THE HOUSE THAT FEMINIST IMAGINATION BUILDS: LOVING PRESENCE
DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY OF CRITICAL FRIENDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Volume I


By

Corinna S. Hasbach




A DISSERTATION


Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of


DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY


Department of Teacher Education


1995

ABSTRACT

# THE HOUSE THAT FEMINIST IMAGINATION BUILDS: LOVING PRESENCE DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY OF CRITICAL FRIENDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

By

Corinna S. Hasbach

There is a dearth of qualitative research about teacher educators who are feminists teaching undergraduate education. In this study, through feminist methodology and scholarship, I present a rich portrayal of a teacher educator with feminist imagination; how she teaches, how she thinks about her own teaching, learning, and students. I describe and analyze her actions, beliefs, commitments, and context through in-depth conversations, journals, and classroom observations. I also probe the students' interpretations of her teaching through in-depth interviews, classroom observations, written work, and feedback forms. In this portrayal, I delve into the concepts of arrogant and loving presence and their manifestations. I employ the metaphor of tilling the soil to describe teaching and learning about oppression and privilege. I explore the theme of a community inhabited by critical friends working toward social justice. I inquire into what context-specific adventurous teaching means for a teacher educator with feminist imagination. I present a case of conflict which illustrates the teacher educator in relation to her

students. I investigate the factors which contributed to the case of conflict and move beyond the conflict to look at how silence plays out in educational institutions for women. I also explore how speaking up and out is perceived as grounds for potential failure for both men and women students. I uncover the contextual factors which had a more general bearing on the teacher educator and her students, such as: the context of teacher education, post-feminist young women, and the sexual dynamics of a mixed-gender class. I look at how a teacher educator with feminist imagination can help students develop a critical consciousness. I raise questions about what true reform might mean in teacher education, suggesting the need for loving presence and critical friendship. I also reveal how my own conception of feminism changed from a view of "one" feminism to a richer conception of feminist imagination.

Our schools and colleges, institutions of the patriarchy, generally teach us to listen to people in power, men or women speaking the father tongue; and so they teach us not to listen to the mother tongue, to what the powerless say, poor men, women, children: not to hear that as valid discourse.

I am trying to unlearn these lessons, along with other lessons I was taught about my society, particularly lessons concerning the minds, work, works, and being of women. I am a slow unlearner. But I love my unteachers--the feminist thinkers and writers and talkers and poets and artists and singers and critics and friends, from Wollstonecraft and Woolf through the furies and glories of the seventies and eighties--I celebrate here and now the women who for two centuries have worked for our freedom, the unteachers, the unmasters, the unconquerors, the unwarriors, women who have at risk and at high cost offered their experience as truth. "Let us NOT praise famous women!" Virginia Woolf scribbled in a margin when she was writing <u>Three Guineas</u>, and she's right, but still I have to praise these women and thank them for setting me free in my old age to learn my own language. (Ursula K. Le Guin, 1986, p. 151)

This woman's work is dedicated to all the feminists who have gone before me, my unteachers who with "ordinary courage" (Rogers, 1993) challenged the mainstream and the "malestream" (Warren, 1989). To those who were dismissed, unacknowledged, erased, and labeled "mad." To the "madwomen in the attics," who often were merely *different*, this is dedicated to them all.

This is especially dedicated to my mother, Barbara Hasbach, the first feminist and unteacher in my life who with ordinary courage and sometimes extraordinary courage survived. She was a woman before her time.

My mother has stared tragedy in the face and survived, "...i've been through so much pain that i've popped out the

other side" (Littlebear, 1983, p. 158).

She was born in 1932 and lived with her mother and father, Rita and Hans Hasbach, her sister Sabine, and her brother Michael. The first seventeen years of her life were spent in East Germany, during the time of Hitler and World War II, and after. When she was thirteen her father, an interpreter for the Germans interrogating Russian defectors during World War II, was arrested in the middle of the night by the Soviet military. He was imprisoned in a Siberian gulag for eleven years. In the gulag he was tortured and dehumanized. My mother's mother was lonely without her husband and sought companionship from another man. She became pregnant. Alone and afraid, terrified of the consequences of having a child outside her marriage, she had an illegal abortion. The abortion was botched. My mother watched her mother, ashen and afraid, hemorrhage to death. My mother was fifteen years old when she became a motherless, fatherless child.

My mother's paternal aunt Emmy came to look after her and her siblings. Emmy mentally and physically abused them. After two years of abuse my mother could take no more. Alone, at seventeen, she crawled beneath barbed wire fencing, evading machine-gun fire, fleeing East Germany and Aunt Emmy to make a new life in West Germany. Barbara Hasbach survived the first seventeen years of her life.

In May 1956, Hans Hasbach was released from prison.

He was alive but irreparably scarred. He was able to emigrate to West Germany and join his daughters and son.

At the age of twenty-three my mother became pregnant. She chose not to marry. Her choice to have a child without being married challenged the mores of German society. I was born on June 22, 1956. Having a girl made my mother glad, for as Marge Piercy says, "When a girl is born, in her heart her mother is twice glad. Because she is born over again in her daughter, and maybe this time it will be better" (1987, p. 55).

Four years after I was born we left for Canada. My mother had no friends there, nor did she know the language and culture. She did not know what our future would hold. She spent hard years struggling as a sole-support parent. Yet, for me, she fashioned a life filled with both love and security. Many years passed in relative peace.

At age fifty-five, when my mother should have been enjoying the "golden years" of her life, she was raped. (Women are never safe at any age; their years may still be filled with tears.) At age sixty she learned of her father's suicide. He had lived thirty-seven years after his imprisonment, healthy of body but sick of heart and soul. Again my mother lost her father. Yet she survived all this and is healing her Self.

Through the living text of her life, my mother taught me about adventure, risk, and courage. She taught me that

women could be independent, courageous, and survivors. She taught me to be woman-centered--that women are valuable people in their own right, and valuable to one another. Although she has experienced much pain in her own life, she was able to teach me about happiness and love, and how to delight in life.

When I was little, she played with me for hours with patience and enthusiasm, teaching me joy, laughter, and friendship. As I grew up, she read innumerable stories to me, allowing my imagination to soar. As I became older she talked with me for hours, teaching me to think and speak my mind. She handed me a legacy of feminism before I knew what feminism was.

My mother has always had the soul of a poet. In recent years she has begun to write poetry. In her poem "My Child," she connects three generations of women: Rita, Barbara, and Corinna. With this poem my mother is "Making the past walk through the present" (Marge Piercy, 1987, dedication).

### MY CHILD

*Entering life at the break of dawn,*
*Traces of morning mist,*
*Ethereal, divine, transparent,*
*A soul untouched*
*Frail.*
*Changing my world.*
*A Mother's mother*
*Child.*
*World beyond world reaching,*
*Coming together.*
*Words beyond words forming*

*Gestalt, autonomy of two women*
*Transilient, manifest in a third.*
*Secret threads unravelling*
*Mysteriously.*
*A dream flowing through.*
*Unfolding*
*In a fragment of time*
*Becoming reality*
*Given birth*
*Adding change     continuity*
*Eternity.*
*(Barbara Hasbach, 1994)*

Like my mother's poem, this dissertation is women speaking to women, past, present, and future. From our rooms to their rooms and their rooms to our rooms. The past informs the present and the present informs the future.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Michael Michell, my partner.  He taught me that men can "unlearn the myths that bind them" (Christensen, 1992).  By doing difficult soul searching and critical self-reflection, he reinvented himself.  In Michael's manuscripts, "Forgive me mother for I have sinned" (unpublished), and in "Michael's Story: The Struggle to be Open Minded" (1994) he provides powerful examples of the honesty and self-reflection that can make men allies to women in the struggle for justice and peace.  He is unlearning how to oppress the Other (de Beauvoir, 1952/1974).  It is men like Michael, willing to do what it takes to reinvent themselves, that will "re-write the future" (Warren, 1989, p. 46).

I am also extremely grateful for the enormous help he has given me on this dissertation.  Our lengthy conversations, his feedback, and his editing have been incredibly important to this work.

I want to thank my committee members.  There were many criteria by which I chose the people on my committee-- intellectual strength and courage were especially important. Each gave me the freedom to let my imagination soar unfettered by what is "traditional" or "conventional."  Each has been my critical friend.  With loving presence each has pushed my thinking and my ways of seeing the world and myself.  Each has let me express my ideas _and_ emotions in

front of them -- each has allowed me to express the whole range of what is human.

Each member of my committee has supported me intellectually and emotionally innumerable times. I have stored in my memory many vignettes that speak to their mentorship, in the following paragraphs I choose one illustration that speaks in part to how much they have contributed to my educational life.

I first met Bruce Burke in Manila, Philippines when he taught a course for Graduate Studies in Education Overseas. When I was planning to leave the Philippines and complete my masters in East Lansing, I sought him out as my unofficial advisor. He was the one who left a notice of Gender and Schooling, a new course taught by Lynn Paine and Annelies Knoppers, in my mailbox and suggested that I take it. In so many ways this launched my professional passion and commitment to feminist issues in education. Also, in so many ways Bruce has had more faith in me than I did in myself. As I was finishing up my masters and contemplating whether I should pursue an Educational Specialist or a Doctorate in Education (actually believing there really was no way I could do a doctorate[1]) I asked his advice. He

---

[1] This feeling of not being able to succeed at a new academic situation is not unusual for girls or women to experience. The American Association of University Women (1992) state:

> Studies also reveal that competent females have higher expectations of failure and lower self-confidence when encountering new academic situations than do males with similar abilities. The result is that female students are more likely to abandon academic tasks. (p. 70)

counselled me to enter the doctoral program, for as he said, when I wrote a dissertation I would be contributing to the knowledge in education. A simple piece of advice, but symbolic of the kind of faith and mentorship that Bruce provided. He has given me careful and thoughtful feedback on this dissertation and all aspects of my education and career. He has guided me and supported me from the day I met him.

Early in my doctoral studies, I remember being upset and frightened by what another graduate student told me. He emphatically warned me one day, "You cannot be nice in higher education; you will never make it!" My heart and stomach sank. Being brand new and uncertain of the norms, but knowing that kindness and compassion were values I held highly, I felt dismayed and worried. I went to Doug Campbell's office depressed and emotional. I told him what the other graduate student had said. He did not dismiss my concerns, or agree with the graduate student. Instead, he pointed out to me the people he knew who had "made it" (perhaps not by conventional standards, but were at MSU and were happy and doing what they wanted to be doing). I was relieved and hopeful. This may sound like such a small incident yet it is symbolic of the kind of hope and faith that Doug embodied at every turn. He has also given me thoughtful and insightful feedback at every turn with my work and dissertation, and he "takes women students

seriously" (Rich, 1978), a disposition valued and valuable in an institution of higher learning. He has always affirmed me and at the same time pushed my thinking.

I first met Susan Melnick when I was taking one of the first classes of my doctoral program. My feminist Self was speaking up and out in classes and never did I feel my ideas were trivial or did I feel dismissed. One incident stands out for me. Susan had to leave for a conference and another professor was taking her place. Two sections of the class were together that day. The professor had us do a role play about implementing an educational policy. He gave out various roles. One of the women in the class was to be a spokesperson for education for this policy. A man was to be a senator listening to this "testimonial." The woman was speaking and at one point said, "Let me paint you a picture...." Before she could finish, the man (the senator) interrupted and lewdly asked, "A centerfold?" As another woman and I protested, the professor dismissed our annoyance with "Well, senators are like that." When I told Susan about this, she did not dismiss me, instead she was angry. I knew that had she been there that casual sexist comment would not have been dismissed but would have been confronted. Her ability and readiness to "call out" sexism and other forms of domination have always made me feel that I had an advocate on my committee. In addition to being an advocate, Susan has given me significant and wise feedback

on my dissertation.  She pushed my thinking in ways that helped to make it more thoughtful, reflective, and clearer. She has also made herself available to counsel me at every turn about my studies and career.  She puts students first, an important and precious quality in higher education.

I first met Lynn Paine, the chairperson of my committee, during my masters when she was co-teaching Gender and Schooling with Annelies Knoppers.  This was the first class that I took where I felt completely at home.  It was not that I did not love and value other classes that I had taken, but this was the class where my passion for feminist issues had a forum for intellectual and philosophical consideration.  I had never realized that my passion for feminism and my professional life could merge.  This was the first class where I read feminist scholars and theorists critique education.  I was thrilled and I had never before encountered such work.  This class was really the catalyst to my pursuing a life's work-in-progress.  Lynn and Annelies taught the class in a way that I was also not familiar with. Not only did they team teach, but they taught "differently." At first I did not really recognize what this "difference" was, but as I read more of their readings, I had an epiphany.  They were engaging in "feminist pedagogy."  This was the entryway for my fascination with and commitment to feminist teaching.  Lynn has always been willing to listen to my conceptions of feminism, feminist teaching, oppression

and privilege with loving presence.  There must have been
times in the past where I went to her and told her about my
conceptions that now seem to have been imbued with arrogant
presence, but I never felt that she did not listen and did
not push me as a critical friend.  She has taught me that as
a scholar and as a teacher you can engage in feminist issues
with loving presence and treat the other as a critical
friend.  I appreciate not only what she knows but who she is
as a person.  She has modeled what I hold dear in a scholar
and a teacher.

There is another person who was not officially on my
committee but has been such a wonderful support for me
during the grueling intellectual and emotional ups and downs
of writing a dissertation that I care so much about.  I want
to thank Joan Hunault for being who she is.  I would speak
to her about my dissertation, often with tears in my eyes,
afraid that I could not say all I felt and thought with
enough articulateness that it could be comprehensible.  Joan
always listened, supported, and I felt understood when I
talked about the need for compassion and loving presence in
teacher education.  She has been there as a critical friend
and with her own loving presence has helped me add to
feminist theory.  She has been an invaluable, unofficial
member of my committee.

All these people have truly let me "dwell" in the realm
of ideas, caring enough to let me work toward becoming all I

can be. I am truly grateful for their intellectual, emotional, and philosophical support throughout this dissertation, but even more throughout the last years of my professional exploration and development. They have and are helping me paint a room in the house that feminist imagination builds.

I want to also acknowledge Reebok, our mutt, who has shown me that sometimes life is as simple as a playful, joyous tug on the pull-toy. Reebok was there during my coursework, to give me puppy warmth and unconditional love. Underdog, the newest addition to the family, during the writing of this dissertation showed me that sometimes my deepest concern had to be whether the puppy pooped and piddled outside the house rather than inside. Vegan and Tahoe, two strays abandoned by others, show me that regardless of what is going on, the purring of cats is a most welcome sound. These creatures teach me about life in ways that are unique because they take complete glee in being alive. They are also part of the great voiceless exploited creatures, the "animal guides" (Daly and Caputi, 1987), who we could learn so much from if we unlearned some of the lessons about "brute beasts" and "dumb animals."[2]

---

[2] I loved when Donovan (1990a) in her article, "Animal rights and feminist theory" stated:

This article is dedicated to my great dog Rooney (1974-87), who died as it was being completed but whose life led me to appreciate the nobility and dignity of animals. (p.350)

It is so important that this work be *mine* and how else but to acknowledge those "whose language is not heard ... who are called voiceless or mute, even the earthworms, even the shell-fish and the sponges..." (Griffin, 1978, dedication).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

# THE FORETHOUGHT[3]

## The House That Feminist Imagination Builds

Many years ago, the poet Diane di Primia wrote a line that comes back to me now: "The only war that counts is the war against imagination." I often wondered what she meant by it, but now I think I understand. All war is first waged in the imagination, first conducted to limit our dreams and our visions, to make us accept within ourselves its terms, to believe that our only choices are those that it lays before us.... But if we hold to the power of our visions, our heartbeats, our imagination, we can fight on our own turf, which is the landscape of consciousness. (Starhawk, _The Fifth Sacred Thing_, 1993, p. 238)

Mystics have always traditionally considered the feminine aspect of the universe as a...house...as well as an enclosed garden. Another symbolic association is that which equates the house...with the repository of all wisdom.... (Cirlot, 1971, p. 153)[4]

I invite you into a house. A house built by feminist imagination. You will enter one of the rooms. A room, a study actually, with many shelves filled with many books.

---

[3] The title of "The Forethought" is taken from W. E. B. DuBois (1903/1994, p. v). In DuBois' forethought he writes:

> Herein lie buried many things which if read with patience may show the strange meaning of being black here in the dawning of the Twentieth Century. This meaning is not without interest to you, Gentle Reader; for the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color-line.
>
> I pray you, then, receive my little book in all charity, studying my words with me, forgive mistake and foible for sake of the faith and passion that is in me, and seeking the grain of truth hidden there. (p. v)

I, like DuBois, ask you to read with patience, and study the words contained in this text _with_ me. I also ask that you forgive me for the mistakes and foibles that I am bound to make as a writer trapped within my own paradigms. I try to show you the strange meaning of being a woman with feminist imagination, writing, existing, teaching, and learning within a sex/gender, race, and class system, all the while writing and working against the very same system. DuBois entreats his readers to hear his faith and passion, and I make the same request.

[4] The "house" is also a powerful symbol in several American Indian mythologies. For example,

> the Iroquois of New York used to speak of their entire territory, stretching a distance of some three hundred miles, as the great "longhouse" of the confederated nations. At Niagara Falls, the Seneca were keepers of the western "door," while the Mohawks were keepers of the eastern "door" in the Hudson River....
>
> Among the North American Pawnee, the world's rim, or horizon, was considered to be the circular "wall" of the great house, with the sky as its "roof," representing the traditional domed earth-lodge. And since anyone who inhabited an ordinary house was said to be "inside," the universe as a whole was called the "inside land." (Bierhorst, 1994, pp. 109-111)

There are books of fiction and nonfiction. Books that are theoretical and practical. Books that meld the two. There are mystical and magical books. Futuristic and children's books. Books of poetry and drama. There are songbooks too. I have been dwelling in and painting this study for a long time. It is actually a life's work-in-progress.

This study exists within a house and I invite you to explore this house. This is an unusual kind of house, though--it is a house that feminist imagination builds. A house where new rooms keep appearing--the construction is not rigid. Fronts become backs and rooms have indiscernible shapes. This kind of house verges on the mystical--verges on that which cannot be known, but which many thinkers for many centuries have struggled to know. This house is a metaphor for the theory that feminist imagination built and builds, a theory constructed by many tears. Do not forget the tears. Tears cried for the "madwoman in the attic," the room with "yellow wallpaper," and the "ontological basement for women and children."[5] It represents a theory constructed with much laughter. Do not forget the laughter, nor the humor, joy, and passion.

The theory is fluid and dynamic, even when constructed.

