reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force. *Family Relations*, *51*, 28-36. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2002.00028

Grzywacz, J. H., & Marks, N. F. 2000a. Family, work, work family spillover, and problem drinking during midlife. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62,* 336-348. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00336

Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. 2000b. Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*, 111-126. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.111

Gutek, B. (1995). *The dynamics of service.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guttman, A., & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy & disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Han, W., & Waldfogel, J. (2009). Parental employment and child development: Variation by child, family, and job characteristic. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 409-424). Lanham, MD: University Press of America

Hancock, P., & Tyler, M. (2004). 'MOT your life': Critical management studies and the management of everyday life. *Human Relations*, *57*, 619-645. doi: 10.1177/0018726704044312

Harvey, D. (2010). The crises of capitalism. RSA Animate. Retrieved September 19, 2011 from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qOP2V_np2c0&feature=player_embedded.

Herd, P., & Harrington Meyer, M. (2002). Care work: Invisible civic engagement. *Gender & Society*, *16*, 665-698. doi: 10.1177/089124302236991

Hewlett, S. A. (2005). Off-ramps and on-ramps: Keeping talented women on the road to success. *Harvard Business Review,* 1-12. doi:10.1089/jpm.2008.9844

Heymann, S. J. (2009). Work and family health in a global context. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 172-194). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Hill, E. J., & Crane, D. R. (2009). Editor's introduction. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 1-8). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, *50*, 49-58. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00049.x

Hiltonsmith, R. (2011). Generation Y Bother. *The American Prospect*. Retrieved March 15, 2012 from http://prospect.org/article/generation-y-bother.

Hochschild, A. R. (1997). *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, A.R. (2003). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Penguin Books.

Hoffman, M. F. & Cowan, R. L. (2008). The meaning of work/life: A corporate ideology of work/life balance. *Communication Quarterly*, *56*, 227-246. doi: 10.1080/01463370802251053

Hoffman, M. F. & Cowan, R. L. (2010). Be careful what you ask for: Structuration theory and work/life accommodation. *Communication Studies*, *61*, 205-223. doi:10.1080/10510971003604026

Holmer Nadesan, M. & Trethewey, A. (2000). Performing the enterprising subject: Gendered strategies for success(?) *Text & Performance Quarterly*, *20*, 223-250. doi: 10.1080/10462930009366299

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1999). What is family? *Marriage & Family Review*, *28*, 3-20.

Holstein, J. A. & Gubruim, J. F. (2000). *The self we live by: Narrative identity in a postmodern world.* New York: Oxford University Press. Jablin, F. (1982). Organizational communication: An assimilation approach. In M. E. Roloff & C. R. Berger (Eds.), *Social Cognition and Communication.* (pp. 255-286). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2001). *Doméstica: Immigrant workers cleaning and caring in the shadows of affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hrdy, S. B. (1999). *Mother nature: Maternal instincts and how they shape the human species*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Hwang, H. & Powell, W. W. (2009). The rationalization of charity: The influence of professionalism in the non-profit sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *54*, 268-298.

Jablin, F. M. 1987. Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective.* (pp. 679- 740). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jablin, F. M. (2000). Organizational entry, assimilation, and disengagement/exit. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 732-818). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jacobs, J. & Gerson, K. (2004). *The time divide: Work, family, and gender inequality.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jones, E., Watson, B., Gardner, J. & Gallois, C. (2004). Organizational communication: Challenges for the new century. *Journal of Communication*, *54*, 722-750. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02652.x

Jorgensen, J. (2006). Seeing work-life from children's standpoints. *Electronic Journal of Communication* 16, 3-4. Available at http://www.cios.org.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/getfile/01638_EJC.

Julian, T. W., McKenry, P. C., & McKelvey, M. W. (1994). Cultural variations in parenting: Perceptions of Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American parents. *Family Relations*, *43*, 30-37.

Kamo, Y. (2000). Racial and ethnic differences in extended family households. *Sociological Perspectives*, *43*, 211–229.