---

[5] The "madwoman in the attic" is taken from Gilbert & Gubar (1984) and "the yellow wallpaper" is borrowed from Gilman (1892/1899/1973). The "ontological basement" is from a quote by Martin (1982):

> Lorenne Clark has shown that, from the standpoint of political theory, women, children, and the family dwell in the "ontological basement," outside and underneath the political structure. This apolitical status is due not to historical accident or necessity but to arbitrary definition. (p. 162)

Can a theory be like that?  Can a house be like that?  Not in present ways of knowing.  We need to take flights of imagination.  Authors of fiction have the capacity to take this flight.  We can learn much from them.  As educators who are feminists and profeminists imagining that which others say is impossible is crucial.  To conceive of the impossible allows us to question that which we have judged inconceivable.  To conceive of all the possibilities is, for me, feminist imagination: "The possibilities, she told us are endless.... The possibilities, we see, never end..."(Griffin, 1978, p. 192).  John Crowley in Little, Big (1981), a book of mystical and magical conjecture, describes a house.  His house suggests the kind of house I will ask you to enter--an unusual and unfamiliar abode:

> "My room--see?"  He peeked in, and mostly saw himself in the tall *mirror*.  *"Imaginary study*.  Old orrery, up those stairs.  *Turn left, then turn left."*  The hallway seemed concentric, and Smoky wondered how all these rooms managed to sprout off it.  "Here," she said.
>      The *room was of indiscernible shape*; the ceiling sank toward one corner sharply, which made one end of the room lower than the other; the *windows* there were smaller too; the room seemed larger than it was, or smaller than it looked, he couldn't decide which...."
>      Alone together...in the *walled garden* at the back front of the house.  "The back front?"... This used to be the front," Daily Alice said. "Then they built the garden and the wall; so the back became the front.  It was a front anyway.  And now this is the back front".... "That's not really it," she said, looking birdwise at her star, "but sort of.  See, it's a house all fronts.... It's so many houses, sort of put inside each other or across each other, with their fronts sticking out".... "Look. See?"  she said.  He looked where she pointed, along the back front.  It was a severe, classical facade softened by ivy, its gray stone stained as though by dark *tears*; tall, arched windows; symmetrical detail he recognized as the

classical Orders; rustications, columns, plinths....
She...led him by the hand along the front, and as they
passed, it seemed to fold like scenery; what had looked
flat became out-thrust; what stuck out folded in;
pillars turned pilasters and disappeared. Like one of
those ripply pictures children *play* with, where a face
turns from grim to *grin* as you move it, the back front
altered, and when they reached the opposite wall and
turned to look back, the house had become *cheerful* and
mock-Tudor with deep curling eaves and clustered
chimneys like *comic* hats. (Crowley, 1981, pp. 29-31,
emphasis added)

Odd, strange, disconcerting, improbable? Perhaps yes, but

Crowley pushes us to stretch our imaginations to think about

something we know so well in radically different ways. He

pushes, as I push, to make the familiar strange. Something

normally rigid and unyielding is made elastic by the

novelist's imagination. So the house with the rooms,

especially the study that I am painting, moves and shape-

shifts. My room--my contribution to feminist theory--shape-

shifts, because contexts shape theories.

Are you willing to enter such a house, such a room,

such a study? You will need to turn left and then left

again to reach this study. Some theorists argue that

feminism is more radical than other leftist analyses.[6] In

my conception turning left and then left again means that

you are moving in a circular motion, which is encompassing

---

[6] For example Shulamith Firestone (1972) states:

> The contemporary radical feminist position is the direct descendant of the radical feminist line in the old movement,
> notably championed by Stanton and Anthony, and later by the militant Congressional Union subsequently known as the
> Woman's Party. It sees feminist issues not only as *women's* first priority but central to any larger revolutionary
> analysis. It refuses to accept the existing leftist analysis not because it is too radical, but because *it is not radical*
> *enough*: it sees the current left analysis as outdated and superficial, because this analysis does not relate the structure
> of the economic class system to its origins in the sexual class system, the model for all other exploitive systems, and
> thus the tapeworm that must be eliminated.... (p. 37, emphasis in original)

and therefore supports inclusivity. It is not a linear left
to "right" model, with "arrival" points which end up
excluding by categorization. In this room you may see
yourself in the mirror; in this theory you may see a
reflection of yourself. I want to suggest that this
feminist theory is constructed in place and time, but
"echoes forward" (Featherstone, private communication, 1994)
to a much less fixed vision of what is possible. Please
bring your imagination and your paintbrush because there are
spots unpainted. You have choices in dealing with the
unpainted spots. You could criticize and berate me for
missing the spots. You could show me where the spots are
and I will attempt to paint them myself. Or you could pick
up a paintbrush and help me paint the spots, thereby helping
me paint the room.[7] I hope you will embrace the third. For
this is an invitation to pick up the paintbrush and to
become a part of a *community of critical friends*, to dwell
for a time in my study.

I use the term *critical friend* to indicate that you are
crucial and significant to my learning and growth by
fostering my intellectual, emotional, and psychological
development with challenge and support. By critical, I mean
being analytical and discerning, but not disparaging or
belittling. As a critical friend, you are assessing and

---

[7] This image was created by Marilyn Frye (1994). She relayed it to Michael Michell in a paper he wrote for her in a Feminist Theory class.

reacting to what I write and you will push my thinking. With your help we can make this a new and brightly painted room. The room is part of the theory that I am trying to create, theory that undoubtly has missing pieces--unpainted spots. So take up the paintbrush and *join me--be my critical friend*. Help me avoid painting myself into a corner.

The unpainted spots are an invitation for others to enter into the spirit of the community I will be writing about--the community of critical friends, the community of feminist imagination--a community I wish to help develop in teacher education. This spirit gets at the essence of the kind of community of scholars and teachers that could be created within the academy for pre-service teachers in the class*room* (in the school*house*) to talk about issues that are complex and difficult. Such a community would not rip apart theory or attack members' ideas for violence's sake. Rather such a community would work to create theory through criticism that is

> without the edge of violence that creeps into its tone. Maybe violence is too strong--without the contempt for other work that seems to come with the territory.... Maybe one has to distinguish between a criticism that actually attends to something and a criticism that's really dismissive.... What we need is an ethics of criticism. (Gallop, Hirsch, & Miller, 1990, p. 368)

I am proposing that we act as critical friends. Within the context of this text, I invite you to become a critical friend for the time that you read and react to this work

about a teacher educator, her students, and the researcher
teaching and learning about issues of privilege and
oppression. Let *your* feminist imagination help you
construct this house and its many rooms.

Pay attention to the locks, the keys, the doors, the
trap doors, the windows, the glass ceilings, and the
mirrors--they are all part of the study. Go outside of the
house to the garden--for there is land there that needs to
be tilled, and seeds that need to be planted and worked into
the ground. This is *grounded* theory in the making. It is
theory grounded in life. There is life in this house, a
live house. "Out of our lives, we make theories; according
to our theories, we live our lives. And I do not know which
comes first" (Torton Beck, 1983, p. 291). We need to
unearth the possibilities that our lives hold for the
creation of feminist imagination.

Notice the wall that surrounds the garden. A wall can
provide safety and create a safe place, building defenses.
But it can also entrap us (as can the house). Walls are
potential barriers and we want to make sure that our
imagination can scale those walls. I also "struggle
endlessly endlessly" not to be trapped within a White house,
built by the bricks and mortar of "whiteliness."[8] Will you
help me paint it more color-fully?

---

[8] The phrase "struggle endlessly endlessly" I borrow from Morales (1983) to emphasize the continual and consistent work that I
need to do in terms of my race privilege, and the term "whiteliness" is created by Marilyn Frye (1983-1994) which I will
explore later in the dissertation.

What does it mean to dwell within a house, within a community?  What does it mean to have an institution like education inhabited by critical friends?  What would it mean to till the land and work together in harmony to create a safer place?  It does not mean working without conflict.  In fact, it is how we approach conflict and what we do with conflict that I want us to think about.  Feminist imagination can open the door to a new kind of vision of conflict.

If we come together as critical friends I believe it will enable us *all* to move beyond our own limits and the limits of our singular imagination to a vision full of possibility and hope.  In a meeting place of critical friends, we are no longer isolated and individualistic, but working and learning together to create a shared vision, a house to dwell in, to care in, to feel compassion in, to develop *loving presence*[9] in, a house built by feminist imagination.  Critical friends could build a coherent vision of learning, peace, and social justice *for all*.

---

[9]  The concept of loving presence will be developed fully in the chapters which follow.

*It is exhilarating to be alive in a time of awakening consciousness; it can also be confusing, disorienting, and painful. This awakening of dead or sleeping consciousness has already affected the lives of millions of women, even those who don't know it yet. It is also affecting the lives of men, even those who deny its claim upon them.... The sleepwalkers are coming awake, and for the first time this awakening has a collective reality; it is no longer such a lonely thing to open one's eyes.*

*Re-vision--the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entertaining an old text from a new critical direction--is for women more than a chapter in cultural history: it is an act of survival. Until we can understand the assumptions in which we are drenched we cannot know ourselves. (Rich, 1971, p. 167)*

# FEMINIST IMAGINATION IN THE TIME OF "BACKLASH"[10]

> It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it
> was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness,
> it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of
> incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the
> season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was
> the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we
> had nothing before us, we were all going direct to
> Heaven, we were all going direct the other way....
> (Dickens, 1859/1980, p. 13)

This is a study of how a teacher educator with feminist

imagination and her students explored issues of gender,

race, and class in an educational foundations course, all

the while being with/in, and constructed by a gender, race,

and class system.  This is also a study of the ways in which

the teacher educator, Piercy Sand, and I learned together

through our working together.[11]  This is also a study of the

deep learning that occurred for me and the ways in which I

re-visioned feminism in teacher education and conceptualized

feminist imagination.

This study, this house that feminist imagination

builds, is located in a historical context.[12]  Context

affects scholarship and scholarship affects context.  They

are dialectical and reflexive.  Dickens' words were written

almost a century and a half ago, however, they seem

---

[10] The concept of "backlash" has been used by both Faludi (1991) and Miller (1986).

[11] Piercy Sand is a pseudonym. Also all of the students' names and the names of the college and the town are pseudonyms.

[12] I am limiting my analysis of the backlash to the context of the United States, rather than moving out globally, for I think that I can only speak of how I perceive what is occurring within the boundaries of the country in which I am living. I am acutely aware that global issues affect the United States and that I cannot divorce what occurs globally with what occurs in the United States. However, since Piercy Sand, her students, their educational institution and I are most immediately situated within the United States, it seems to be important to uncover the backlash primarily within the United States.

timeless. I believe we currently exist within these
paradoxes. Is it merely because this is my time that it
seems to me that we are situated within a time of great
extremes? Or, are the 1990s especially polemic? I feel
that this particular moment in time is a time like no other.
Perhaps the phrases are forever *true*, yet somehow, during
this time of incredible progress and incredible backlash,
they seem even *truer*. Is it only because I have come to
understand that two seemingly contradictory truths can
coexist? Perhaps that is why Dickens' words seem to speak
to me and the dissertation I write. Whether it is
historical reality that these extremes exist, or whether it
is my heightened perception, Dickens' phrases seem
especially pertinent.

It is a time when the popular press tells us that the
feminist movement is the culprit for nearly everything that
is ailing women in general. For example,

> Professional women are suffering "burnout" and
> succumbing to an "infertility epidemic." Single women
> are grieving from a "man shortage." The New York
> Times reports: Childless women are "depressed and
> confused" and their ranks are swelling. Newsweek says:
> Unwed women are "hysterical" and crumbing under a
> "profound crisis of confidence." (Faludi, 1991, p. ix)

It also claims that women's equality has really been won
(Faludi, 1991). Yet, when we look at the statistics
regarding women's "progress," it is shocking:

> If American women are so equal, why do they represent
> two-thirds of all poor adults? Why are nearly 75
> percent of full-time working women making less than
> $20,000 a year, nearly double the male rate? Why are

they still far more likely than men to live in poor
housing and receive no health insurance, and twice as
likely to draw no pension?... If women have "made it,"
then why are nearly 80 percent of working women still
stuck in traditional "female" jobs--as secretaries,
administrative "support" workers and salesclerks?...
Nor is women's struggle for equal education over; as a
1989 study found, three-fourths of all high schools
still violate the federal law banning sex
discrimination in education.  In colleges,
undergraduate women receive only 70 percent of the aid
undergraduate men get in grants and work-study jobs--
and women's sports programs receive a pittance compared
with men's. (Faludi, 1991, pp. xiii-xvi)[13]

Sometimes it is easier for me to think of the worst of

times in the United States, a time when the neo-nazi

movement is burgeoning and a conservative and "neo-

nationalist backlash" (Hate and Hope, 1994) abounds.  It is

a time when hate crimes are on the rise.[14]  It is a time of

homelessness, AIDS, poverty, crime, violence, the abuse of

children and animals.

During this historical period those who care about

social justice seem to need even sharper vision, for the

means and methods of backlash are sophisticated.  For

example, "blaming the victim" (Ryan, 1966/1976) has achieved

such new and subtle convolutions that it is at times

---

[13] The American Association of University Women (1992) also reports that

> Occupational segregation among women of color is even more extreme.  Forty-one percent of black women working
> in service occupations are employed as chambermaids, welfare service aides, cleaners, or nurse's aides.  For Hispanic
> women, job segregation has meant disproportionate employment in low-level factory jobs in some of the industries
> hardest hit by the current downturn in the economy. (p. 4)

[14] The statistics reveal that racial hate crimes are on the rise during the 1990s:

> Racially motivated violence is on the rise, the numbers indicate.  More than 50 murders across the United States in
> 1991 and '92 were classified as hate crimes by Klanwatch, a research group in Birmingham, Ala., that has monitored
> hate-group activity since 1979.... "The message is to everyone in that group: 'You don't belong.'" (Brutal Crimes
> Against All Races on the Increase, 1993)

difficult to figure out when the phenomenon is being

enacted. Jones (1993) tells us that a "simple" question,

such as why a woman who is being beaten by her partner

doesn't just leave, is an insidious form of blaming the

victim. It is a time when "affirmative action" is called

"reverse discrimination."[15]    As Nathan, one of the students

in Piercy Sand's class, stated:

> I think affirmative action is more discriminating than
> discrimination. I don't like the idea of like, having
> minority requirements at schools, where the school has
> to have a certain percentage of minority students, I
> think that's just as demeaning as not having any.

It is a time when women are demanding the freedom to be

out at night and protesting rape and violence against women

with "Take Back The Night" marches. These marches are

occurring on campuses nationwide, including Atwood College,

where Piercy taught. "Take Back the Night" marches are

usually made up of all women, however, when men are invited

they walk behind the group of women. This all-women march

is a statement that women SHOULD be safe to walk the streets

at night without the protection of men from men. Matt, a

student in Piercy's class, told about the men's reactions to

this march on Atwood's campus:

> Some guys from [an apartment building] yelled down to
> 'em [the women] "I'm gonna come down there and rape you
> all," which the people in the fraternities didn't
> realize. Some of the guys in the fraternities did
> holler some stuff at them [but] not as bad as that.

---

[15] See Greenawalt (1983) for a more traditional definition and related concepts of "reverse discrimination" and "affirmative action." Also see Daly and Caputi (1987, p. 257) and Daly (1987, pp. 248-260) for broader discussions of "reversals" in language.

Matt reported that the women on the march were angry, and "yelled" at the men in the fraternity dorms. After the march some of the men put up a sign that read, "Take Back The Night But Don't Start A Fight" by "The Coalition Against The Persecution Of Men." By telling us this story, Matt is suggesting a larger issue. As women speak up and out about their oppression, men react in verbally hostile ways and claim that they are being "persecuted."

Miller (1986) tells us that backlash happens when small changes have occurred:

> At the same time that we recognize that women have just begun to act for and from themselves, we see that a backlash has arisen in reaction to even partial change. A backlash may be an indication that women really have had an effect, but backlashes occur when advances have been small, before changes are sufficient to help many people. For example, women have been blamed for the "breakdown of the family" or for all the problems of youth, drugs, crime, and unemployment.... It is almost as if the leaders of backlashes use the fear of change as a threat before major change has occurred.... Thus, we are in a period of great flux, a time of transition with trends in several directions. (Miller, 1986, pp. xv-xvi)

Miller predicted that a great flux would come at the end of the eighties. We are now in the mid-nineties, encountering that flux. We are going in several directions at once.

This is a time when the backlash against women's progress is "undeclared" but vicious. Faludi (1991) writes:

> [The] last decade has seen a powerful counterassault on women's rights, a backlash....
> The backlash is at once sophisticated and banal, deceptively "progressive" and proudly awkward. It deploys both the "new" findings of "scientific

research" and the dime-store moralism of yesteryear; it turns into media sound bites both the glib pronouncements of pop-psych trend-watchers and the frenzied rhetoric of the New Right preachers. The backlash has succeeded in framing virtually the whole issue of women's rights in its own language...the backlash has convinced the public that women's "liberation" was the true contemporary American scourge--the source of an endless laundry list of personal, social, and economic problems. (p. xviii)

It is a time during which speaking of equity brings charges of "political correctness." It is a time when talk shows have titles like, "White Men Fight Back: I'm Sick of Being Discriminated Against," and participants shout out that "White, straight men are the minority" and this is "reverse discrimination."[16]

In this time of backlash speaking up and out about oppression and privilege and feminist imagination makes some of us feel alone, lonely, and "mad" at times, because others don't seem to cry out at the same injustices and inequities. I am reminded of Emily Dickinson's poem, about "madness" making divine sense:

> Much madness is divinest sense
>          To a discerning eye;
> Much sense the starkest madness.
>          'Tis the majority
>     In this, as all, prevails.
>     Assent, and you are sane;
> Demur,--you're straightway dangerous,
>     And handled with a chain.
>          (1993, p. 30)

It is in this interesting time that I began investigating what feminist imagination means to a teacher

---

[16] Ricki Lake, February 23, 1994.

educator and teacher education. It feels like the season of
light and the season of darkness, for this is a time when
feminist scholarship and research is being accepted in some
of the publications which are highly regarded (see for
example Rogers, 1993; Lewis, 1990); yet, it is also a time
where there is a counterassault inside and outside of
academia against feminist thinking (Paglia, 1991; Limbaugh,
1992, 1993). It is a time of speaking up and speaking out.
It is a time of polemics and a time of bitter controversies.
Yet these times provide an opportunity for dialogue which
could help push toward a brighter tomorrow.

Dickens' phrases are also a reminder to me that I need
to challenge my own dichotomous thinking, away from an
either-or way of seeing the world. It is a time when people
are speaking publicly about issues that were rarely spoken
about in public forums in the past: Gay and lesbian rights,
sexual abuse, child pornography, rape and violence against
women. People are talking about invisibility in the
disciplines, who is included and excluded and why.

It is a time of Rush Limbaugh (1992, 1993) and John
Stoltenberg (1990, 1993). It is a time of Camilia Paglia
(1991) and Susan Faludi (1991). Their voices tell us about
the polarities and paradoxes we live with/in.

Limbaugh is extremely popular. Many North Americans
feel he speaks for them. I have felt like dismissing him
outright as a buffoon or a comic. Yet, I think this is not

advisable. He appears on many respected media shows, is named by the newly elected Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich as a friend and inspiration, and reaches a huge audience through his bestsellers, and his nationally syndicated talk show. His name is a household one. Many people are obviously taking him seriously *enough*.

Perhaps part of his appeal is that he has an either-or way of looking at the world. Limbaugh labels readily and easily. For example, he calls some feminists "feminazis."