Karin, M. (2009). Time off for military families: An emerging case study in a time of war . . . And the tipping point for future laws supporting work-life balance? *Rutgers Law Record*, *33*.

Karin, M., & Onachila, K., (2012). The military's workplace flexibility framework. *American University Labor & Employment Law Forum*. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/abstract=1994468.

Kauffman, B. J. (1992). Feminist facts1: Interview strategies and political subjects in ethnography. *Communication Theory*, *2*, 187-206. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.1992.tb00038.x

Keefe, S. E. (1984). Real and ideal extended familism among Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans: On the meaning of "close" family ties. *Human Organization*, *43*, 65-70.

Kirby, E. L. (2006) "Helping you make room in your life for your needs": When organizations appropriate family roles, *Communication Monographs*, *73,* 474-480. doi:10.1080/03637750601061208

Kirby, E. L., Wieland, S., McBride, M. C. (2006). Work-life communication. In J. Oetzel and S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.) *Handbook of conflict communication* (pp. 327-357). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kirby, E., Golden, A., Medved, C., Jorgenson, J. & Buzzanell, P. (2003). An organizational communication challenge to the discourse of work and family research: From problematics to empowerment. In P. Kalbfleish (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 27* (pp. 1-44). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kirby, E. L., & Krone, K. J. (2002). "The policy exists but you can't really use it": Communication and the structuration of work-family policies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 30*, 50-77. doi: 10.1080/00909880216577

Kirby, E. L., Wieland, S., McBride, M. C. (2006). Work-life communication. In J. Oetzel and S.Ting-Toomey (Eds.) *Handbook of conflict communication* (pp. 327-357). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Knapp, M. L. Stohl, C. & Reardon, K. K. (1981). "Memorable" messages. *Journal of Communication*, *31*, 27-41. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1981.tb00448.x

Kondo, D. K. (1990). *Crafting selves: Power, gender, and discourses of identity in a Japanese workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Krouse, S. S., & Afifi, T. D. (2007). Family-to-work spillover stress: Coping communicatively in the workplace. *The Journal of Family Communication, 7*, 85-122. doi:10.1080/15267430701221537

Kuhn, T. (2006). A 'demented work ethic' and a 'lifestyle firm': Discourse, identity and workplace time commitments. *Organization Studies*, *27*, 1339-1358. doi: 10.1177/0170840606067249

Kuhn, T., Golden, A. G., Jorgenson, J., Buzzanell, P. M., Berkelaar, B. M., Kisselburgh, L. G., Kleinman, S. & Cruz, D. (2008). Cultural discourses and discursive resources for meaning/ful work: Constructing and disrupting identities in contemporary capitalism. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*, 162-171. doi: 10.1177/0893318908318262

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lair, D., Sullivan, K. & Cheney, G. (2005). Marketization and the recasting of the professional self: The rhetoric and ethics of personal branding. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *18*, 307-343. doi: 10.1177/0893318904270744

Lair, D. J., Shenoy, S., McClellan, J. G. & McGuire, T. (2008). The politics of meaning/ful work: Navigating the tensions of narcissism and condescension while finding meaning in work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*, 172-180. doi: 10.1177/0893318908318263

Lambert, S. J. 1990. Processes linking work and family: A critical review and research agenda. Human Relations, 43: 239-257. doi: 10.1177/001872679004300303

Langellier, K. M., & Peterson, E. E. (2006): "Somebody's got to pick eggs": Family storytelling about work, *Communication Monographs*, *73*, 468-473. 10.1080/03637750601061190

Lareau, A. (2002). Invisible inequality: Social class and childrearing in black and white families. *American Sociological Review*, *67*, 747–76.

LeGreco, M. (2012). Working with policy: Restructuring healthy eating practices and the circuit of policy communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *40*, 44-64. doi: 10.1080/00909882.2011.636372

LeGreco, M. & Tracy, S. J. (2009). Discourse tracing as qualitative practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *15*, 1516-1543. doi: 10.1177/1077800409343064

Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic reward: A test of the "overjustification" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *28*, 129-137. doi: 10.1037/h0035519

Levine, K. J. & Hoffner, C. A. (2005). Adolescents' conceptions of work: What is learned from different sources during anticipatory socialization? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *21*, 647-669. doi: 10.1177/0743558406293963

Levine, K. J. & Hoffner, C. A. (2006). Adolescents' conceptions of work: What is learned from different sources during anticipatory socialization? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *21*, 647-669.

Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lucas, K. (2011). Blue-collar discourses of workplace dignity: Using outgroup comparisons to construct positive identities. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *25*, 353-374. doi: 10.1177/0893318910386445

Ludden, J. (2010). When Employers Make Room for Work-Life Balance. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved March 15, 2010 from http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=124611210&sc=emaf.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & McDermott, V. (2008). The constitution of employee-abusive organizations: A communication flows theory. *Communication Theory*, *18*, 304-333. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2008.00324.x

Marcia, J. E. (1994). The empirical study of ego identity. In: H.A. Bosma, T.L.G. Graafsma, H.D. Grotevant & D.J. de Levita, (Eds.), *Identity and development: An interdisciplinary approach*. (pp. 67–80). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Martin, J., Knopoff, K., & Beckman, C. (1998). An alternative to impersonality and emotional labor: Bounded emotionality at The Body Shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *43*, 429-469.

Mason, M. A. & Ekman, E. M. (2007).*Mothers on the fast track: How a new generation can balance family and careers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McPhee, R. D. & Zaug, P. (2000). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, *10 (1-2)*.

Medved, C. E. (2009). Constructing breadwinning-mother identities: Moral, personal and political positioning. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 37*, 136-152.

Medved, C. E., Brogan, S. M., McClanahan, A. M., Morris, J. F., & Shepherd, G. J. (2006): Family and Work Socializing Communication: Messages, Gender, and Ideological Implications, *Journal of Family Communication*, *6*, 161-180. doi: 10.1207/s15327698jfc0603_1

Moen, P., & Kelly, E. (2009). Working families under stress: Socially toxic time cages and convoys. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives.* (pp. 31-61). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Morf, M. 1989. *The work/life dichotomy*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Morrow, V., & Vennam, U. (2010). Combining work and school: The dynamics of girls' involvement in agricultural work in Andrha Pradesh, India. *Children & Society*, *24*, 304-314. doi: 10.1111/j.1099-0860.2010.00314.x

Muirhead, R. (2004). *Just work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mumby, D. K. (1987). The political function of narrative in organizations. *Communication Monographs*, *54*, 113-127. doi: 10.1080/03637758709390221

Mumby, D. K. (2005). Theorizing resistance in organization studies: a dialectical approach. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *19*, 19-44. doi: 10.1177/0893318905276558

Mumby, D. K. & Putnam, L. L. (1992). The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded emotionality. *Academy of Management Review*, *17*, 465-485.

Myers, B. (2008). Straight and white: Talking with my mouth full. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *14*, 160-171. doi: 10.1177/1077800407308905

Myers, K. K. & Sadaghiani, K.(2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business Psychology*, *25*, 225-238. doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9172-7

Myers, K. K., Jahn, J. L. S., Gailliard, B., & Stoltzfus, K. (2011). Vocational Anticipatory Socialization (VAS): A Communicative Model of Adolescents' Interests in STEM. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *25*, 87-120. doi: 10.1177/0893318910377068

Nippert-Eng, C. (1996). *Home and work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

OccupyWallStreet. (2011).A modest call to action on this September 17th. Retrieved November 1, 2011 from http://occupywallst.org/.

Özbilgin, M. F. Beauregard, T. A., Tatli, A., & Bell, M. P. (2011). Work–life, diversity and intersectionality: A critical review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *13*, 177–198. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00291.x

Parker, M. (2002). *Against management*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Piotrkowski, C. S. (1979). *Work and the family system*. New York: Free Press.