> Many feminist leaders are humorless, militant, pugnacious, and very unhappy people who do not want to equalize the status of women, but instead want to irreversibly alienate women from men and vice versa (p. 188).... Increasingly feminist groups are viewed as a fringe element who, because they are incapable of assimilating into mainstream society, are exacting their revenge on it. They are trying to change society to make it conform to them, rather than accepting the fact that they are not the mainstream...I prefer to call the most obnoxious feminists what they really are: feminazis. (Limbaugh, 1992, p. 192-193)

Stoltenberg is being published at the same time as Limbaugh. His books, <u>Refusing to be a Man: Essays on Sex and Justice</u>, and <u>The End of Manhood: A Book for Men of Conscience</u>, are not bestsellers. He is not well known by the mainstream, and his name is not a household one. When I read his work, I understand why. Stoltenberg is trying to challenge the social construction of manhood and masculinity. He writes:

> What would happen if we each told the deepest truth about why we are men who mean to be part of the feminist revolution--why we can't *not* be part of it-- why its vision of full humanity for everyone so moves us?..."the male sex" requires injustice in order to

exist. Male sexual identity is entirely a political
and ethical construction, I argue; and masculinity has
personal meaning only because certain acts, choices,
and policies create it--with devastating consequences
for human society. But precisely *because* that personal
and social identity is constructed, we can refuse it,
we can act against it--we can change. The core of our
being can choose allegiance to justice instead. (1990,
pp. 2-4)
A woman's voice in opposition to feminism is Paglia

(1991). Paglia makes many feminists and profeminists

shudder. She claims that rape is more of a sexual act than

a violent act and that it is:

> a mode of natural aggression that can be controlled
> only by the social contract. Modern feminism's most
> naive formulation is its assertion that rape is a crime
> of violence but not of sex, that it is merely power
> masquerading as sex. But sex *is* power, and all power
> is inherently aggressive. Rape is male power fighting
> female power. It is no more to be excused than is
> murder or any other assault on another's civil right.
> Society is woman's protection against rape, not as some
> feminists absurdly maintain, the cause of rape.
> (Paglia, 1991, p. 23)

Many feminists declare Paglia's theory as absurd, and Faludi

writes about the other absurd ways in which rape is talked

about--actually as a backlash against women. She writes:

> The U.S. Attorney General's Commission on Pornography
> even proposed that women's professional advancement
> might be responsible for rising rape rapes. With more
> women in college and at work now, the commission
> members reasoned in their report, women just have more
> opportunities to be raped. (p. xii)

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to explore

this backlash in depth. I include these conflicting voices

on pressing feminist concerns because they highlight the

paradoxes and polarities of the larger society in which this

study is located. I as the researcher, Piercy as the

teacher educator, and Piercy's students were located within a time of extremes, where the popularity of arch-conservatives was on the rise and yet the scholarship with and for women was reaching new acuity and acceptance.[17]

Times have changed enough so that women are in universities writing about women's experiences and realities. So I see the times as receptive to women. It was not that long ago that higher education was not even available to women (see Sadker and Sadker, 1994, pp. 15-41).[18] I am able to see how the lives of some women have improved greatly. On the other hand, many women's lives are still filled with tragedy and despair. When I think of the poverty which exists in this country, one the most prosperous in the world, I also feel that this is the season of darkness.

Dickens' words also remind me to see the complexity within the nature of truth and reality. This complexity is difficult to grapple with--it is elusive. Although I may yearn at times for order and Truth with a capital "T," current feminist and constructivist scholarship tells us that this is not possible. Instead, we are told that we need to learn to operate in a world that is filled with wisdom and foolishness, lightness and darkness, hope and

[17] I will be using the past tense, for readability but also because this study and the participants were located in a moment in time, we are no longer the people we were.

[18] See also Clifford, 1982; Solomon, 1985, pp. 133-140.

despair.

I found these same contradictions in my work. I found that I need to learn how to negotiate in a world where contradictions exist. I found that teacher education needs to be able to figure out how to help future teachers negotiate within these contradictions also. This is no easy feat. Many theorists claim that we now know there are no longer laws that guarantee certainty and uniformity in the sciences or social sciences. Instead, open-endedness is a major quality of this post-modern framework (see Doll, 1992).[19] This open-endedness is what I invite you into, this room where multiple realities and multiple interpretations are possible.

Part of what makes liberatory education such a complex and challenging task is that one enters into the realm of human consciousness. Education for liberation attempts to transform individual and collective lives by transforming consciousness. As Starhawk (1993) reminds us, "Consciousness is the most stubborn substance in the cosmos, and the most fluid. It can be rigid as concrete, and it can change in an instant. A song can change it, or a story, or a fragrance wafting by on the wind" (p. 153).

---

[19] A definition of postmodernism that I have found helpful is found in Roy (1994)

> Sholle and Denski contrast *postmodernism* with *modernism*: "Postmodernism, as a form of cultural criticism and as a historical condition, directly challenges the project of modernism [by questioning] modernism's reliance on the notion of the autonomous individual, the emphasis on the linearity of thought, the aesthetic of rationality and order," and the preeminence of Western history and thought (304). The postmodern view of learners as differently "gendered, raced, classes"—each learner always and already situated in race, class, and gender contexts, multiply overlapping and interconnecting, and frequently in conflict.... (p. 200)

Liberatory education seeks to transform consciousness, the students' and the teacher educator's. Therefore, no longer can the teacher educator be a transmitter of information. "The teacher's role will no longer be viewed as causal, but as transformative...learning will be an adventure in meaning making" (Soltis, 1992, p. xi). The adventure in meaning making will be a communal enterprise, where the teacher educator and the students are transformed together. If teacher education could help future teachers regard teaching and learning as an adventure in negotiating the complexity, ambiguity (Cohen, 1988; Lortie, 1975) and disorder (Finley, 1988) which exists in the world, this would be transformative teacher education. But this means breaking down the dichotomous thinking so many of us have been schooled in.

Dickens has helped me to outline the complexities and the paradoxes. My feminist imagination asks, How do we as teacher educators help future teachers create the best of times for all students and the epoch of belief in social justice for all? How do we create a season of Light, where no one is blind to injustices and inequity? To come closer to answering these questions would signal the best of times.

Chesler (1989) writes at the end of *her* introduction, "In bringing you this book, I feel like a time-traveler turned messenger, a bearer of bad news. I wonder how you will receive it, I wonder what you will do" (p. xxxvii)? I

claim something slightly different, yet end with the same
questions. By inviting you into this house, into this room,
I, too, feel like a messenger. I am the bearer of good news
and bad news, for I believe these are the "best of times,
the worst of times, the age of wisdom, the age of
foolishness...the season of Light, the season of Darkness,
the spring of hope, the winter of despair." I tell of
barriers and possibilities. *I wonder how you will receive
it.* *I wonder what you will do?*

*We can imagine women's exclusion organized by the formation of a circle among men who attend to and treat as significant only what men say. The circle of men whose writing and talk was significant to each other extends backward as far as our records reach. What men were doing was relevant to men, was written by men about men for men. Men listened and listened to what one another said.*

*That is how a tradition is formed. A way of thinking develops in this discourse through the medium of the written and printed word as well as in speech. It has questions, solutions, themes, styles, standards, ways of looking at the world. These are formed as the circle of those present build on the work of the past. From these circles women have been excluded or admitted only by a special license granted to a woman as an individual and never as a representative of her sex. (Smith, 1987, p. 18)*

*Discerning what action, attitude, and stance are really liberatory, for ourselves and others, is almost never easy. We have been confused and misinformed, have been taught since the cradle values which promote our subordination rather than our liberation. To a large extent these learned values have even caught us up in the oppression of others. Because of this, we have to think and analyze and talk with each other endlessly about how to understand the information we have, how to assess our feelings and desires, how to change ourselves; we have to think together and discuss among ourselves what sorts of collective strategies are sound, are "cost effective," are least prone to cooption, and so on. Everything is in question. Everything has to be created anew. (Frye, 1991, pp. 15-16)*

# CHAPTER I

## INTO THE WOMAN'S STUDY: WOMEN'S LIVES AS THEORY IN THE MAKING

### Women Working Together: Or Don't Close That Door

[W]e must first, quite literally, learn to *see*. To see what is *there*; not what we've been taught is there, not even what we might wish to find, but what is. We literally *cannot see women* through traditional science and theory. Learning to do so is no simple task; it is not simple even for feminists. The distorting perceptual and conceptual lenses of patriarchy are the lenses we have all been taught to look through; removing them is slow, sometimes painful and frightening as it opens our eyes to reality-without-explanation; and it is often startling. It is also *communal*, not an individual task. As each one of us removes those lenses and is able to say what she sees, the world opens up for all of us: things begin to make sense. (Barbara Du Bois, 1979, pp. 109-110, emphasis in original)

In this chapter I examine the barriers that exist for women working toward "woman-centered scholarship" (Du Bois, 1979, p. 108). I explore what it means to engage in feminist methodology and scholarship, for example, my own subjectivity as an integral part of this study. I also provide the data sources that I used. I explain why I have conceived of and written this text in the way that I have. In this chapter I also introduce you briefly to Piercy Sand, the teacher educator I studied. By allowing me into her classroom and into her life, she worked with me to conceive of what feminist imagination in teacher education could mean.

Du Bois states that the task for women is to *see* differently and that this seeing is a communal task of women

24

working and learning and re-seeing together. Yet, herein
lies a painful condition of women's lives. That is, women
are often kept from, or keep themselves from, developing and
maintaining communities of women in their lives. Research
and scholarship are not exempt. The idea of women working
together to "unlearn the myths that bind them" (Christensen,
1992) is not as commonplace or as accepted as one might
assume.

What does it mean for women to learn and build
community together, community which honors and values women?
Community as a construct means different things for women
and for those who see women in community. Why do I
highlight that a community of women is different in kind
than a community of men and women? It is because women have
been taught to align themselves with men, not other women.
They have been taught that for economic, psycho-sexual, and
intellectual community, the company of men is more essential
than the company of women (see Lewis, 1990; Miller, 1986).
Women have been left out of the circle of men and believe
that to be of "worth" means entering into that circle of
men, reaching for that "special license granted to a woman
as an individual and never as a representative of her sex"
(Smith, 1987, p. 18).

For a woman to align herself with women, to say she
likes women, or to say she loves women in this homophobic
and sexist culture rings warning bells for many. Odd, isn't

it, when one really thinks about it. Caring for women, for
women's conditions, caring enough about women to take them
seriously (Rich, 1978) and wanting the best for them is so
contrary to this culture, a culture that Dworkin (1974)
calls "woman hating." This culture does not promote or
educate women to love each other, or to work with and for
each other. Women are trained to be male-centered and male-
identified, versus woman-centered or woman-identified (see
Eisenstein, 1983; Radicalesbians, 1973).

I share with you some vignettes from this study and
from other sources to accentuate that women in the company
of other women is not as customary as one might hope for.
Piercy told me a story about telling a colleague of hers, a
male philosophy professor, about the work we were doing
together. She told him that I had been a student of Marilyn
Frye's (a philosophy professor and also an "out" lesbian).
He said, "I think you better leave your door open when this
woman comes in." She just laughed in response, not taking
his warning seriously. Yet, what if she had been
homophobic? What if someone suggesting that I could be
lesbian would have frightened her? Would she have worked
with me? Could this have harmed our work together? Are
labels like lesbian one of the mechanisms used by the
sex/gender system to keep women apart?

Instead of dismissing his comment as my first
inclination might be, I need to pay attention to a comment

like his. His doubts may also reflect doubts others might have about our work together. Comments like the philosophy professor's alert us to the homophobic, heterosexist, and sexist culture that still exists in the nineties (see Pharr, 1988; Bunch, 1987). I must remember that many women still fear the term lesbian. Klein (1983) reminds us, "Because, ideally, our work is undertaken in groups, we should not underestimate the barriers that keep women from working with each other" (p. 100). A little more than ten years after Klein forewarned women, women working with each other still churns a homophobic reaction in some observers.

If woman-centered community and scholarship is to be created we need to understand how "lesbian" is used as an undermining tool to women's work:

> Lesbian is the word, the label, the condition that holds women in line. When a woman hears this word tossed her way, she knows she is stepping out of line. She knows she has crossed the terrible boundary of her sex role. She recoils, she protests, she reshapes her actions to gain approval. Lesbian is a label invented by the Man to throw at any women who dares to be his equal, who dares to challenge his prerogatives (including that of all women as part of the exchange medium among men), who dares to assert the primacy of her own needs.... Affixing the label lesbian not only to a woman who aspires to be a person, but also to any situation of real love, real solidarity, real primacy among women is a primary form of divisiveness among women: it is a condition which keeps women within the confines of the feminine role, and it is the debunking\scare term that keeps women from forming any primary attachments, groups or associations among ourselves.... As long as male acceptability is primary--both to individual and to the movement as a whole--the term lesbian will be used effectively against women. (Radicalesbians, 1973, p. 241-243)

Another question raised by the philosophy professor's

caution is, What if I was a lesbian?  Would this have affected my work with Piercy?  I am reminded of Bunch's (1987) statement that "Male society defines lesbianism as a sexual act, which reflects men's limited view of women: they think of us only in terms of sex" (p. 161).  As Piercy quoted him, I am reminded that in 1992, as I collected my data, homophobia and heterosexism were pervasive, and "smart" people (like this philosophy professor) were not exempt from the myths surrounding these issues.  In 1994 as I write this dissertation, I realize that academicians still have their own myths to unlearn about women working together.  Grumet (1988) states, "Sexual difference is not a mere anatomical decoration on the surface structure of personality but central to the personality's experience of the world" (p.46).

I can think of four examples that elucidate this problem even further.  Two that Marilyn Frye told her class in 1990 were as follows:  She and another woman were sitting in a restaurant eating dinner.  A man approached and asked "Why are you girls eating all alone?"  She then told that on a Saturday night with a dorm full of women--the lament heard loudly is, "We are all alone on a Saturday night."  A recent comment by a woman in her all-woman support group, highlights this problem even further, "I don't want to be with a bunch of women, it'll just be a hen party" (Mary, January, 1994, private communication).  Finally, Lynne

Cavazos told me (July 7, 1994) that when she suggested to a woman she worked with that they form a woman's discussion group about science, the woman's reply was, "I would rather have men in the group. I like men."

It seems clear to me that part of what we need to teach each other and our women students is that caring about women means caring about oneself, and that caring about oneself means caring about women. It seems that we need to create circles of women who attend to and treat as significant what women say, a circle of women whose writing and talk is significant to each other, where what women are doing is relevant to women, where women listen to one another and write with and for one another.

I must also not underestimate the taken-for-grantedness of the male as norm (see Miller, 1986; Spender, 1985; Rich, 1973-1974) in work environments and how it is sometimes seen as odd or inconsequential that a woman would want to study women and deal specifically with feminist issues. This kind of thinking afflicts not only men but women also. As Fetterley (1987) states, "As readers and thinkers and scholars, women are taught to think as men, to identify with a male point of view, and to accept as normal and legitimate a male system of values" (as cited in Obbink, 1992, p. 39).

Miller (1986) explains that in the realm of the academy women are still second-class study subjects, and also are invisible in most of the disciplines:

Most members of the professional and academic world
still do not consider the study of women to be serious
work. They view it as secondary or peripheral at best.
They do not perceive the obvious implications for the
total human community, for all society, for men as well
as women. Or perhaps they glimpse this profundity and
perceive it as threatening. Perhaps this fear accounts
in part for their disparagement of this work, even when
some of it is brilliant and almost all of it
stimulating. (p. xvii)

Almost ten years have passed since Miller wrote this

and one would assume much has changed. However, when women

do start questioning why women are invisible, ignored, or

erased in a certain field, responses from others may be to

blame the questioner. Lynne Cavazos tells a story about

being a student in a graduate class and challenging a man in

the class about the androcentric nature of science. Other

women added to her challenges. On the way out of class the

man said to Lynne, "How did I end up in a class with so many

man-haters" (February 6, 1992)?

The preeminence of men in scholarship is not often

questioned. For example, in my own teacher education

graduate work there were not many opportunities to uncover

the ways in which research and scholarship were male-

centered and did not adequately reflect women's knowledge or

experience. Smith (1987) looks at this androcentrism:

In the field of education research itself, our
assumptions are those of a world seen from men's
position in it. Turn to that classic of our times.
Philippe Ariés's *Centuries of Childhood*. Interrogate it
seriously from the standpoint of women. Ask, should
this book not be retitled *Centuries of the Childhood of
Men?* Or take Christopher Jenck's influential book
entitled *Inequality*. Should this not be described as
an examination of the educational system with respect

to its implications for inequality among men. The very
terms in which inequality is conceived are based on
men's occupations, men's typical patterns of career and
advancement.... The problem is not a special,
unfortunate, an accidental omission of this or that
field, but a general organizational feature of our kind
of society. (p. 22)

In the vignettes mentioned above there are important

implications for women working with women. If groups do not

have a male presence, the women are "all alone," that is,

they are working without the benefit of men (see Murphy,

1991). Male approval syndrome (Frye, 1990, private

communication) is something that keeps women from seeking

out other women to work and learn with. The deep

invisibility of androcentric reality, including research,

often does not alert women to the need for women to discover

and recover their own realities and experiences.

In the academic profession "women contest most directly

the old norms denying the power of female minds, and they

meet most directly the current forms of ancient resistance

to their efforts" (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988, p.5). This

connects to the demographics of faculties in the academy:

"Three out of every four professors are male, and nine out

of ten are white and non-Hispanic.... With Hispanic and

African-American women comprising only 1 percent of the

faculty..." (Sadker and Sadker, 1994, pp. 166-167). In

education women earn more doctorates than men, yet "where

they claim almost 58 percent of the doctorates, they are

only 45 percent of the faculty" (Sadker and Sadker, 1994, p.

167).

We should never underestimate the barriers that keep women separate from one another. I did take for granted the ways in which Piercy and I sought to work together, and did work together. The male philosophy professor was helpful in reminding me that women do not necessarily and with ease work together. In the "minute phenomenon" of his casual comment, he reminded me of what Rich (1979) entreats women to do:

> To question everything. To remember what it has been forbidden even to mention. To come together telling our stories, to look afresh at, and then to describe for ourselves.... To do this kind of work takes a capacity for constant active presence, a naturalist's attention to minute phenomena, for reading between the lines, watching closely for symbolic arrangements.... (Rich, 1979, pp. 13-14)

Piercy and I studied, worked, and learned together. As women we learned from one another, we entrusted one another with deep felt emotions and ideas. This alone was a political act. This may sound dramatic, but when I look at the ways in which women are encouraged to affiliate and align themselves with men instead of women in most realms, it was political. I use political as Millett (1970) does:

> The word "politics" is enlisted here when speaking of the sexes...Groups who rule by birthright are fast disappearing, yet there remains one ancient and universal scheme for domination of one birth group by another--the scheme that prevails in the area of sex ...whereby males rule females. Through this system a most ingenious form of "interior colonization" has been achieved.... However muted its present appearance may be, sexual domination obtains nevertheless as perhaps the most pervasive ideology of our culture and provides its most fundamental concept of power. (pp. 32-33)

This dissertation is an attempt to declare that women as Subjects of study are serious and important contributions to the world of teaching teachers. They are not peripheral, they are not secondary. We are women teaching primarily women, who teach boys and girls. It is important that the sex/gender system is taken into account, not as a subtext to be ignored, but as an important text to be considered.

What was complex and intricate about studying a woman, being myself a woman, is that I was theorizing and writing about a sex/gender system within a sex/gender system, having been shaped by a sex/gender system. As women, Piercy and I have been objects, who tried to make ourselves subjects (which we essentially were), but we had internalized objectification in innumerable ways (see de Beauvoir, 1952/1974).

I was also trying to study other subjects as subjects not as objects. However, I had internalized ways of observing that treats those I "watched" as objects and not as subjects. As Mies (1983) tells, women in academia

> will realize that their own existence as *women* and *scholars* is a contradictory one. As women, they are affected by sexist oppression together with other women, and as scholars they share the privileges of the (male) academic elite.
> Out of this split existence grows a double consciousness which must be taken into account when we think about a new methodology. Women scholars have been told to look at their contradictory existence, i.e., at their subjective being as women as an obstacle and a handicap to "pure" and "objective" research. Even while studying women's questions they were advised to suppress their emotions, their subjective feelings of involvement and identification with other women in

order to produce "objective" data. (p. 120)

I was also theorizing about a race and class system,
within a race and class system, having been shaped by a race
and class system. At times this boggled my mind. There
were moments when this was so difficult to write about
because I second-guessed myself, aware of the caveats and
qualifications I needed to mention, yet needing to write in
the midst of the complexity and ambiguity. This writing was
difficult and it suggests the difficulty that Piercy and I
experienced when we spoke of these issues: we were trying to
"see" clearly what is in fact very complex. As Frye states,
"A clear picture of a fuzzy line is still a fuzzy line"
(private communication, February, 1994).

The father tongue has so influenced the language that I
am able to use that finding the mother tongue in my writing
was difficult. Spender (1985) states:

> Language helps form the limits of reality. It is our
> means of ordering, classifying and manipulating the
> world.... Having learnt the language of a patriarchal
> society we have also learnt to classify and manage the
> world in accordance with patriarchal order and to
> preclude many possibilities for alternative ways of
> making sense of the world. (p. 3)

Therefore, I am aware that the very ways in which I attempt
to tell the story of Piercy, her students, and myself are
limited by a language that constructs and reflects the world
according to male norms and male reality. The effort to use
a language that often does not speak for women but rather
about them means that I am constantly aware of how saturated

in symbol and connotation the words that I use are, and the

symbology and connotations are not usually favorable to

women (see Adams, 1990; Spender, 1985; Mills, 1989; Miller

and Swift, 1988). Du Bois states:

> The values and epistemology of the researcher inform
> each phase of the process, and contrary to general
> ideas of strict scientific neutrality, the process of
> science-making in fact involves interpretation, theory-
> making, and thus values, in each of its phases.
> "Naming" is probably the first order of interpretation
> in science--the naming of the question, the naming of
> one's observations, and so on--and naming, the capacity
> to name what we see, is, as a matter of language,
> inherently expressive of culture.
>     In science as in society, the power of naming is
> at least two-fold: naming defines the quality and value
> of that which is named--and it also denies reality and
> value to that which is never named, never uttered.
> That which has no name, that for which we have no words
> or concepts, is rendered mute and invisible: powerless
> to inform our consciousness of our experiences, our
> understanding, our vision; powerless to claim its own
> existence. (Du Bois, 1979, pp. 107-108)

I have made declarations, aware of how limited my

language was to get across all the nuances and subtleties of

the theory and study at hand. The effort to tease out what

I meant to say and how I could say it was a source of

excitement and challenge in this work, although at times

also a source of frustration.

> Seeking out the wild questions, the interconnected
> "whys" unfragmented by the fathers' philosophies, is
> the way beyond mere escape and into enspiriting
> process. This requires hard work, for the categories
> of Aristotle, of Kant, of ancient myths and
> contemporary -ologies have shattered the deepest
> questions, making them seem disparate, unrelated. The
> questions--such as Why? If? When? Where? How? How come?
> Why not?--have been frozen. The natural flow among
> them has been intercepted. Males have posed the
> questions; they have placed the questions, tagged and
> labeled, into the glass cases of mental museums. They

have hidden the Questions. The task for feminists now
is con-questioning, con-questing for the deep sources
of the questions, seeking a permanently altering state
of consciousness. (Daly, 1978, p. 345)

Seeking out the "interconnected 'whys'" was something
that I thought I was doing as I shaped this study. I
thought that I had placed my own questions, I thought I had
uncovered some of the hidden questions, yet it was only in
doing the fieldwork and looking deeply in the mirror that I
saw my own questions had been fragmented and undergirded by
the father tongue.

This study's proposed title, "The Journey of a Teacher
Educator With a Feminist Perspective"--seemed to lay out my
path in a clear fashion. That was also the danger--that in
the "journey" that I was proposing, a search for the one
true feminist perspective, I missed the deep questions, the
ones I didn't even know I was looking for. I believe I have
found new questions, ones posed and placed with the help of
the participants and myself. Yet there remain some frozen
Whys, Ifs, Whens, Wheres, Hows, How comes, Why nots, for I
have been schooled well in the lessons of the fathers:
"Under patriarchy, Method has wiped out women's questions so
totally that even women have not been able to formulate our
own questions to meet our own experiences" (Daly, 1985, pp.
11-12). I need to keep learning and teaching the lessons of
the mothers. This is a constant struggle. This
dissertation is only a small piece of that process.
"Questions, it seems, contain enormous power...whose voices

we hear, which details we attend to, which perspectives we take as our own. Ultimately, our questions inform and are informed by political issues" (Obbink, 1992, p. 43).

## Entering the Field

> As Corinna enters the field, she takes off the buttons that are pinned to her coat. These buttons declare her politics. "Live and let live, be a vegetarian," "If she says no it's rape," and "No fur." She takes them off because she knows that they are red flags. They would declare who she is before anyone has a chance to know her, and this could alienate those people with whom she wants to speak, jeopardizing her field work. She leaves her buttons at home but not her politics, her beliefs.[20]

In many ways this dissertation is about leaving those buttons at home, but not being able to leave the beliefs at home. The personal is political is pedagogical.

This vignette surfaces two issues for me which are central to this dissertation and its focus on teacher education with feminist imagination. First, feminist scholarship says outright that a person cannot leave her politics at the door when she enters a classroom to do research. There is no such thing as bias-free scholarship. Who we are as people is in part who we are as observers. I cannot and will not pretend that my beliefs and values do not affect what I see, hear, and experience.

> [F]eminism argues that "the personal", lived experience is intensely political and immensely important

---

[20] I use the voice of the third person in this particular piece to dramatize the personal/political episode and to create the tone of being observed by an outsider. Michael Michell shared this technique with me. He learned this technique from Victor Villanueva, Jr. (1993) Bootstraps: From an American Academic of Color.

> politically. [I]n order to examine "the
> personal"...it's necessary to locate not only the
> researched but also the researcher, thus making her
> extremely vulnerable in ways usually avoided by
> researchers like the plague.... Traditionally, social
> science identifies people's understandings of their
> experiences as deficient or incompetent. The only
> certain way to avoid doing this is to move away from
> presenting "them" as the focus of the research and
> instead present ourselves in the form of our
> understandings about what's going on, by examining
> these in any given context. We must make ourselves
> vulnerable and not hide behind what "they" are
> supposed to think and do.
>      "Vulnerability" thus makes absolutely explicit the
> centrality of researchers in all research processes.
> All research necessarily comes to us through the active
> and central involvement of researchers, who necessarily
> interpret and construct what's going on. There is no
> other way to "do" either research or life. (Stanley &
> Wise, 1983, pp. 194-196)

The assumptions I have and that are embedded within my

writing, I will attempt to uncover. As I unearth my own

assumptions I can become clearer about the myths I need to

unlearn. This is part of learning to learn. I invite the

reader to question the assumptions I have not been able to

question or uncover; the ones that are so deep as to be

invisible to me.

> We will look at all questions and issues from as many
> sides as we can think of; but I am inescapably a
> feminist.... You must question my assumptions, my
> sources, my information; that is part of learning to
> learn. You should also question your own assumptions.
> Skepticism about oneself is essential to continued
> growth and a balanced perspective. (Rosenfelt, 1973, as
> cited in Rich, 1973-74, p. 145)

Second, why did I feel that I needed to leave those

particular buttons, those politics "at home?" Was it a lack

of courage on my part not to shout out what I believe? That

is probably part of it, but there is also the issue of

colleges of education being conservative and conserving

institutions. "Radical" ideas rarely first surface in the

field of education. Many of the people who enter education

are White,[21] middle-class, young people who have been and

are privileged, and they do not necessarily see themselves

as social activists or change agents. There is a great deal

of scholarship on the unchanging nature of the teaching

profession (see Jackson, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Cohen, 1988;

Saranson, 1971; Weiler, 1988).

Would I have felt the need to take off those buttons

had I been walking into a center for women's studies

somewhere? A sociology department? I am not sure. But

there is a need to look at teacher educators who are

attempting to teach and learn about issues of oppression and

privilege in an institution which often seems to promote

conservativism in an already conservative enterprise. As

Giroux (1980) states:

> Bernstein and others have argued that schools are the
> primary agents of ideological control. This raises
> specific questions about teacher-education programs
> since they "train" those intellectuals who play
> pervasive and direct part in socializing students into
> the dominant society...schools do not transmit culture,
> instead they play a fundamental role in reproducing the
> dominant culture...teachers at all levels of schooling
> are part of an ideological region that has enormous
> importance in legitimizing the categories and social

---

[21] I have chosen to use the term "White" and capitalize it as Nieto (1992) suggests:

You will notice that the terms White and Black, when used, are capitalized. I have chosen to do so because they refer to groups of people .... As such, they deserve to be capitalized. Although these are not the scientific terms for race, terms such as Negroid and Caucasian are no longer used in everyday speech or are rejected by the people to whom they refer. These more commonly used words, then, should be treated as the terms of preference. (p. 17)

practices of the dominant society. (Giroux, 1980 p. 410)

Giroux asks, "How does the dominant ideology manifest itself in teacher education programs?" (1980, p. 410). This is an important question. I pose another one: How can teacher education with feminist imagination promote the unlearning and unteaching of the dominating ideology? Teacher educators and students are not entities that merely react to a system. They are not "merely social puppets in the machinery of domination" (Giroux, 1980. p. 404). Instead, they shape and alter it; they create it. I wanted to find out what a teacher educator who cared about feminism, and who was committed to confronting issues of privilege and oppression, thought about, reflected upon, and what her practice was like. My task became how to create ways of doing research _with_ and _for_ a teacher educator (Noddings, 1986) that would illuminate the ways in which a teacher education class could be a site of struggle around key feminist issues, instead of a place where these issues were unaddressed or glossed over. How to accomplish this without falling into the trap of "methodolotry" (Daly, 1985) became the challenge.

## Methodolotry, Methodology, and Method: Methodology With Feminist Imagination is "Not Your Father's Paradigm"

The tyranny of methodolatry hinders new discoveries. It prevents us from raising questions never asked before and from being illumined by ideas that do not fit into pre-established boxes and forms. The

worshippers of Method have an effective way of handling
data that does not fit into the Respectable Categories
of Questions and Answers. They simply classify it as
nondata, thereby rendering it invisible. (Daly, 1985,
p. 11)

"A declaration to stop putting the answers before the

Questions" is Daly's (1978, p.xv) summons to women--to

engage in studying women. So often the answers have been

placed before us and we have not even had a chance to ask

our own questions. This dissertation came out of a yearning

on my part to grapple with what it might mean to be a

feminist in a teacher education class. I began with

questions. However, I did not know that I had a whole slew

of answers deep within me. I was to find this out. I

believe that I was able to stop those answers and return

once again to the questions, in the process revising my own

conception of a feminism as feminist imagination.

My conception of feminist imagination in research and

scholarship now is that it is a way of seeing, of looking at

a classroom and the human beings within it. It is seeing

the sex/gender, race, and class system being enacted inside

and outside of classrooms and having a heightened awareness

of their manifestations. It is a commitment to listening to

the participants and struggling to make sense of their lived

experiences. It is about letting participants speak of

their own reality. Yet, it is more than this. It is

examining those lived experiences and voices with feminist

imagination, uncovering the ways in which sex/gender, race,

and class systems inscribe on all our psyches. It means

trying to tease out the ways in which androcentric theories

and ways of seeing have defined all of us, and how to create

theories that better describe women's lives. Feminist

imagination is trying to stretch to see how the personal,

the political, and the pedagogical meld in individual lives:

"Recognising that life cannot be separated from

knowledge...that we are knowledge, nothing out there...who

we are means what we know. My life, my biography [is]

inseparable from what I know" (Spender, 1983, p. 30).

Feminist imagination means that as the researcher I

need/ed to use "methodological humility" and "methodological

caution":

> By the requirement of "methodological humility" I mean
> that the "outsider" must always sincerely conduct
> herself under the assumption that, as an outsider, she
> may be missing something, and that what appears to her
> to be a "mistake" on the part of the insider may make
> more sense if she had a fuller understanding of the
> context.
> By the requirement of "methodological caution," I
> mean that the outsider should sincerely attempt to
> carry out her attempted criticism of the insider's
> perceptions in such a way that it does not amount to,
> or even seem to amount to, an attempt to deny or
> dismiss entirely the validity of the insider's point of
> view. (Narayan, as cited in Warren, 1989, p. 50)

I sought "methodological humility" and "methodological

caution" at each stage of the research: the observing, the

gathering, the analyzing, and the writing. I tried to take

a methodological step backwards, instead of judging what I

saw with the assumption that I had the final word on

feminism, I tried to figure out what I saw said about me.

The methodological humility and caution relied heavily on
listening and hearing what Piercy said, and then examining
my own Self in relation to what I had heard.

In this study I wanted to hear the participants make
sense of their lives, given their own personal, political,
and pedagogical "truths." However, in all qualitative
studies it is sometimes difficult to discern whose voice is
really being heard, the insiders' or the author's. The
author is the one who gives the final shape to the
information she has seen and heard. She is in the
privileged position of telling the story she believes she
has witnessed (see Clifford and Marcus, 1986). As the
translator of this story, I had "the final authority in
determining the subject's meanings--it is then the former
[the translator/author/I] who becomes *the real author* of the
latter" (Asad, 1986, p.162). Piercy and I talked about the
nature of ideas and the authorship of those ideas. I
worried that the ideas we had together conceived of I would
"author." She wrote in her journal the following:

> You can't help but claim our thoughts as your own--to
> me I believe in what Foucault refers to as "anonymous
> authorship"...our ideas develop in community, with
> community exchange thoughts become more complex--
> intellectual caring/conflict bring us to deeper levels
> of thinking. (undated, Sunday, 7:00 a.m.)

I am in the privileged position of not only claiming ideas
as my own, when they were actually developed collectively,
but I get to decide which ideas get developed and which are
unaddressed.

I invited Piercy to write an epilogue, to give her a chance to speak in her own voice completely, about what I have written for, with, "about" her, her students, and myself. This is an attempt to have her tell about her own growth and change. The dilemma of any work such as this is that words freeze moments in time, yet identities are continually moving through time, evolving and transforming. Le Guin (1976/1987) speaks to this in her piece "Is Gender Necessary? Redux." She re-visits and revises an earlier piece of writing. She lets the older version stand and writes the additions in italics, the past and present standing side by side. She states in her introduction, "It doesn't seem right or wise to revise an old text severely, as if trying to obliterate it, hiding the evidence that one had to go there to get here" (p. 7). And so, this dissertation is one moment in time that tells of what we thought and felt in the past. However, it allows us to reflect on who we were and who we are. It becomes a text from the past that can speak to the present and "echoes forward" (Featherstone, private communication, 1994).

## Data Sources and Collection

Feminism influenced each stage of this work. It influenced the way that I collected data because I wanted the teacher educator and the students to tell me what they wanted and needed. I emphasized interviews in this study,

for as Zavarzadeh and Morton state, the power of interviews
is that they "affirm the belief that people contain
knowledge" (cited in Lather, 1991, p. 113). I attempted to
truly listen to what the participants said and, as much as
possible, allow them to "write" the text. Their voices
suggested the themes and motifs, their ways of being told me
about what seemed important to document and write about.

I conducted in-depth interviews with the students in
the class. I conducted in-depth conversations with the
teacher educator. I do not call them interviews because
they were dialogical in nature. There is controversy about
the "right" way to conduct an interview. Theorists like
Seidman (1991) claim that one should not lead the
interviewee and should remain distant and detached. Yet,
others claim that interviews are political acts, and should
be like conversations. Brunner says that in-depth
interviews are a relationship that is built over time with
shared vulnerability. The interviewer is a participant
observer. This kind of interviewing is reciprocal (private
communication, 1992). Piercy and I felt the latter position
made more sense for our work. She asked that we engage in
dialogues, where I had as much right to create the agenda as
she did.

With the students I did two rounds of interviews (see
Appendices F & G), the first round at the end of February
and the second round at the end of April and beginning of

May. I was able to interview eleven students two times. These 22 interviews were transcribed. With two students I was only able to do the first interview; these interviews were also transcribed. One student, Darlene, I did not interview on the first round, but after her participation in the conflict that is a focus of this study, I especially wanted to interview her. I interviewed her on the second round and this was also transcribed. The students' interviews were fairly structured but open enough for the students to tell what they wanted. I tried to create interview questions, and opportunities during the interview, that would allow the students to raise any issue they felt important and be able to talk about their thoughts and feelings. (See Appendices F & G for illustrations of this.)

In the first interview I asked questions like, "If you were to explain to a friend about what you are learning in ED 277, what would you tell the friend?" "Tell me what you think or feel about ED 277." I also asked some specific target questions that were less open-ended to be able to address issues that were important to me, for example, how the students felt about the ethos of the class. One such question asked the students to place themselves on a continuum from very comfortable to uncomfortable.

The questions in the second interview were similar but were a little less structured toward specific feelings like "comfort." I asked questions such as "How do you feel about

the way that gender issues were discussed in ED 277"? ("How about race?" "Class?") "How did you feel about the issues which were raised in this class?"

I also tried to personalize the second interview since there were individual issues that arose throughout the semester that I was familiar with and that I wanted to ask the students about. For example, Ellen seemed very uncomfortable when Piercy went around pointing out people who spoke and those who did not, and I asked her about that. And I asked Dan about the time when Darcy came as a guest lecturer to speak about gay and lesbian issues and he seemed very uncomfortable.

All the conversations with Piercy were open-ended. We met and spoke on eighteen occasions, for at least two hours each time. I transcribed all of these conversations. The process of transcribing each conversation was invaluable because it allowed me to hear Piercy's voice inflection, intonation, and tone. For example, her adventurous spirit came through in not only what she said but also the way she said it.

Piercy and I created a midterm feedback form (Appendix D) and had students fill them out anonymously. Fifteen students filled out these midterm feedback forms out of the 22 students. The final feedback was also jointly created but was not anonymous. Eighteen out of 22 students handed in the final feedback forms.

I received copies of the college's standard feedback forms on the instructor. I observed 21 classes, which were all the classes except the second class of the semester and a two week period in March. I took fieldnotes on all of the classes I observed. All classes, except the first, were audiotaped and videotaped, including the ones during the two week period in March. I received copies of the students' papers, journals, tests, and essays. Piercy and I also wrote dialogue journals to one another.