Polk, D. M. (2008). Intersecting work and family: The influence of relational beliefs and behaviors on work-family integration. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *14*, 345-366. doi: 10.5172/jmo.837.14.4.345

Real, K., & Putnam, L. L. (2005). Ironies in the Discursive Struggle of Pilots Defending the Profession. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *19*, 91-119. doi: 10.1177/0893318905276561

Repetti, R. L., & Saxbe, D. (2009). The effects of job stress on the family: One size does not fit all. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 62-78). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Robinson, K. (2010). Changing education paradigms. RSA Animate. Retrieved September 19, 2011 from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zDZFcDGpL4U.

Roehling, P. V., Roehling, M. V., & Moen, P. (2001). The relationship between work-life policies and practices and employee loyalty: A life course perspective. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *22*, 141–170. doi: 10.1023/A:1016630229628

Romero, M. (2011). *The maid's daughter: Living inside and outside the American Dream*. New York: NYU Press.

Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*, 655-684.

Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46: 655-684.

Rothenberg, D. (1999). *With these hands: The hidden world of migrant farm workers today*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., Panzer, K., & King, S. N. (2002). Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 369-386.

Ruhm, C. J. (2009). Maternal employment and child development. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 331-354). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Sarkisian, N.; Gerena, M., & Gerstel, N. (2006). Extended family ties among Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Whites: Superintegration or disintegration? *Family Relations*, *55*, 331-344. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2006.00408.x

Sabelis, I. (2001). Time management: paradoxes and patterns. *Time & Society*, *10*, 387-400.

Sass, J. S., & Mattson, M. (1999). When social support is uncomfortable: The communicative accomplishments of support as a cultural term in a youth intervention program. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *12*, 511-543. doi: 10.1177/0893318999124002

Schor, J. B. (2010). *Plenitude: The new economies of true wealth*. New York: Penguin Press.

Schor, J. B. (1998). *The overspent American: Why we want what we don't need*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Schor, J. B. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Basic Books.

Schwartz, B. (1986). *The battle for human nature: Science, morality, and modern life*. New York: Norton.

Schwartz, B. (1994). *The costs of living: How market freedom erodes the best things in life*. New York: Norton.

Scott, C., & Myers, K (2005). The socialization of emotion: Learning emotion management at the fire station. *Journal of Applied Communication* Research, 33, 67-92. doi: 10.1080/0090988042000318521

Scott, C., & Myers, K. (2010). Toward an integrative theoretical perspective on organizational membership negotiations: Socialization, assimilation, and the duality of structure. *Communication Theory*, *20*, 79-105. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2009.01355.x

Scott, C., Corman, S., & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structurational model of identification in the organization. *Communication Theory*, *8*, 298-336. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.1998.tb00223.x

Sharma, P. (2004). An overview of the field of family business studies: Current status and directions for the future. *Family Business Review*, *17*, 1-36. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-6248.2004.00001

Shields, S. A. (1975). Functionalism, Darwinism, and the psychology of women: A study in social myth. *American Psychologist, 30*, 739–754.

Shuler, S. (2006). Working at home as total institution: Maintaining and undermining the public/private dichotomy. *The Electronic Journal of Communication*, *16(3-4*).

Sillince, J. A. A. (2007).Organizational context and the discursive construction of organizing. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *20*, 363-394. doi: 10.1177/0893318906298477

Small, S. A., & Riley, D. (1990). Toward a multidimensional assessment of work spillover. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *52*, 51-61.

Smeeding, Timothy M. (2005). Public Policy, Economic Inequality, and Poverty: The United States in Comparative Perspective. *Social Science Quarterly* 86, 5, 955-983. doi: 10.1111/j.0038-4941.2005.00331.x

Spradlin, A. L. (1998). The price of "passing": A lesbian perspective on authenticity in organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *11*, 598-605. doi:10.1177/0893318998114006

Staines, G. L. (1980). Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and nonwork. *Human Relations*, *33*, 111-129. doi: 10.1177/001872678003300203

Stohl, C. (1986). The role of memorable messages in the process of organizational socialization. *Communication Quarterly*, *34*, 231-249. doi:10.1080/01463378609369638