## The Limits of Feminist Imagination and My Own Situatedness

Detailed though this data collection effort was, this study is constrained within a history of its own, that is, as an investigator I am a product and an agent of the culture in which I am situated. No matter how far I stretch my feminist imagination there are doors that are locked, windows that are closed, and keys that I do not have. As Friedan suggests:

> [N]o social scientist can completely free himself from the prison of his own culture; he can only interpret what he observes in the scientific framework of his own time. This is true even of the great innovators. They cannot help but translate their revolutionary observations into language and rubrics that have been determined by the progress of science up until their time. Even those discoveries that create new rubrics are relative to the vantage point of the creator. (1963, p. 105-106)

I am a White, middle-class, heterosexual woman who lives with a man, who works with teachers-in-preparation, who studied a woman similar in many ways to myself. This

made for an unusual insider/outsider status. My own

historicity allowed me to see certain phenomena and not see

others. "Insiders studying their own cultures offer new

angles of vision and depths of understanding. Their

accounts are empowered and restricted in new ways"

(Clifford, 1986, p. 9). Being close to the subject matter I

was studying, my own beliefs were even more likely to

influence every stage of the process:

> [T]he closer our subject matter to our own life and experience, the more we can probably expect our own beliefs about the world to enter into and shape our work--to influence the very questions we pose, our conception of how to approach those questions, and the interpretations we generate from our findings. (Du Bois, 1979, p. 105)

I also consider myself a "hybrid" (Cavazos, 1994,

private communication) of an ecofeminist and a radical

feminist.[22] By radical I mean, as Frye (1991) does, "to the

root"; that is, I recognize that oppression and privilege

---

[22] Warren (1994) states:

> "Ecological feminism" is an umbrella term which captures a variety of multicultural perspectives on the nature of the connections *within* social systems of domination between those humans in subdominant or subordinate positions, particularly women, and the domination of nonhuman nature. First introduced by Françoise d'Eaubonne in 1984 to describe women's potential to bring about an ecological revolution (d'Eaubonne 1984: 213-52), "ecofeminism" has come to refer to a variety of so-called "woman-nature connections"--historical, empirical, conceptual, religious, literary, political, ethical, epistemological, methodological, and theoretical connections on how one treats women and the earth. Ecofeminist analyses of the twin dominations of women and nature include considerations of the domination of people of color, children, and the underclass. (p. 1)

Frye (1991) talks about what radical feminism means to her:

> [T]he term "radical feminist" is a term which almost no one in the academy would use to name or locate herself. Oddly out-of-touch, I thought "radical feminist" meant "feminist to the root," "feminist all the way," "extremely feminist," or even "extremist feminist." I thought that if you took feminism absolutely seriously, embraced it courageously and logically (crone-logically or lesbianic logically) to its conclusions, you were a Radical Feminist.... This union and integration of analysis and action, this *lived theory*, does not separate politics from living. Every moment of living has meanings connected with our oppression, our resistance, our liberation.... Radical feminists, I mean extremist feminists, want to produce such theory, for they want all their personal resources--bodily energy, ardor, intelligence, understanding, vitality--to be available and engaged in the creation of a world for women.... (pp. 12-15)

direct and redirect many of the relationships that are possible between human beings, and that power relations undermine and harm the connectedness between all peoples. The reason that it is important for me to also embrace ecofeminism is its explicit addressing of the ways in which nature, and all the living beings within nature, are arbitrarily hierarchically arranged. Ecofeminism honors and respects the interrelatedness and intermingling of all life, envisioning a new tomorrow (see Warren, 1994; Griffin, 1978; Adams, 1990; Ruether, 1975; Donovan, 1990a, 1990b; Daly and Caputi, 1987). Radical feminism and ecofeminism together seem to speak for the voiceless and the silent, and to see and show the invisible:

> These words are written for those of us whose language is not heard, whose words have been stolen or erased, those robbed of language, who are called voiceless or mute, even the earthworms, even the shellfish and the sponges, [and] for those of us who speak our own language.... (Griffin, 1978, dedication)

> We are the bird's eggs. Bird's eggs, flowers, butterflies, rabbits, cows, sheep; we are caterpillars; we are leaves of ivy and sprigs of wallflower. We are women. We rise from the wave. We are gazelle and doe, elephant and whale, lilies and roses and peach, we are air, we are flame, we are oyster and pearl, we are girls. We are woman and nature. And he says he cannot hear us speak.
> But we hear. (Griffin, 1978, p.1)

> At this moment a Muse cups her ear and tells all to be silent. She says she Hears thundering of hooves, flapping of wings, splashing of flippers. "They're coming!" she cries. "Our parade Guides are here." (p. 53).... [We are] adventuring and Questing for the Lost Words. We are assured by the animals that we *can* find these and that when we Sound them, we will be Heard. (Daly and Caputi, 1978, p. 55)

My own subjectivity helped and hindered the ways in which I saw the participants in the context I was studying. Rogers (1993) writes that it is becoming more common for researchers and feminist researchers to locate themselves in regard to their gender, race, class, and sometimes sexual identity,[23] but not telling much more about themselves. Rogers states that it is important for the researcher to include her own subjective voice. "Writing in an artistic, subjective voice is not an impediment to theory building but allows me to build theory and use theory to make suggestions for educational practice" (p. 266).

I have sought to weave my own voice throughout the text of this study because this study is not only about a teacher educator and the students she was teaching, but also a study of a deep learning experience about my conceptions of feminism and teacher education. I use the metaphor of a mirror to relay that as I looked at Piercy and her students, I also looked at myself. As Rogers (1993) states:

> A feminist methodologist...rejects the belief that one can separate the "subjectivity" of the researcher from the "object" of her research and, in fact, creates research practices that close the inevitable distance between the researcher and the participants in the research. (p. 266)

The research that I wanted to be involved in was not to be something done to the teacher educator, or on the teacher

---

[23] I use the term sexual identity as many use the term "sexual orientation." I use the term sexual identity for I believe that it affirms and validates that being Lesbian, Bisexual, Gay, or Transgender (see Sears, 1994) is not just a matter of sexuality, but includes many more dimensions of being a human being within a culture that is homophobic and heterosexist.

educator, but something done *with* and *for* the teacher

educator (Noddings, 1986). Piercy and I took seriously

Lather's (1991) idea that, "reciprocity in research design

is a matter of both intent and degree...what I suggest is

that we consciously use our research to help participants

understand and change their situations" (p. 57). This was

not merely a study where I observed at a distance the

teacher educator. Rather I interacted with her by giving my

opinions, pushing her thinking, challenging her ideas, as

she did for me. This came about because of an explicit

conversation we had early in our work where I asked her what

kind of relationship she wanted. I asked her if she wanted

to be able to just talk and I would listen, or whether she

wanted us to engage in dialogues. She wanted the latter.

So I decided not to engage in "contemplative, uninvolved

'spectator knowledge'"(Mies, 1983, p. 124). Instead I

decided to engage in active and involved knowledge

construction.

### Dialogue and Dinner at Daly's

Without dialogue there is no communication, and without
communication there can be no true education. (Freire,
1968/1985, p. 81)

The most important things are the hardest to say. They
are the things that you get ashamed of, because words
diminish them--words shrink things that seemed
limitless when they were in your head to no more than
living size when brought out. But it's more than that,
isn't it? The most important things lie too close to
wherever your secret heart is buried, like landmarks to
a treasure. And you may make revelations that will cost
you dearly only to have people look at you in a funny

way not understanding what you said at all, or why you
thought you almost cried while you were saying it.
That's the worst I think. When the secret stays locked
within not for want of a teller but for want of an
understanding ear. (unknown author)

Without dialogue there is no communication, and without

communication there is no real education. But those things

that we care so deeply about, those passions that lie deep

within, are often not included in our dialogues. If this is

so, I then question what happens to the education of the

spirit, the heart, the soul, and the intellect. To have

meaningful dialogue do we not need to speak with our hearts

and our souls? In certain communities this can occur. I

believe this occurred between Piercy and myself. There was

trust and connectedness, of the soul, heart, and spirit. We

were able to honor in each other all the human passions, all

those emotions that make us human: anger, fear, pain,

sadness, conflict, and laughter.

Early in our work together, I worried that our

comfortable conversations may not have been providing the

kind of "research" that Piercy might have anticipated or

wanted. I talked to her about the ways in which we were

communicating. During the second week of the semester we

had the following conversation:

Corinna: One of the things that I want to talk about
tonight because it may change our interactions, but it
may not because I read your journal entry where you
said you felt heard by me. [The way that it has been
is] that you would say these really neat things about
your belief system and then I would say things and we
had this long and really good conversation, I was
worried that you weren't feeling heard. I really want

to clarify with you what you want our interaction to be like and I read the article you wrote, the idea of co-generative dialogue and that's sort of the impression that I had in terms of what we had. That we both come with things that we want to talk about and things to say.

Piercy: Oh yeah. And I feel totally comfortable in challenging you when I disagree, and I read that into you, and I like that when you say, "Think about it this way."

Corinna: That's what I wrote in my journal, you like that intellectual challenge and intellectual conflict. I really kind of worried, here's Piercy telling me all these really neat things about her belief system and I am jumping in. That was a tension for me, what is this research going to look like. I could be the interpretivist who just sits there and nods her head....

Piercy: I hate that.

Corinna: ...and lets you surface everything. But actually I don't think that's collaborative.

Piercy: I agree.

Corinna: Okay.

Piercy: It's funny because we talk about that in the class, Soltis and the interpretivists. I say that that doesn't smack to me [as collaborative].

Corinna: What's so interesting about all of this is that all so interconnected, the personal, and the political, the public. The issues that you and I are dealing with, your students are dealing with, it's so enmeshed.

Piercy: So interrelated.

This conversation was important because Piercy asked

for a collaborative, relational kind of research. In

hindsight, it probably could not have been any different,

given what I now know about her yearning for intellectual

and emotional connection. Piercy wanted reciprocity in the

interaction. Lather (1991) captures an important aspect of the work that we did together: "Through dialogue and reflexivity, design, data and theory emerge, with data being recognized as generated from people in a relationship" (p. 72). Clandinin and Connelly (1988) say that collaborative research is similar to a friendship:

> [C]ollaborative research constitutes a relationship. In everyday life, the idea of friendship implies a sharing, an interpretation of two or more persons' spheres of experience. Mere contact is acquaintance-ship, not friendship. The same may be said for collaborative research which requires a close relationship akin to friendship. (p. 281)

This dissertation is about a search whereby two women with feminist commitments attempted to find new ways of being and learning with each other in order to do research, new ways for teacher educators to be with their students, and new ways of being in the world. Through our conversations we attempted to make sense of the issues we were struggling with and to construct theories through co-generative dialogue.

Piercy and I listened to one another. This does not mean that we always accurately heard one another, but we attempted to listen with what Daly (1985) calls an inner ear. Piercy wrote in her journal:

> I was thinking about our conversations together and how much I feel heard by Corinna.... I hate being dismissed. I wonder if that isn't similar to saying being taken seriously.... Somehow having you with me. Having you care about my students has to be the most gratifying, most exciting part of my life. This work hits pretty deep. I crave depth. I feel cared about--Noddings talks about caring that to me is intellectual

caring. There isn't any sincerer form of love than caring for a person intellectually in my mind. In a way that is what good teaching is--more than hearing, caring for another person's concerns. Helping them to see how their concerns are part of a community's larger conversation. (January 23, 1992)

We became critical friends. Critical friends are those who foster another's intellectual, emotional, and psychological development with challenge and support. For Piercy intellectual caring was a sincere form of love, taking the person seriously and willing to engage with them in intellectual issues of import. We were able to both speak and be listened to, have our concerns attended to and attend to another's concerns. She linked this attending to another's concerns to the wider community, and how good teaching for her was that ability to care for another's concerns.

Piercy and I spoke about the challenge and trust in our relationship during the first month of the study. Piercy had been relaying to me that she found a committee's questions "enjoyably challenging," but contrasted it with our relationship and how I questioned her about her practice:

> Piercy: When you challenge me, it is definitely a challenge of belief and a challenge of trust. There is a trust behind your challenge that I didn't feel in their challenges. There's a belief either I'm teachable or.... We haven't explored that enough with each other to have total trust but, you know, I think there's an area that both of us wonder about each other's knowing and each other's sense, but underneath it all is a trust. It was a fascinating difference.

> Corinna: Can I just pick up on something, and I don't

mean to interrupt you, but one of the things and I
think this is very interesting, the belief and the
trust. Would this be putting words in your mouth or
not, but that somehow we enter in good faith and in
friendship? It's real interesting, there is this
article of Maria Lugones called "Playfulness and World
Traveling" where she talks about the ways in which
White women and women of color can interact and it has
to be entering in friendship. It has to be entering in
good faith. And there is something about that that I
think is really important because it changes the tone.

Piercy: And you see, I think again this is where the
political and personal, our forward view and both of
our hopes is that together we are going to be able to
make something that is going to be better. That we're
going to develop a new vision of the world, [and it
will be] better. That together we are gong to do this.
So, part of our challenging of each other and
uncovering our differences is going to lead us to being
[better]. This relationship is positive and not
threatening in a lot of ways. I mean our conflict, we
know that it could, we could have such a time with each
other that we could, but I think we know we are going
to be all right. We want it this way. But again, this
is where the personal and the political comes in.

Piercy talked about the ways in which we challenged each

other, all the while the challenge was undergirded with

trust. Piercy was not sentimental and naive, claiming that

there was complete trust, for that takes years to develop.

Yet we had a trust between us that allowed conflict and

difference to exist. We worked together, with challenge and

support, to conceive of what feminist imagination in teacher

education could mean for better education and for a better

world.

Davis (1983) states that feminists need to listen to

the complexity of traditional women's lives:

It is as important for feminists to learn to listen as
to be heard-to understand the complexity of...women's
lives as to present the alternatives of their own.

Otherwise, no one is "advanced"; we are all still in first grade. The challenge to us *as teachers* is...to listen to each other. (pp. 92-93)

I broaden this idea to include all women's lives, including other feminists' lives, for this is a form of love and intellectual caring. By listening with an inner ear, Piercy and I learned much from one another. At Daly's we held up the mirrors for one another. Our conversations ran the gamut of the personal, the political, and the pedagogical. We struggled together to make sense of the constructs of equity, diversity, and oppression.

During one of our conversations I told her that, in teacher education, I valued asking questions as a way to make sense of these issues. Piercy said that she thought education was about taking a position and then standing back and questioning the position rather than only asking the questions, for that seemed too timid to her. I changed my mind about merely asking questions, and agreed that taking a position and then questioning seemed to make more sense. And so in our conversations, we took our positions, stood back and questioned our notions of truth and visions of what teacher education could be.

Delpit (1988) speaks to the kind of "special listening" that is needed for people to hear alternative view points. It is a

listening that requires not only open eyes and ears, but open hearts and minds. We do not really see through our eyes or hear through our ears, but through our beliefs. To put our beliefs on hold is to cease to

exist as ourselves for a moment—and that is not easy.
It is painful as well because it means turning yourself
inside out, giving up your own sense of who you are,
and being willing to see yourself in the unflattering
light of another's angry gaze. It is not easy, but it
is the only way to learn what it might feel like to be
someone else and the only way to start the dialogue...
we must learn to be vulnerable enough to allow our
world to turn upside down in order to allow the
realities of others to edge themselves into our
consciousness. In other words, we must become
ethnographers in the true sense. (p. 297)

All of our conversations took place over dinner. We
would eat and talk, talk and eat. Our interwoven
conversations were so important.[24] It was over dinner that
we debriefed and processed what happened in the classroom,
and talked about the personal and the political, the
personal and the pedagogical. I came to think of these
talks as "Dinner at Daly's."[25] As Grumet (1989) states,
"along with the soup and salad, Abigail served murmurs and
memories of warmth and intimacy" (p. 21). So, too, warmth
and intimacy was served up at Daly's. Yet, all the while we
realized that as "Bromidic though it may sound, some
questions *don't* have answers, which is a terribly difficult
lesson to learn" (Graham, cited in Partnow, 1978, p. 349,
emphasis in original).

Across the dinner table, we talked out loud about our
personal lives and our educational experiences. Lessing

---

[24] I take this idea of interwoven conversations from the title of a book by Newman (1991) Interwoven conversations: Learning and teaching through critical reflection.

[25] I use this phrase for it reminds me of an article written by Grumet (January, 1989), "Dinner at Abigail's: Nurturing Collaboration" about a collaborative teacher's group who would go out to a restaurant and eat and talk.

(1994) argues that when a writer includes the personal she is writing about something much larger than just "the personal":

> [T]here was no way of *not* being intensely subjective...to recognize that nothing is personal, in the sense that it is uniquely one's own. Writing about oneself, one is writing about others, since your problems, pains, pleasures, emotions—and your extraordinary and remarkable ideas—can't be yours alone. (Lessing, 1994, pp. xix-xx)

We verbalized the seamless web of our lives, the personal, the political, and the pedagogical. The feminist phrases "the personal is political" (Hanisch as cited in Humm, 1990, p. 162) and the "political is personal" (Steinem, 1992, p. 17) come to mind. Yet a new set was forged for us as teacher educators with feminist imaginations: the personal is the pedagogical and the pedagogical is the personal, the political is pedagogical and the pedagogical is political.

By studying our own lives, Piercy and I were entering into something much larger. This is how women's lives become theory in the making. Conceiving of lives as theory is "not your father's paradigm" (Lincoln, as cited in Lather, 1991, p. 113). Seeing women's lives as theory, and allowing interwoven conversations to inform that theory, is moving toward feminist imagination and toward a paradigm reconstruction.

I named the restaurant Daly's where Piercy and I met, because of the inspiration feminist theorist and author Mary Daly has been to me. Playful and passionate, irreverent and

heretical, with words Daly topples entrenched hierarchies and the status quo. For example, in her and Caputi's (1987) Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language they play with revered institutions. For example, they have entered the word "academentia" in their Wickedary which they define as "*n*: normal state of persons in academia, marked by varying and progressive degrees; irreversible deterioration of faculties of intellectuals" (p.184).

Daly turns the sex/gender, race, class, and sexual identity system on its head in the most delightful way. She outrages and infuriates some and teaches and inspires others. I think she is marvelous. The dinner conversations Piercy and I shared were enveloped in the aura of irreverence and passion. As Daly does, we, too, were trying to set oppressive systems on their respective heads. The name of the restaurant is also a tribute to Piercy's irreverent and passionate nature. Her irreverence was actually a feminist tool, that is, she did not revere any particular dogma in her ways of understanding teaching and learning, and feminism. This irreverence helped Piercy move to new ways of seeing and thinking about issues.

Piercy's playfulness may be considered another feminist tool. As Frye states, being playful also implies that you don't have to have all the answers (private communication, 1994). This is part of the "practice of courage" that

Rogers (1993) speaks to:

> This practice involves the art of being playful and
> outspoken, and of being a vulnerable and staunch
> fighter--someone who transgresses the conventions of
> feminine goodness. To engage in this practice would
> upset the structure of formal education that preserve
> the status quo of our society. (p.291)

While at Daly's, talking across our differences and our

commonalities, I re-visioned my own conceptions of what it

means to be a feminist--what I now call having feminist

imagination. In Piercy's classroom and at Daly's I learned

about Piercy and at the same time gained some unexpected

insights about myself. Daly's was where we spoke what we

believed to be "true" about pedagogy, politics, and our

personal lives.


## The "Style" of This Dissertation

> [T]his piece is not--will not be, cannot be--
> constructed or understood according to patriarchal
> literary standards or masculine literary tradition.
> This is women's writing; it must be read differently.
> It does not answer male questions; it does not conform
> to male expectations. (Obbink, 1992, pp.39-40)

The collaborative work that Piercy and I did does not

answer traditional questions--it does not conform to the

traditional research paradigms. We were asking different

questions and our tentative answers therefore were also

different. They were not definitive nor absolute. Instead

the answers we came up with only served to raise new

questions. However, I believe the proposed answers open up

dialogue around issues of teacher educators struggling

with/in feminist imagination.