Sumer, H. C, & Knight, P. A. (2001). How do people with different attachment styles balance work and family? A personality perspective on work-family linkage. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 653-663. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.653

Sundaramurthy, C., & Kreiner, G. E. (2008). Governing by managing identity boundaries: The case of family business. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, *32*, 415-436. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2008.00234

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). Principal components and factor analysis. In *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed., pp. 582 - 633). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tang, S. H. & Hall, V. C. (1995). The overjustification effect: A meta-analysis. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *9*, 365-404. doi: 10.1002/acp.2350090502

Tausig, M. & Fenwick, R. (2001). Unbinding time: Alternate work schedules and work-life balance. *Journal of Family & Economic Issues*, *22*, 101-119. doi: 10.1023/A:1016626028720

Tenbrunsel, A. E., Brett, J. M., Maoz, E., Stroh, L. K., & Reilly, A. H. (1995). Dynamic and static work-family relation- ships. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *63*, 233-246. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1995.1076

Thackaberry, J. A. (2004). "Discursive opening" and closing in organizational self-study: Culture as a trap and tool in wildland firefighting safety. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *17*, 319-359. doi: 10.1177/0893318903259402

The State of Young America (2011). Demos & Young Invincibles. Retrieved March 15, 2012 from http://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/SOYA_TheDatabook_2.pdf.

Tracy, S. J. (Forthcoming). *Qualitative Methodology Matters: Creating and communicating qualitative research with impact.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

Tracy, S. J. (2008). Care a common good. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *2*, 166-174. doi: 10.1080/07491409.2008.10162529

Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce: Emotion labor, self-subordination, and discursive construction of identity in a total institution. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *14*, 90-128. doi: 10.1177/0893318900141004

Tracy, S. J., & Rivera K. D. (2010). Endorsing equity and applauding stay-at-home moms: How male voices on work-life reveal aversive sexism and flickers of transformation. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *24*, 3-43. doi: 10.1177/0893318909352248

Tracy, S. J. & Trethewey, A. (2005). Fracturing the real-self ←→ fake-self dichotomy: Moving toward "crystallized" organizational discourses and identities. *Communication Theory*, *15*, 168-195. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2005.tb00331.x

Tracy, S. J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Alberts, J. K. (2006). Nightmares, demons, and slaves: Exploring the painful metaphors of workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 148-185. doi: 10.1177/0893318906291980

Tracy, S. J., Myers, K. K., & Scott, C. (2006). Cracking jokes and crafting selves: Sensemaking and identity management among human service workers. *Communication Monographs*, *73*, 283-308. doi: 10.1080/03637750600889500

Trethewey, A. (1997). Resistance, identity, and empowerment: A postmodern feminist analysis of a human service organization. *Communication Monographs*, *64*, 281-301. doi: 10.1080/03637759709376425

Trethewey, A. (1999). Disciplined bodies: Women's embodied identities at work. *Organization Studies*, *20,* 423-450. doi: 10.1177/0170840699203003

Trethewey, A. (2001). Reproducing and resisting the master narrative of decline: Midlife professional women's experiences of aging. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *15*, 183-226. doi: 10.1177/0893318901152002

Tyler, M. (2004). Managing between the sheets: Lifestyle magazines and the management of sexuality in everyday life. *Sexualities*, *7*, 81-106. doi: 10.1177/1363460704040144

Twigg, J. (2000). Care work as a form of bodywork. *Ageing and Society, 20*, 389-411.

Valenzuela, A., & Dornbush, S. M. (1994). Familism and social capital in the academic achievement of Mexican origin and Anglo adolescents. Social Science Quarterly, 75, 18–36.

van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2009). How family supportive work environments and work supportive home environments can reduce work-family conflict and enhance facilitation. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives.* (pp. 79-104). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Vincent, C., & Ball, S. J. (2007). 'Making-up' the middle-class child: Families, activities, and class dispositions. *Sociology*, *41*, 1061-1077. doi: 10.1177/0038038507082315

Way, A. (2012). There's no "I" in team: Adolescence as a space for organizing feminine identity. *Emotion, Space & Society*. doi:10.1016/j.emospa.2012.01.001

Way, A. (forthcoming). Engaging organized resistance: Considering the challenges of organizing girls' empowerment. *TAMARA Journal for Critical Organizational Inquiry*.