This dissertation is a life's work-in-progress. It is a room filled with other authors' writings, for part of who I am has to do with what I have read. The style that I have taken in this dissertation is a deliberate one. My author's voice is only one of many in this text. I want to represent the voices of those who spoke in the past in their own authentic ways. These others'/Others' knowledge and beliefs are often represented by including quotes from them.[26] Their own words are essential. Paraphrasing does not always do justice to their ideas. I want their original words to be represented, for all too often Others' voices are silenced, stolen, coopted, redirected, or made into something other than they were intended.[27]

I use others'/Others' voices in conjunction with Piercy's and my own. You may find the same idea represented by various voices. There is a conscious overlapping of ideas washed into this text. The style is like the strokes of a paintbrush that is being used in a circular motion. You may encounter ideas and themes presented earlier, but there is a slightly different shade or hue to the later use of the idea. It may at times feel like the paint is on too thick. However, it is because I have attempted to present

---

[26] I use this way of representing others and Others so that it is clear that I am speaking about "others" who are not considered oppressed and "Others" (see de Beauvoir, 1952/1974) who are.

[27] This does not imply that I will always fully grasp or understand the depth of what another is trying to say, only that in keeping the words as the original author wrote them it seems to honor that voice more than paraphrasing and altering it.

the idea in a slightly different fashion and from a slightly

different angle.

In her writing Lather (1991) states that her

"accumulation of quotes, excerpts...is...an effort to be

`multivoiced,' to weave varied speaking voices together as

opposed to putting forth a singular `authorative' voice'"

(p. 9). I am trying to do the same. This dissertation's

blend of theory, description, interpretation, poetry, song,

and voices (my voice and the voices of others'/Others') in

this dissertation is my attempt in content and form to meld

the personal, the political, and the pedagogical. There

seems to be a tendency within academia to separate theory

and practice and this has "escalated into a peroration for

the new and much improved feminist theory called feminist

poststructuralism or, indifferently, poststructural

feminism...[where] poststructuralism is the theory and

feminism is just a practice" (de Lauretis, 1990, pp. 259-

261).

I believe that we have been schooled to be fragmented

thinkers, but this is not inevitable. We can unlearn the

fragmentations and learn the interconnections of all that is

life. The writings of deep ecologists say it best for me:

> To the western mind, interrelatedness implies a causal
> connectedness. Things are interrelated if a change in
> one affects the other. So to say that all things are
> interrelated simply implies that if we wish to develop
> our "resources," we must find some technological means
> to defuse the interaction. The solution to pollution
> is dilution. But what is actually involved is a
> genuine intermingling of parts of the ecosystem. There

are no discrete entities.... (Devall & Sessions, 1985,
p. 48)

This sense of the intermingling is a way of being in the

world for me. I want this dissertation to "speak" my

beliefs in content and in form.

## The Observer and the Observed

I hope the tone of the dissertation resembles the tone

that I am suggesting for teaching with feminist imagination.

It is an invitation to explore what feminist imagination

could mean for teacher education. This is not a study about

"exemplary" feminist teaching and learning. The tone that

is suggested within the notion of exemplary is that of

"right," that there is a kind of liberatory teaching that is

best. Instead, I want this study to have a tone that keeps

questioning and curiosity in the forefront.

The notion of what is exemplary suggests as much about

the person doing the judging as what is being judged. That

which is unfamiliar, unique, or different may register for

the observer as something other than exemplary because she

does not recognize it as such (Allison & Pissanos, 1993-94).

I did not want to engage in research that scrutinized a

person as object; I did not want to be the observer

dictating what counts as good, right, or best. Instead, I

entered with the premise that pedagogy for liberation is a

messy, complex, and confusing endeavor. Honoring and

unearthing the struggles and the complexities of such an

endeavor in a study would promote dialogue around the issues of teaching with feminist imagination. Lives lived with feminist imagination help illuminate the theory that we are trying to build.

## A Sojourn Into Possibilities

For a relatively short period of time I was a sojourner, dwelling in another's room in order to learn more about my own room, the one that I am painting. I was a temporary resident, not knowing much of what came before I entered, or much about that which came after. So this is the telling of a moment in time for all of us.

Neither Piercy nor I knew what we were agreeing to in this research; we did not anticipate the ways in which we would change because of it. I had intended this study to be primarily about a teacher educator. I initially decided that I would choose about five target students to hear their perceptions of the class. As the inquiry evolved, I found that I wanted to hear as many students' voices as possible. However, the relationship that developed with Piercy was much deeper than any I developed with the students I interviewed. In part, this had to do with the initial design of the study.

Originally, I did not understand how my own learning would figure so prominently in the study. I came to understand that I was an integral part of the story that I

was telling, that my own story had to be told along with the teacher educator's and the students'. Therefore, this is a story of the ways in which Piercy and I worked and learned together. This is a story of the ways in which our feminist imagination was conceptualized by the work we did together. This is a story of the ways in which one teacher educator and her students grappled with issues of gender, race, and class, in a foundations course, all the while being constructed by a gender, race, and class system. This is also a story of the ways in which as teacher educators, Piercy and I grappled with issues of gender, race, and class, all the while being constructed by a gender, race, and class system.

This is the story of barriers and possibilities. The barriers are strong, yet the possibilities are also strong. Griffin (1978), in her book <u>Woman and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her</u>, speaks of the tragedies and horror that exist for women and animals. She speaks of the great possibilities which exist. She speaks of the "capacity to dwell in possibility" (Rogers, 1993, p. 278). I turn to her words, for they are like a refrain of possibility for me:

> This teacher tells us we must ride the unknown....
> She says we cannot rely on a formula....
> She says we must learn from each act,
> and no act is ever the same...
> recipes are useless.
> These will achieve only the conventional, she says.
> But beauty demands a more arduous process....
> Suddenly, we find we have a new language.
> The possibilities, she has told us, are endless...
> The possibilities, we see, never end.

(Griffin, 1978, pp. 191-192)

# CHAPTER II

## INSIDE THIS WOMAN'S STUDY: WRITINGS BY WOMEN, WITH WOMEN, AND FOR WOMEN

In each of the chapters which follow the voices of others/Others are present, illuminating ideas, concepts, and theories. I explore four large ideas in this chapter because they are fundamental to understanding this dissertation and yet they do not get examined closely in subsequent chapters. Those are: feminism; oppression, especially as it pertains to the sex/gender system; feminist teaching; paradigms of knowledge, particularly positivism and constructivism. In this chapter I review what other writers have said about these large ideas so that all who enter this study may have a sense of what these ideas have meant to me in conducting this research. These writers are the ones who have collectively struggled to help open all of our eyes: "This awakening has a collective reality; it is no longer such a lonely thing to open one's eyes" (Rich, 1971, p. 167). In this chapter I also suggest that as teacher educators with feminist imaginations we need to find our own way. We can use the constructs and ideas that male critical theorists have developed, but we need to reforge and create our own. That is, we need to re-read and re-write the malestream's word and world.

There is a song by the female pop-folk duet Indigo Girls entitled "Virginia Woolf." Those who have been touched by Woolf's writings will understand the meaning

behind the following excerpt from the song's lyrics:

> they published your diary and that's how i got to know
> you key to the room of your own and a mind without end
> here's a young girl on a kind of telephone line through
> time the voice at the other end comes like a long-lost
> friend so i know i'm alright i just got a letter to my
> soul.... (Saliers, 1992, p. 6)

A woman writes a song about Virginia Woolf, honoring a woman who spoke and speaks to women. Echoes from the past, "echoing forward." Long ago, but actually just a moment away, women like Virginia Woolf sat and wrote of hopes and dreams for a world in which things would and could be different. These unteachers from yesterday help us today "unlearn the myths that bind us" (Christensen, 1992). These women in their rooms and in innumerable other places-- wherever space could be found--wrote and spoke to the women coming after them. They formed a community of friends never to meet in a literal sense, but nonetheless, giving hope and affirmation, articulating the belief that our experiences are real and have been felt before. Their words are keys to the past and doors to the future. I sit in *my room* and those who have gone before me speak to me about their houses, their rooms, their locks, and their keys. "I needed all this murmured chorus.... They were like mothers and sisters to me, these literary women, many of them already dead...they seemed to stretch out a hand" (Fraser, as cited in Rose, 1993, p. 19).

Emily Style (1988) writes about windows into other people's realities and mirrors into one's own. The house

that feminist imagination builds has many windows and many mirrors. It also has many doors that you can enter into other rooms and look out other windows. Some of the keys have been lost and we need to *re*-search for them. Some have never been cut. Some are being held by people who do not even know they hold the keys. And others are still searching for someone to help them find a key.

I invite you into my study, a study constructed of women's lives, by women, with women, and for women. As I participate in this construction, I am poignantly aware of the limitations of a "room," a "house," and particularly a "study," as a metaphor for all women. A significant percentage of women do not have homes, have no "room of their own," and few, only the most privileged, can afford a study. The limits to my metaphors need to be acknowledged and remembered; it is my own privilege that allows me to envision these metaphors as possibilities.

And while I know that women continue through the centuries to speak to one another, I never forget the women locked away for what they did, wanted to do, and thought about in their rooms (Chessler, 1989; Gilbert & Gubar, 1984; Gilman, 1892).

> Her husband...has confined her to a large garret
> room...and he has forbidden her to touch pen to paper
> until she is well again, for he feels, says the
> narrator, "that with my imaginative power and habit of
> story-telling, a nervous weakness like mine is sure to
> lead to all manner of excited fancies, and that I ought
> to use my will and good sense to check the tendency."
> (Gilbert & Gubar, 1984, p. 89)

I never forget the madwomen in the attics. Never forget the rooms with yellow wallpaper. Never forget the women locked away in the houses that patriarchy built.[28] Never forget the women who had no rooms of their own. Lessons about oppression and survival that women in the past have sent to women of the present who will send them to the women who come after are so important for they tell us that we are not mad. Our hopes, our feminist imaginings for a different and better tomorrow, are not madness. They are what will help create that new tomorrow.

Insanity is judged differently today. We are not considered mad for the same kind of imagination that women a hundred years ago had. However, certain visions are still dangerous, and the women of today whose imaginations soar are still dismissed, disparaged, trivialized, and ostracized.

> [I]nvisibility is a dangerous and painful condition, and lesbians are not the only people to know it. When those who have the power to name and to socially construct reality choose not to see you, or hear you, whether you are dark-skinned, old, disabled, female, or speak with a different accent or dialect than theirs, *when someone with the authority of a teacher, say, describes the world and you are not in it, there is a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked into a mirror and saw nothing. Yet you know you exist and others like you, that this is a game with mirrors.* It takes some strength of soul—and not just individual strength, but collective understanding to resist this void, this nonbeing, into which you are thrust, and to stand up, demanding to be seen and heard. And to make

---

[28] In most cases I will be using the "sex/gender system" (Rubin, 1975) to talk about the ways in which women are oppressed, for it is more fluid and dynamic in connotation. However, in this case patriarchy seemed the best choice to explain how the house was built with rigidity and impenetrability—locked up tight against women.

yourself visible, to claim that your experience is just as real and normative as any other. (Rich, 1984, p. 199, emphasis added)

The voices of those "demanding to be heard" tell us we are alright, that our experiences are as "real and normative as any other." The mirrors that have been held up for us by those who would oppress us, who write about us, show us either abstractions or nothing at all. We need to hold up our own mirrors and struggle to see the image without distortions.

Often those who are on the cutting edge of new visions, those who see the world in ways that others do not, who are women and thinkers before their time, are still seen as fanatical and dangerous, deviant and insane. I wonder how Daly (1978, 1984, 1985, and Caputi, 1987), Griffin (1978), Starhawk (1993), Adams (1990), Dworkin (1974) are judged. These are women who see the "politics of reality" (Frye, 1983) and who "playfully 'world'-travel" (Lugones, 1987). It is often these mad "madwomen" that force me to stretch my imagination and way of seeing beyond the narrow confines of my paradigms. They help me see with fresh eyes teaching, learning, and myself.

## Concepts Important in This Study

I grew up during a time when "feminist" was not a dirty word. As I grew older I watched the younger women around me reject the word. There seemed to me to be a fear involved,

a fear of alienating men.

> Many college women..."feel that the tag 'feminist' has
> negative connotations in the world at large." The
> majority of young women seem to believe that, in the
> minds of homophobic men, feminism is synonymous with
> lesbianism. Nowhere is this more clear than in their
> replies about how men perceive feminists. Seventy
> percent of the comments are unfavorable and reflect
> extreme stereotypes. An astonishing 68 percent of
> female students say that men dislike feminists.
> (Women's Resource Center, 1994, p. 1)

The label "feminist" seems to evoke discomfort in many

young women, because they think it turns off men. I

realized that a label that had been positive during my

growing up years was no longer one young women eagerly

embraced. In an attempt to counteract a "limited and

stereotyped" (Weiler, 1988, p. 116) notion of what feminism

is, I will explore the nebulous and often unexamined label

of feminism.

## **Feminism**

> Feminism: This term, from the Latin (*femina=* woman),
> originally meant "having the qualities of females"....
> Alice ROSSI has traced the first usage in print to a
> book review published in *The Anthenaeum*, 27 April 1895.
> (Tuttle, 1986, p. 107)

> *Feminism* (with the associated *feminist*), meaning the
> faith in women, the advocacy of the rights of women, or
> the prevalence of female influence, did not appear
> until the 1890s following the 1892 First International
> Woman's Congress in Paris which used the label
> *feministe*. Before then, *womanism* had been briefly
> popular during the 1860s, '70s and '80s for the
> advocacy (by both females and males) of the rights,
> achievements, etc. of women. (Mills, 1989, pp. 86-87,
> emphasis in original)

> I myself have never been able to find out precisely
> what feminism is: I only know that people call me a
> feminist whenever I express sentiments that
> differentiate me from a doormat or a prostitute. (West,

as cited in Mills, 1989, p. 86)

Feminism is evolving and ever-changing and therefore trying to define this movement is a formidable task. I do not try to capture a model feminism. Instead I want to understand the development of my own conceptualization of feminism as it emerged through the learning Piercy and I did during this study. This I will do as the chapters proceed. Our feminisms will unfold by action, thought, and belief.

For many years I thought I knew what feminism was. It wasn't a difficult concept to grasp at all. The dictionary made it quite simple "feminism 1: the theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes 2: organized activity on behalf of women's rights and interests" (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1984, p. 456). I believed it was a perspective that one had in relation to women. That is, they were oppressed, they deserved equal treatment in all areas, and they were valuable in their own right. I had the impression that if all women had their "consciousness raised" (see Mitchell, 1971) they would recognize that they were oppressed and work to change that. Of course there were nuances and subtleties within the construct of feminism but those were minor. Women were united "simply" because of their sex and gender.

Many years and many readings later, I found out that nothing is as simple as that. The monolithic feminism that I believed in did not exist. There was no unifying

framework that connected all feminists. On the contrary, sometimes the strands within feminism served to divide women, even turn them against one another. I was to learn that there are many feminisms, not just one. de Lauretis (1986) says it best for me:

> The image of feminism as a coherent ideology, a set of dogmas and rules of conduct repressive to some and oppressive to others, has a currency inside, as well as outside, the discursive boundaries of feminism. And this image, too, of a homogeneous monolithic Feminism—whether white or black or Third World, whether mainstream or separatist, academic or activist—is something that must be resisted. (p. 15)

My conception of feminism was also imbued with my own privileges of race, class, and sexual identity. When I thought of feminists and feminism I thought of White, middle class, heterosexual women JUST LIKE MYSELF. I had constructed "pseudouniversal definitions of being a woman" (Acosta-Belén, 1993, p. 133).

> It is important to acknowledge the critical insight that women are not all alike—there is no "transhistorical changeless, feminine essence" (Clifford 1989, p. 531)—and that race, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion are... important determinants in the social construction of the self. (Gannett, 1992, p. 11)

The White house that many feminists have resided in and I reside/d in was made more color-full by reading the writings of women of color. For example, the book This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color (Moraga & Anzaldua, 1983) helped me to create a double consciousness. I recognized that although I was oppressed as a woman, I was also an oppressor because of my race,

class, and sexuality. These two coexisting realities--
oppressed and oppressor--were important for me to come to
terms with.

For me it is often difficult to talk about gender, when
I must maintain parallel awareness of other social
constructions--race, class, ethnicity, sexual identity. It
seems that often I can only think about one category at a
time. However, it is not only because it is difficult to
keep all the human constructions at the forefront of one's
mind, but it also has to do with privilege. It is all too
easy for me to see the world as being composed of people
"just like me." So, when I talk about gender, in my mind I
see a woman similar to myself. Privilege has etched images
in my mind. When I talk of sexism I often see the kind of
sexism that a woman like myself might experience. I need to
remember to always stretch and think about the kind of
experiences I will never need to have because of the
privileges of my class, race, and sexuality.

Feminism is about "the politics of experience, of
everyday life" (de Lauretis, 1986, p. 10) and re-visions
hierarchies and categories that are so taken-for-granted
that they are unseen. As Warren (1989) states, feminists'
work is to uncover the conceptual framework that we exist
within, one she calls a "patriarchal conceptual framework."

> A conceptual framework is a set of basic beliefs,
> values, attitudes, and assumptions that constitute the
> "lens" through which we see ourselves and our world.
> An oppressive conceptual framework is one in which the

basic beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions are
used to justify and maintain the subordination of one
group by another. An oppressive conceptual framework
typically is characterized by "up-down" thinking,
whereby what is "up" is assured to be superior to what
is "down" by virtue of some characteristic it has that
"down" lacks, and by virtue of a "logic of domination,"
a moral premise that assumes that superiority justifies
the dominance of what is "up" and the subordination of
what is "down." (p. 46)

Warren (1989) explains further that this framework places

"men up and women down, minds up and bodies down, reason up

and emotions down...[and it is] characterized by up-down

thinking and a logic of domination" (pp. 46-47). This

"patriarchal conceptual framework" places all entities in a

hierarchal pattern as Schaef (1985) suggests:

> God
> Men
> Women
> Children
> Animals
> Earth

God is dominant over men, women, children, animals, and
the earth. Men are dominant over women, children,
animals, and the earth. Women are dominant over
children, animals, and the earth. The earth is at the
bottom of the hierarchy; it is seen as powerless and
submissive. (p. 164)

Schaef, however, does not take into account class, race, or

sexual identity (for example, White woman are dominant(ing)

over women of color.)[29]

What is feminism? Delmar (1986) speaks to this

complicated diversity of meanings in "What is Feminism?"

She has laid out a baseline definition that might be

---

[29] Schaef also uses a Judeo-Christian and western hierarchical arrangement.

helpful:

> [A]t the very least a feminist is someone who holds
> that women suffer discrimination because of their sex,
> that they have specific needs which remain negated and
> unsatisfied, and that the satisfaction of these needs
> would require a radical change (some would say a
> revolution even) in the social, economic and political
> order. But beyond that, things immediately become more
> complicated. (p. 8)

In the end, however, she suggests the more important matter within the concept is that in many cases the differences are greater than the similarities. There are many feminisms, a "pluralism of the ideology" (Mills, 1989, p. 87). No monolithic version exists.