Wayne, J. H. (2009). Reducing conceptual confusion: Clarifying the positive side of work and family. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (eds.). *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives.* (pp. 105-140). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. 2004. Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the big five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*: 108-130. doi: 10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00035-6

We Are the 99%. (2011). Allow us to introduce ourselves. Retrieved November 1, 2011 from http://wearethe99percent.tumblr.com/Introduction.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21*, 1-19.

Weick, K. E. (1989). Organized improvisation: 20 years of organizing. *Communication Studies*, *40*, 241-248. doi: 10.1080/10510978909368277

Weiss, T. (2009). Basic steps toward work-life balance. *Forbes*. Retrieved February 20, 2012 from http://www.forbes.com/2009/03/18/work-life-balance-leadership-careers-basics.html.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, *1*, 125-151. doi: 10.1177/0891243287001002002

Williams, J. (2000). *Unbending Gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Wood, J. T. (2010). The can-do discourse and young women's anticipations of future. *Women & Language*, *33*, 103 -107

Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 699–727. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.128.5.699

Wrzesniewski, A. (2003). Finding positive meaning in work. In Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (Eds.) *Positive organizational scholarship*. (pp. 296-308). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31*, 21-33. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.1997.2162

Zedeck, S. (1992). *Work, families, and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zorn, T. E., & Townsley, N. (2008). Introduction to the forum on meaningful work studies in organizational communication: Setting an agenda. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*, 147-151. doi: 10.1177/0893318908318268

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview Guide

Experience as an YL:

1. How old are you? What grade are you in?
2. Is this your first year as an YL? How many times have you been an YL?
3. Why did you want to be an YL this summer?
4. Why do you think you got selected to be an YL?
5. Walk me through what you did yesterday as an YL from the time you arrived until the time you left? Did you enjoy it?
6. Is the job you have as an YL similar to a paid job you might have late in life? Why or why not?
7. Who gets selected as YL of the year? How do they get selected for that? Is that going to be you? Why or Why not?

Family Experiences with Work:

8. Who do you live with?
9. And what does she/he/they do for work?
    a. If not working, "Is that by choice?" "What would they like to be doing?"
10. Did she/he have to get any special education or training for this job?
11. Would you ever consider this job for yourself? Why or why not?
12. Why does she/he/they work?
13. How do your family members talk about work? What do they say about work? Do they like it or dislike it?
    a. What do they act like when they get home from work? What are the highlights of their jobs? What are the parts they dislike?
    b. What kind of advice do they give you about work?

Own Work Experience:

14. Do you currently have a job that you get paid to do? Have you ever had a job that paid you money? What was that job?
15. Why did you get a job in the first place?
16. Is this a job you would like to keep for a while? What other types of job would you like to have?
17. Imagine yourself 10 years from now. What do you see yourself doing?
    a. Would that require a degree or specialized training?
18. Describe what you think a normal day would be like in that job. What would you do and who would you talk to? Who decides when you start and stop?
19. Where do you do this job? Would you ever take work home with you?
20. How would you know when your work is done in that job? How would you know you did a good job?
21. How will your work as an YL help you in that job?
22. What do you most look forward to about having a job?
23. What are the things that you dread or don't look forward to about having a job?
24. What is a job that you would never want to have? Why?

25. What are the deal breakers in accepting a job? What are some reasons you would not take a job?

Work-Life Balance:

26. Do you think you will have a family one day? Will having a family change how you work? How?
27. Will the person you are with have a job? What type of job will it be?
28. Do you have other interests outside of school or work? What are they? Do you think you will be able to continue to do those things once you have a job? When will you do them/how much time will you spend on them?
29. Are there things you will have to cut out of your life once you get a job?
30. Are there things that having a job will allow you to do that you couldn't do before?
31. Who on television or in the movies has the job you would most like to have? Why?