Warren (1989) states that ever since feminism emerged as a political movement over three hundred years ago, what it has done is try to re-vision the future. She states that there are many alternative and competing feminisms, however the one unifying force is that "all feminists agree that sexism (or, the oppression of women) exists, is wrong, and must be changed" (p. 46). All definitions of feminism must include the end of sexist oppression.

Fay (1987) states that the fact that there are many feminisms is not a detriment; instead, "Far from showing the incoherence or irrelevance of such a theory, such a fluid, dialectical relationship between theory, evidence, and practice is precisely what critical social science calls for" (p. 115). Fay states that this reveals the movement's "health and vitality" (p. 115).

Tuttle (1986) addresses some of the controversies

within the feminist community stating that dictionaries refer to anyone who wants rights based on the belief that the sexes should be equal would be considered a feminist. She goes on to explain that "Bell HOOKS (1984) objects to this 'anything goes' approach, saying it has made the term practically meaningless because 'any woman who wants social equality with men regardless of her political perspective (she can be a conservative right-winger or a nationalist communist) can label herself feminist" (p. 107). However, Tuttle goes on to state that some theorists believe that denying the label of feminist to those who want to use it because they do not follow certain tenets is not only partisan but also denies historical reality. Tuttle cites Jagger (1983): "Just as an inadequate theory of justice is still a conception of justice, so I would say that an inadequate feminist theory is still a conception of feminism" (p. 107).

I am uncomfortable with the notion of "inadequate" feminism and feminists. The tendency within the feminist community to decide whether someone counts as feminist enough, real enough, radical enough provides for all sorts of elitism. Such competitive thinking and acting obstructs learning. It is a positivistic approach to imply that a person who embraces feminism may have an "inadequate" conception of what it means.

By the same token, it is highly problematic to agree

that _anyone_ who wants to be labeled a feminist is one.  For example, there are anti-women people who label themselves feminists, and by anti-women I mean those who in action and speech hurt or denigrate women, who could not properly be called feminists.  Yet there is value in listening to these people who want to be called feminists.  Rather than dismissing them from the dialogue we may learn something about the lives of women.

Tong (1989) writes that although she cannot come up with a complete list of the feminisms which exist, she states "feminist theorists are able to identify their approach as essentially liberal, Marxist, radical, psychoanalytic, socialist, existentialist, or postmodern" (p. 1).  Tong tells that what she finds intriguing about all the theories is that they want women to take "charge of their own destinies, and encourage...each other to live, love, laugh, and be happy as _women_" (Tong, 1989, p. 2, emphasis in original).

The one feminism that I need to add to Tong's list, for it describes in part who I am, is ecofeminism (see Griffin, 1978; Ruether, 1975; Donovan, 1990a, 1990b).  Ecofeminism emerged out of a response to the male dominated(ing) deep ecology movement and is being acknowledged as a powerful way of merging the interlocking systems of oppression.

There is political power in identifying oneself as a feminist, and explanatory power in identifying oneself as

aligned with a particular theory. However, it is important
to remember that any label, any category is limiting and
reductionist and there are many women who act in ways that
emancipate women that do not identify themselves as such
(Weiler, 1988).

Although there are many differences among feminisms, de
Lauretis (1990) states that

> most feminists...agree that women are made, not born,
> that gender is not an innate feature (as sex may be)
> but a sociocultural construction (and precisely for
> that reason it is oppressive to women).... (pp. 256-
> 257)

I have in preceding paragraphs used the notion of gender (as
well as race, class, and sexual identity) as a social
construction. Hodson and Dennick (1994) provide a partial
framework for thinking about the social construction of
identities. Although their particular analysis is of the
environment, I use this example because the environment
would seem to be the last phenomenon that people would think
of as socially constructed:

> [T]he environment is not just a given, but a social
> construct. It is a social construct in two senses:
> (a) we act upon and change the natural environment, and
> so construct it through our social actions, and (b) we
> perceive it in a way that is dependent on the
> prevailing sociocultural framework. Thus, our concept
> of "environment" itself is a social construct, and so
> could be different. (p. 260)

In the same way, gender (race, class, and sexual identity)
is a social construct because we act upon, and change the
notion of gender, and what it means, by our social actions.
And the way in which we perceive gender is dependent to a

large degree on the prevailing sociocultural and historical framework.

It is precisely because gender is a social construction that the ways in which people interact around gender can be learned and unlearned.

> In teaching us to see gender as a socially constructed and culturally transmitted organizer of our inner and outer worlds, in, as it were, making gender visible, feminist theory has provided us with an instrument of immense subversive power. And along with this provision comes a commitment: nothing less...than the deconstruction and reconstitution of conventional knowledge. (Keller, 1986, p. 67)

I will now turn to an examination of the terms oppression and the sex/gender system.

## Oppression and the Sex/Gender System

The concept of oppression is a fundamental one to feminism and to this dissertation and hence needs to be defined. Frye (1983) has perhaps one of the most accessible and clear explications of the concept of oppression. She uses the metaphor of a birdcage to talk about the ways oppression works:

> Consider a birdcage. If you look very closely at just one wire in the cage, you cannot see the other wires. If your conception of what is before you is determined by this myopic focus, you could look at that one wire, up and down the length of it, and be unable to see why a bird would not just fly around the wire any time it wanted to go somewhere.... It is only when you step back...take a macroscopic view of the whole cage, that you will see why the bird does not go anywhere.... *It is perfectly obvious* that the bird is surrounded by a network of systematically related barriers, no one of which would be the least hindrance to its flight, but which, by their relations to each other, are as

confining as the solid walls of a dungeon. (Frye, 1983, pp. 4-5, emphasis in original)

Oppression cannot be understood if one looks at a single act, or a single condition, for that is only looking at one of the wires in the birdcage. It is when one steps back and sees the ways in which conditions, situations, and circumstances combine--as Frye states, "when you look macroscopically you can see it--a network of forces and barriers which are systematically related and which conspire to the immobilization, reduction and molding of women and the lives we live" (p. 7)--that oppression can be understood.

Frye explains that a basic premise of feminism is that women are oppressed. Oppression is a concept that is misunderstood and misused "and is being stretched to meaninglessness" (Frye, 1983, p. 1). The claim that women are oppressed is often countered by the argument that men are also oppressed. The evidence which is used by some males to document their own oppression is that they are unable to cry and that it is hard for them to be masculine. When the tensions and dissatisfactions of being male are used to show that the "oppressors are oppressed by oppressing" the concept of oppression is stretched to meaninglessness.

Frye unpacks the word "oppression," stating that it stems from the word "press," to mold, reduce or immobilize. That which is pressed is trapped between or among forces,

which together confine or impede the thing's movement. One
of the most distinctive and omnipresent elements of
oppressed groups is that they are inevitably caught in
double binds. They have very few options, and often the
options they do have lead to negative consequences. Frye
argues that the lives of oppressed groups are determined by
deliberate and external forces which are linked in order to
entrap them. It is analogous to a birdcage.

Frye points out that to understand oppression one has
to recognize that it has nothing to do with individual
ability or handicap. Instead it has to do with one's
affiliation with a group understood to have "natural"
limitations. If the person is oppressed, it is because the
person is part of a classification that is systematically
diminished and immobilized. One needs to understand that
the oppressed person belongs to a definite group.

Most groups have characteristics which set them apart,
making oppression more visible and group solidarity more
probable. Because women are part of other groups (for
example because of race, class, and sexual identity) and
are, therefore, dispersed, it makes solidarity and
recognition of oppression difficult to achieve.

However, the common factor amongst all women,
regardless of class or race, is their membership in one
group which is defined by function. This function is "the
service of men and men's interest as men define them" (Frye,

1983, p. 9). Women's service to/for men has the destructive nature of combining responsibility with powerlessness. Even though women sometimes are able to serve their own interests and on occasion men's and women's interest overlap, the distinction is that "men do not serve women as women serve men" (Frye, 1983, p.10).

Frye suggests that because we are social beings, we are inevitably part of a social structure, which, by its very nature, constrains us and produces frustrations and restrictions. To figure out if a person's anguish, injury or restriction is an ingredient of oppression, one has to look at it in context, to see if it is part of a network of barriers designed to limit or benefit a particular group of people. A person may experience frustrations or restrictions, but contextually the experience may not be one of oppression.

Examining barriers, both social and economic, one notices that they affect people on both sides; however, they restrict only one group and maintain privilege for the other. For example, looking at the predominantly female service sector shows us that its barriers not only confine women, but also keep men out. Therefore, some men might feel disadvantaged because they are not able to elect a nurturant lifestyle, and then they claim they are oppressed also, due to "sex roles." Yet, the boundary that keeps women in and men out is constructed and conserved by men for

men's own benefit. It is part of a larger picture which guarantees that cultural and economic powers remain in male hands and that their superior status is maintained.

Frye states that just because a person comes up against a disagreeable, repressing, or hurtful barrier or constraint, or just because the barrier deprives someone of something they prize, does not mean that the person is oppressed. There are certain questions which need to be asked about the barrier or force. For example, who manufactured it? Who preserves it? Whose interests are served by having it? Who benefits by it? Who is harmed by it? One needs to figure out if it is a part of a framework which restricts, constricts, and immobilizes a particular group. Then one needs to find out whether the individual is part of that oppressed group.

Frye states that to adapt to oppression, women have disciplined themselves and have internalized restrictions, such as their constricted postures and attenuated movements, in order to meet the expectations and tyranny of others. Women's behaviors signal self-degradation which is part of a larger system of degradation. This differs from men's feelings of restrictions, i.e., emotional restraint, for women's restraints are pieces of this oppressive framework geared toward women, whereas, the men's restraints are part of the oppressive framework geared toward women.

It is in large part membership in the category of women

which marks one for "suffering and frustration" (Frye, 1983, p. 15). "For any woman of any race or economic class, being a woman is significantly attached to whatever disadvantages and deprivations she suffers, be they great or small" (Frye, 1983, p. 16). The lack of economic or political power or their lack of achievement arises from the fact that they are women. Men do not experience these same things because they are men, but rather, they benefit from their maleness. "Women are oppressed, as women...but men are not oppressed as men" (Frye, 1983, p. 16, emphasis in original).

One of the struggles that seems to surround the concept of oppression is the way in which we try to hierarchically arrange or compare oppression, for example, by claiming that gender oppression is greater than race oppression, or vice versa. As Moraga (1983) says, "The danger lies in ranking the oppressions. The danger lies in failing to acknowledge the specificity of the oppression. The danger lies in attempting to deal with oppression from purely a theoretical base" (p. 29).

The challenge for feminists seems to be melding the personal and theoretical into a framework of oppression that recognizes the dynamic nature of oppression and does not try to make it static in order to fit into a pre-existing androcentric paradigm. As feminists we need to develop an analysis and practice that recognizes that "the major systems of oppression are interlocking" (Combahee River

Collective, 1983, p. 210). Is this desire to stratify oppression, the result of our own inability to grasp hold easily of a concept like oppression--a concept that is in many cases "so deep as to be invisible" (Firestone, 1972, p. 1)?

In the past I have used patriarchy to define the power that men have over women. However, I now use the term the "sex/gender system," for patriarchy implies a rigid, inflexible system that is not contextualized. Rubin (1975) defines the sex/gender system as "the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied" (p. 159).

Rubin goes on to explain that what counts as someone's sex is "culturally determined and obtained. Every society...has a sex/gender system--a set of arrangements by which the biological raw material of human sex and procreation is shaped by human, social intervention and satisfied in conventional manner" (p. 165). Rubin explains that patriarchy as a concept was instituted to differentiate between the forces which conserved sexism from those that maintained other relations, such as capitalism. The term sex/gender system is preferable because it "is a neutral term which refers to the domain and indicates that oppression is not inevitable in that domain, but is a product of the specific social relations which organize it"

(Rubin, 1975, pp. 167-168).

One of the givens in this dissertation is that gender, race, class, and sexual identity are social constructions. That is, a culture decides how it will react to someone's sex, skin color, economic situation, and sexual orientation. And within this hierarchical culture--it is "better" to be a man versus a women, White versus a person of color, more monied versus less monied, heterosexual versus gay or lesbian. These social constructions are not inevitable, but they have been powerfully inscribed in our culture and history. However, since they are socially constructed, they can be reconstructed.

Feminist teachers are concerned with fighting the hierarchies. They work to resist and challenge oppression inside the classroom so that their students can resist and challenge it in their lives. I will now move to examining what other theorists have written about feminist teaching.

## Feminist Teaching

I have thought about feminism and teaching for many years. Many questions have arisen for me about the possibilities that feminism holds for teacher education. I have discovered that there is a dearth of information about feminism and teaching and teacher education. Little scholarship exists about how a teacher educator with feminist imagination teaches, how she thinks about her

teaching, and how she thinks about her students. There is little information about how she grapples with helping her students develop a "consciousness of seeing" (Piercy Sand's words) and what it might mean to bring feminist imagination into a teacher education undergraduate classroom. My goal is to let us see the struggles of a teacher educator and her students in action in order to provide images and themes for conversation. Because there are hardly any rich portrayals of a teacher educator with feminist imagination, it is difficult to begin a dialogue about feminist teaching. I hope this dissertation can do that.

Weiler's account (1988) of feminist high school teachers and administrators is a context quite different from the university classroom. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) talk about what teaching would be like in the "connected classroom." Noddings (1984) talks about what a feminine "caring" classroom would be like. Yet we are not shown how this would play out in an actual classroom. Most feminist teaching texts, such as Weiler's (1988), Noddings' (1984), Lewis' (1990), Belenky et al.'s (1986), hooks' (1989), and Lather's (1991) present theoretical frameworks of feminist teaching without fleshing out classroom realities attached to the theory. We need to see how an actual teacher education class, or any class for that matter, unfolds when taught by a feminist.

Certainly many feminists are writing about their

practice. Bunch (1983), hooks (1989), and Rich (1973-74, 1977,1978) all write about feminist pedagogy, but do not locate it within a particular context, other than the academy. Their works are written from the teacher's perspective. No students' voices are featured. Lewis and Simon (1986) wrote about a graduate class and provided the perspective of both the teacher and the student. Lewis (1989, 1990) wrote about a foundations in sociology class, but only featured her perspective.

Ellesworth (1989) writes about working through the myths of critical pedagogy in her teacher education graduate seminar on racism. This is a self-selected group, unlike a general social foundations course for undergraduates. Her voice describes and analyzes what occurred. We rarely hear the voices of the students who were within the class. It seems critical to me not only to hear about students but also from students.

Goodman and Kelly (1988) describe the issues that the male profeminist elementary teacher faces. They provide a helpful set of principles to guide the teacher committed to feminist ideas:

o The teacher is viewed as an alternative role model and feminist advocate who discloses herself...as a multidimensional, collaborative learner rather than a detached, omniscient authority figure.

o The teacher has an orientation toward student empowerment revealed in basic affirmation of students' personal knowledge, interests, and experience as potential learning resources.

o The teacher maintains a concentration on co-operative versus competitive or individualistic norms or activities.

o The teacher considers feminist perspectives in the curriculum, viewed historically and in relation to other forms of oppression such as race and class.

o The teacher emphasizes emotional as well as intellectual development of [students] and self.

o The teacher recognizes the importance of translating understanding into action, reflected in the view of students as active creators and potential transformers of their material and cultural world. (p. 5)

These principles are helpful in orienting the feminist

teacher, and yet, we are not sure what this might look like

enacted in a classroom.

Freire (1968/1985) in <u>Pedagogy of the Oppressed</u>

explores the ways in which those who have been oppressed

exist within a "culture of silence." In spite of being

silenced, Freire explains that it is possible for the

oppressed to talk about their world and their reality and

achieve "conscientizaçao [which] refers to learning to

perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and

to take action against the oppressive elements of reality"

(p. 19). Freire's notion that the teacher who is committed

to liberatory education needs to reject the banking concept

of education and instead problem-pose with students has been

vital to my development of a teacher educator's feminist

imagination.

> Those truly committed to liberation must reject the banking concept in its entirety, adopting instead a concept of men as conscious beings, and consciousness as consciousness intent upon the world. They must

abandon the educational goal of deposit-making and replace it with the posing of the problems of men in their relations with the world. "Problem-posing" education, responding to the essence of consciousness—*intentionality*—rejects communiqué and embodies communication. It epitomizes the special characteristic of consciousness: being *conscious of*, not only as intent on objects but as turned in upon itself in a Jasperian "split"—consciousness as consciousness *of* consciousness. (Freire, 1968/1985, pp. 66-67, emphasis in original).[30]

Belenky et al., (1986) are very helpful in thinking about silence in women's lives and their experiences in universities and informal educational sites. They have the women's voices featured prominently. They also talk about what kind of teachers and teaching women need. They make the claim that teachers need to be "midwives," helping to give birth to the students' ideas, and the classroom needs to be a classroom that is geared toward constructed knowing. However, there are no portraits of what the teaching and learning looks like.

Many theorists argue that feminist perspectives in education are important in challenging the status quo (Belenky et al., 1986; Weiler, 1988; Lewis, 1991; hooks, 1989; Rich, 1977, 1978). Yet, these theorists do not present us with a teacher educator in relation to her students. Moreover, often the focus is on the feminist

---

[30] I have chosen to not use [sic] or add in [she/women/her] after Freire's male pronouns. I have also not added female pronouns to other's selections I quote in which are used only male pronouns, for example Lessing (1971). However, it is jarring for me to read the male pronoun used. Jones (1993) talks about how it was possible for Ryan (1967/1977) to write about targets of discrimination and "blaming the victim" and yet not talk about women. It was possible for Freire to talk about oppression only using male pronouns. This reminds me of what Friedan (1969/1984) said so prophetically in The Feminine Mystique: those who are revolutionary thinkers are trapped within their own culture and their paradigms. Research indicates that using male generics increases male imagery in the speaker and the listener (Hamilton, 1988) and that as we read these works it is important for us to remember the women that are by virtue of the language left out.

teacher's perspective and often the students' voices are not present, or are only included to emphasize the resistance they display.

Lather's (1991) and Wallace's (1993-1994) works seem to address the ways in which knowledge in a feminist classroom is more than just the teacher teaching, and the students either learning or resisting. Lather illustrates what occurs in a classroom when teachers and students construct knowledge together. Wallace makes it clear that no matter what the teacher intends or desires for her classroom community, the students make choices about how they will participate.

On the whole, there is little talk of what it means to create a community within a classroom where a teacher with feminist imagination is teaching and learning. There is little discussion of the ways in which the teacher, the learner, and the knowledge interact in the classroom--there is little attention to what Hawkins (1974) characterizes as the "I, Thou, It" relationship. I wanted to hear the voices of the students and how they were experiencing the pedagogy of a teacher educator with feminist imagination. I wanted to uncover the dialectical and reflexive nature of teaching and learning in a class where the community is co-developed by the teacher educator and the students.

There is often little description of how difficult it is to teach with feminist imagination, not merely because

students resist, but because feminism is in flux--ever-changing, renegotiated, reinvented, and reimagined. As Spender (1983) puts it:

> [E]verything I know is open to challenge.... there are
> no absolutes,...meaning is socially constructed
> and...This does not apply to everything else BUT
> feminism; I include feminism in it as well and I can
> distinctly remember one of the hardest lessons that I
> ever set myself was to "prove" that feminism is as
> arbitrary as everything else I know. (p. 28)

It is within that arbitrariness, that uncertainty, that chaos that a teacher educator works, learns, and teaches. We do not have vivid portraits of what this is like for the teacher educator. We do not have the portraits of what it is like for the students she teaches; their voices are often unavailable.