Wrap Up:

32. Are there any questions you have for me?
33. Would you be willing to do a follow up interview sometime during the school year?
34. May I get your phone number and email address to contact you?

APPENDIX B

YOUTH CHARACTERIZATIONS OF WORK INSTRUMENT

Youth Characterizations of Work

1. Which of the following activities count as work? Check either "Always" "Sometimes" or "Never" for each activity depending on whether you think it ALWAYS counts as work, it can SOMETIMES be considered work, or it would NEVER be considered work:

	Always	Sometimes	Never
Making a lemonade stand			
Watching a brother, sister, other family member			
Doing a service project (like picking up trash or raising money for school)			
Going to school			
Making sandwiches at Subway			
Refereeing a kids soccer match			
Spending time with your parents			
Spending time with your grandparents			
Driving your kids to school			
Attending a school play			
Sending emails from home			
Mowing lawns			
Helping a friend or classmate with homework			
Writing a paper			
Reading a book			
Painting a fence			
Cleaning a house			

2. Complete the following sentences (write your answer in the space provided below each sentence):

When choosing a job, the most important thing to consider is …

_____

If I could have my dream job it would be…

_____

In order to get my dream job, I would need to…

_____

I will be happy with my job as long as…

_____

I would never work in a job that…

_____

The most important thing I've learned about work is… (who/where did you learn that from?)

_____

The best part of having a job is…

_____

The worst thing about having a job is…

_____

3. Imagine yourself in 10 years. During a normal WORK DAY, which of the following activities will be your top 3 priorities. Put a number 1 next to your top priority, a number 2 next to your second most important priority and a number 3 next to your third most important priority. Leave the rest of the spaces blank.

Caring for family	
Church or community	
Commuting (driving, riding the bus)	
Eating	
Exercise	
House/yard work	
Playing/Leisure	
Relaxing	
Sleeping	
Volunteering	
Working	

Now consider yourself in 10 years, on a day you are NOT WORKING. Again, rank which of the following activities will be your top 3 priorities. Put a number 1 next to your top priority, a number 2 next to your second most important priority and a number 3 next to your third most important priority. Leave the rest of the spaces blank.

Caring for family	
Church or community	
Commuting (driving, riding the bus)	
Eating	
Exercise	
House/yard work	
Playing/Leisure	
Relaxing	
Sleeping	
Volunteering	
Working	

APPENDIX C

IRB APPROVAL FORM

ASU Knowledge Enterprise Development

Office of Research Integrity and Assurance

To:	Angela Trethewey STAUF
From:	Mark Roosa, Chair Soc Beh IRB
Date:	04/25/2012
Committee Action:	**Amendment to Approved Protocol**
Approval Date:	04/25/2012
Review Type:	Expedited F12
IRB Protocol #:	1104006366
Study Title:	YOC Dissertation Research
Expiration Date:	06/02/2012

The amendment to the above-referenced protocol has been APPROVED following Expedited Review by the Institutional Review Board. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required. It is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval of ongoing research before the expiration noted above. Please allow sufficient time for reapproval. Research activity of any sort may not continue beyond the expiration date without committee approval. Failure to receive approval for continuation before the expiration date will result in the automatic suspension of the approval of this protocol on the expiration date. Information collected following suspension is unapproved research and cannot be reported or published as research data. If you do not wish continued approval, please notify the Committee of the study termination.

This approval by the Soc Beh IRB does not replace or supersede any departmental or oversight committee review that may be required by institutional policy.

Adverse Reactions: If any untoward incidents or severe reactions should develop as a result of this study, you are required to notify the Soc Beh IRB immediately. If necessary a member of the IRB will be assigned to look into the matter. If the problem is serious, approval may be withdrawn pending IRB review.

Amendments: If you wish to change any aspect of this study, such as the procedures, the consent forms, or the investigators, please communicate your requested changes to the Soc Beh IRB. The new procedure is not to be initiated until the IRB approval has been given.

Please retain a copy of this letter with your approved protocol.