We have been given accounts of students' resistance to feminist ideas within a course (Weiler, 1988; Lewis, 1991), but the voices of students themselves have not been heard, telling their own stories. I believe that to gain a more complete understanding of the inclusion of feminism within teacher education, the interpretations and reflections of the students in that context are critical to include. Therefore, I chose to interview students, and Piercy and I chose to give them feedback forms two times during the semester. Although in my study the teacher educator is the primary focus, the relationship between her and the students is central. The students' voices help us see the ways in which the teaching and learning were co-constructed.

Whenever humans interact there is bound to be conflict
(Peck, 1987; Miller, 1986). This would seem especially
likely in a feminist teacher's classroom. Weiler (1988)
states that conflict can occur in

> cases where the gender race, or class of teacher and
> student are different, feminist teaching creates
> conflicts on various levels. But that conflict can
> become the text for counter-hegemonic teaching. What
> is important is not to deny the conflict, but to
> recognize that in a society like the U.S., which is so
> deeply split by gender, race, and class, conflict is
> inevitable and only reflects social and political
> realities. But recognition of conflict, oppression,
> and power does not mean their acceptance. It means
> making them conscious so they can be addressed and
> transformed. (pp. 144-145)

However, we do not have portraits of the kind of conflict
that can arise and how it unfolds in a classroom in which a
teacher educator with feminist imagination teaches.
The texture of conflict is unavailable in the current
literature on teacher education. It is precisely within the
conflict that there is much to be learned about the issues
that a teacher educator and her students grapple with when
teaching and learning about privilege and oppression. This
dissertation examines a case of conflict closely and how it
affected the classroom community.

What is also interesting about the works that examine
race, class, and gender is how little attention is given to
the identity of the researcher/theorist/writer speaking of
these issues (see for example Belenky et al., 1986). The
authors do not situate themselves within their work. We
know very little about them as people. For example,

Ellesworth (1989) identifies herself as a "White middle-class woman and professor" (p. 297), and Henry (1993-1994) describes herself as an African American woman. However, rarely do the feminist teachers place their Selves within their research. The person who comes closest to placing herself inside the work, melding the personal, political, and the pedagogical is Grumet (1988) in **Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching**. Rogers (1993) states that it is necessary to place your own subjective voice within the theorizing so as to better flesh out the theory. This is what I have attempted to do. I have inserted my own Self in this dissertation. I weave myself in and out of all the chapters, some more than others, but nonetheless my own subjective voice comes through.

Lewis (1989, 1990) uncovers the kind of sexual dynamics that are in play in a mixed-gender class and the kind of effects this has on the students', especially the women's, desire to engage with issues of feminism. Although other writers talk about resistance, they often do not unpack what factors might be contributing to the reluctance of students to embrace what the teacher is trying to offer. I have tried to uncover some of the reasons I perceive that students may reject feminism.

Ellesworth (1989) states that the race, class, gender and other social constructions affect what goes on in the classroom. Weiler (1988) claims when the identity of the

teacher is different from her students, conflict may result.
However, there are other life experiences and other identity
issues, for example being married, or having a son, which
may impact the ways in which feminism is thought about and
enacted in the classroom. Teacher educators who are
feminists have very few ways of thinking about their
practice because of the limited representations available.
Although none of these authors include a recipe or formulaic
approach to feminist teaching, there is little sense of the
uniqueness and individuality of the teacher educator which
impacts her thoughts about feminism.

Overall, there is a lack of scholarship on feminist
teaching. Weiler (1988) states, "Particularly lacking are
ethnographic and qualitative studies investigating the
impact of feminist ideas on teachers and students" (p. 2).
I would add there is even a greater scarcity of qualitative
scholarship on feminism and teacher education, featuring
both the teacher and the students. There is almost no
scholarship on undergraduate preservice classes taught by a
teacher who considers herself a feminist.

The insights that have been gained about feminist
teaching have not been explored in great depth in relation
to teacher education. Yet of all the places that exploring
feminist teaching would be extremely helpful, it would be in
teacher education--teachers teaching teachers. To help
teacher educators think deeply about privilege and

oppression, in order to help their own pre-service teachers think deeply about these same issues, teacher educators need to have access to studies that explore teacher education for liberation.

I wanted to investigate the "political space" that Giroux (1980) states is available in teacher education for teachers to challenge the status quo. As Giroux claims:

> It is crucial to recognize that teacher-education programs, then, both embody and demonstrate contradictions specific to their own interests. It is the tensions and contradictions in these programs that testify to their relative autonomy, and it is within the context of this relative autonomy that "radical" teachers can find the political space to develop innovative courses and alternative modes of pedagogy. It is an opportunity that should not be ignored. (p. 418)

It is important to think about just how much political latitude a teacher educator can take or has. There is little written about the actual unfolding of a teacher education classroom where a teacher tries to push against the boundaries of oppression. There is little written about the ways in which curriculum is uncovered rather than covered (Hawkins, 1974, as cited in Calkins, 1986) in teacher education classes. By uncovering curriculum I mean the ways in which content and pedagogy are unwrapped and revealed for the biases, invisibilities, and hidden messages that are usually taken-for-granted. With a dearth of scholarship in this area, there is little offered to the teacher educator who is a feminist (or anyone for that matter) as she struggles to confront equity and inequity

issues in her classroom.

I wanted to investigate what a teacher educator with feminist imagination was like in her classroom and what her relationship was like with her students. I felt this would enable all of us to think more deeply and profoundly about grappling with issues of oppression and privilege in the teacher education classroom.

Recently a special edition of Action in Teacher Education (1993-1994) came out that featured "Feminist Pedagogy in Teacher Education." In this edition there were very few articles that looked within the classroom at the teacher educator and the students she taught. Henry's article "There Are No Safe Places: Pedagogy as Powerful and Dangerous Terrain" and Roychoudhury, Tippens, and Nichols article "An Exploratory Attempt Toward a Feminist Pedagogy For Science Education" dealt with practice in the classroom. Henry's piece was told from the teacher educator's perspective, but students' voices were not included. Roychoudhury, Tippens, and Nichols's piece was told from the perspective of teacher and student. This is a beginning to building a body of knowledge in teacher education about feminist pedagogy. However, we have far to go to get multiple portraits that uncover the complexities of teacher education being taught by feminists.

Teacher education with feminist imagination is undergirded and informed by a constructivist paradigm of

knowledge. Piercy and I both described ourselves as being informed by a constructivist theory of knowledge. However, I continue to struggle with a positivistic hold on my feminist imagination and teaching. It is important to briefly uncover the knowledge paradigms that inform my understandings of the teaching of teachers.

## Paradigms of Knowledge: Positivism and Constructivism

Dividing knowledge into two large frameworks is merely for heuristic purposes, allowing me to show the broad categories I am using when I use the terms "positivism" and "constructivism." I realize that simplification of complex epistemological, ontological, and methodological postures occurs when lines are drawn between theoretical positions.

Education has had a long legacy of the positivistic (often called the conventional or scientific) paradigm of knowledge undergirding and informing teaching, learning, and the curriculum. This paradigm asserts that natural and scientific laws can govern knowing and that objectivity is possible and desirable.

Positivism espouses that there is an objective reality "out there" which can be ascertained if the observer remains detached, value-free, scientific (experimentation that will be reproducible), and removes confounding influences from the site under investigation. Positivism believes that Truth (with a capital T) is discoverable, generalizable, and

universal. In this framework the known is separate from the knower; facts, concepts, and principles are separate from the person discovering them. Positivists claim that neutrality and impartiality is obtainable and that prediction and control of the natural world are possible. This framework asserts that reality is static, measurable, and quantifiable. Therefore order and cohesion are possible.

Educators who are influenced by positivism believe that there is a fixed body of knowledge which can be captured if the teacher dispenses the knowledge accurately and efficiently. The curriculum becomes a technical problem to be made more efficient, so that more content can be covered. In this scheme the curriculum must be logical, so that outcomes are predictable and controllable.

The constructivist paradigm has recently begun to infuse various educational circles. It has been labeled the naturalistic, hermeneutic, or interpretive paradigm, all of which have nuances in meanings (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Constructivists claim that human endeavors cannot be reduced to natural or scientific laws because human beings are complex and unpredictable entities. Tomlin humorously and astutely characterizes the constructivist paradigm in her one-woman show The Search for Signs of Intelligent Life in the Universe, when she asks and answers the question about the nature of reality: "What is reality anyway? Nothin' but

a collective hunch" (Wagner, 1986, p. 18). With these two sentences, Tomlin has described the social construction of reality and knowledge.

The constructivist conceptualization of knowledge moves pedagogy away from the traditional "banking" (Freire, 1968/1985) notion of teaching and learning and moves pedagogy toward a more fluid, tentative, and dialectical form. No longer is knowledge a fixed, static, and pre-packaged "truth."

Constructivists espouse that there are multiple, socially constructed realities which are created by individuals as they try to make sense of their experiences, and these experiences are interactive in nature. Truth with a "T" does not exist "out there," but rather there are informed and sophisticated constructions which are assented to within a particular social, historical, and cultural context. "Contexts give life and are given life by constructions that are held by the people in them" (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 175). In this framework, all the facts, concepts, and principles we use are imbued with ideology and are value-laden because they have no independent meaning outside of a theoretical rubric.

Individuals engage in dialectical processes and co-constructions of meaning and knowledge occur. Constructivists assert that all we know and come to know is a result of human social construction. They argue that we

are human social agents and we cannot escape our humanness;

we cannot divorce ourselves from our values and

subjectivity.

> Constructions come about through the interaction of a
> constructor with information, contexts, settings,
> situations, and other constructors...using a process
> which is rooted in previous experience, belief systems,
> values, fears, prejudices, hopes, disappointments, and
> achievements of the constructor...constructions come
> about by virtue of the interaction of the knower with
> the already known and the still knowable or to-be-
> known. (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 143)

Constructivists believe that our interpretation of the

world and its phenomena are inevitably partial because

social phenomena are not in a static state. Therefore, we

are unable to freeze their realities long enough to fully

comprehend them. "The peculiar web or pattern of

circumstances that characterize the situation may never

occur in the same way again" (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p.

98). Phenomena elude us just as we are beginning to grasp

hold of them.

In order to imagine a new reality for teacher

educators there is a need for a researcher who is herself a

teacher educator with feminist imagination to hear the

voices of a teacher educator and her students, and to place

her subjective self in the study. There is a need to

examine conflict and the co-construction of a community

where the teacher is challenging the status quo. There is a

need for women teacher educators to find their way, re-

reading and re-writing the world according to their own

interpretations. I have attempted to begin this endeavor

within the pages of this study.

## Finding Our Way:  Re-reading and Re-writing the Malestream's Word and World

> Speaking of critical theory, radical politics, and
> Paulo Freire, as much as feminists owe to their
> concepts, it is helpful to remember that they come out
> of a male model, heavily reliant on the primacy of
> rationality and abstract principles of justice,
> assuming a personal power base in their education by
> confrontation and argument, and that they were put
> together apart from any consideration of women's
> experience or women's history.... For best results,
> they [critical theorists] are read cautiously, if not
> skeptically with the understanding that we, as academic
> women, are still finding our way. We have little of
> our own to guide us and a very great distance to go.
> (Wallace, 1993-94, p. 18)

I have borrowed Freire and Macedo's (1988) notion of

"reading the word and the world," but I have reshaped their

phrase to create a feminist rendition of the idea. I agree

with Wallace, that as feminists we have learned much from

critical and radical theorists who have developed powerful

concepts which helped us name our reality. Yet, there is

the necessity for those with feminist imaginations to re-

read and re-write the malestream's word and world. All

constructs that have been handed down to us need to be re-

examined. Questions must be asked: do they make sense in

this context, for this teacher educator, for these students,

for this woman?

Constructs are defined differently both by and for

women. For example, courage is not a generic term; as

Wallace (1993-94) reminds us, "Women's lives define courage differently than those of men, and we pay a different price for it" (p. 19). Many of the constructs that are commonly used to describe teaching and learning may need to be recreated by teacher educators with feminist imaginations, beginning with questioning the underlying assumptions of the constructs.

In my study I use concepts such as loving presence, eros, and passion in teacher education, not the common "stuff" of educational research. Very recently, I was given a gift of affirmation. It came in the form of a book by bell hooks, her most recent (1994) <u>Teaching To Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom</u>. As I read hooks I felt a deep pleasure and validation because she writes about similar themes and motifs.

Feminists who have come before, and are still to come, can offer teacher education boldness and courage. This kind of boldness and courage is needed in a conservative field to push the paradigms that constrain us. Lortie (1975), Jackson (1986), Cohen (1988), and Weiler (1988) talk about the conservatism, cautiousness, and reproduction of education. Teacher education reflects this conservatism and caution and therefore helps to contribute to a conservative and cautious teaching population and teaching profession. There is a reflexive and dialectical relationship between teaching and teacher education.

I believe that the feminist writings both inside and outside of the field of education offer brave new ways to look at the process and content of educating future educators. They help us illuminate what new questions need to be asked, what constructs need to be cast away, unlearned, modified, or created anew. Teacher education has not explored feminist scholarship and method to the fullest. Feminist imagination in teacher education is a rich opportunity to investigate new ways of thinking and new visions for the future for teaching and learning. Teacher education "classics" are seen in new lights with a feminist eye.

> With regard to mainstream scholarship, feminists continually press the questions "For whom?" "According to whom?"... With the appropriate prefixes, it becomes at least an open question whether that [discipline]... is truly representative or inclusive of the realities of workers, women and men of color, non-Westerners, of the multiple realities of diverse groups of people.
> This insistence on prefixing: or "marking" traditions has two very important and related functions: it makes visible the ways in which privilege and power are invisible in the mainstream curriculum, and it raises questions about gender, race, class, and other sorts of bias in traditional scholarship. (Warren, 1989, p. 46)

I ask the question, Why, if women dominate in numbers in the teaching field, and there are women teacher educators teaching those many future women teachers, why is there not more "woman-centered scholarship" (Du Bois, 1979, p. 108)? Although there have been many studies about and on women teachers, and even some on women teacher educators, there are very few that are by feminist women for and with

feminist women.

All the authors I have mentioned lend their ideas, their constructs, and their principles to my work; however, none are able to comprehensively inform the work I have done. The context, Piercy, the students, and I were at a particular moment in history--herstory. Our individuality and uniqueness made this a study that cannot rely on the frameworks of others.

This room was constructed by the study of women, for women. I wanted to do the same in this study of a woman teacher educator and her students. I wanted all that I had learned and all that I would learn to work for and with my participants. I wanted what Noddings (1986) advocates:

> In educational research, fidelity to persons counsels us to choose our problems in such a way that the knowledge gained will promote individual growth and maintain a caring community...from an ethical perspective, the difficulty may be identified as a failure to meet colleagues in genuine mutuality. Researchers have perhaps too often made persons (teachers and students) the objects of research. An alternative is to choose problems that interest and concern researchers, students, and teachers.... Such research would be genuine research for teaching instead of simply research on teaching. (Noddings, 1986, p. 506, emphasis in original)

The chapters you are about to read are this woman's attempt to promote the individual growth of Piercy and myself. It is also my attempt to create and maintain a caring and compassionate community with fidelity to the persons within this study of, with, and for women.

*"The feminist revolution"...is occurring--now.  It
occurs as and when women, individually and together,
hesitantly and rampantly, joyously and with deep
sorrow, come to see our lives differently and reject
externally imposed frames of reference for
understanding these lives, instead beginning the slow
process of constructing our own ways of seeing them,
understanding them, and living them.  For us, the
insistence on the deeply political nature of everyday
life and on seeing political change as personal change,
is quite simply, "feminism". (Stanley and Wise, 1983,
p. 192, emphasis in original)*

# CHAPTER III

## WHO IS PIERCY SAND? A PARTIAL DESCRIPTION

### Keys and Doors and Cardboard Cut-outs: What a Researcher Can and Cannot Do

You have encountered Piercy Sand briefly in chapters one and two. In this chapter I continue to introduce you to this teacher educator with feminist imagination. As the subsequent chapters unfold you will meet her through her actions, her beliefs, and her commitments. She was a unique and complex woman teacher educator and I can only partially reveal her to you.

I begin by notifying you about the limits to this account of Piercy Sand. I tell the tale and am therefore the final interpreter of the story. Piercy would write a different story. Piercy would

> have her own version. I am not the center of her story, because she herself is that. But I could give her something you can never have except from another person: what you look like from outside. A reflection. This is the part of herself I could give back to her. We are like twins in old fables, each of whom has been given half a key. (Margaret Atwood, 1989, p. 434)

I tell about her. I tell what I know, what I have seen, what I have heard, and what I have felt. In these pages, I hold up a mirror. Yet, I can never tell of her Self completely. But we have given each other gifts, for as I hold up a mirror for her, I also hold it up for myself. In this study, we stand side by side. We tell each other what we saw from the outside. We also know that we each hold the other half of the key, the half that opens the inner doors

to the Self.

In unanticipated ways she tells me about me. This is
what searching is all about. This is part of the joy of
*research*. New knowledge is created when I "stop putting the
answers before the Questions" (Daly, 1978, p.xv).

There are other limits to what I do. Language is never
enough to describe reality. I can only tell part of what is
"real." I take a vibrant, complex, multidimensional woman
and write about her. She appears as words on paper--in
unidimensional form. For example, Piercy's vibrancy is only
suggested and implied because she is not living in the
pages; here, she flattens.

When I transcribed her words and our conversations on
paper, some of her passion was lost, for the dynamic nature
of her speech is unavailable to the reader. So part of my
task is to get across her spirited nature. She was
passionate and she was playful, and she was passionately
playful and playfully passionate. My charge is to attempt
to capture this aliveness and lively way of being, working,
interacting, learning, and teaching that Piercy exemplified.

How to relay the life--the Being? With words I can
only represent the life. I am reminded of Michael Snow's
(1962) cardboard cut-out of a woman. He declares: "My
subject is not women or a woman but the first cardboard cut-
out of a walking woman" (Snow, 1962). His declaration about
his art reminds me that I cannot fully render up Piercy in

my study.  I will *not* portray her as a "cardboard cut-out,"
yet her representation is only part of who she was, the part
that I witnessed or that she informed me of.   Margaret
Atwood's key (1989) will not open all the doors to the rooms
which no outsider enters:

> We live...with a number of rooms inside us.  The best
> room is open to the family and friends and we show our
> finest face in it.  Another room is more private, the
> bedroom, and very few are allowed in.  There is another
> room where we allow no one in...for it is a room of the
> most intimate thoughts we keep unshared.  There is one
> more room, so hidden away that we don't even enter it
> ourselves.  Within it we lock all the mysteries we
> cannot solve and all the pains and sorrows we wish to
> forget. (Uris, 1977, p. 56)

We cannot know what lies deep within the consciousness,
imagination, mind, heart, and soul of another, the room that
is unshared.  This investigation presents only those rooms
that I have been invited into, the rooms that I can describe
and tell you about, that which have been made concrete to me
in words and actions.  This analysis only gives glimpses
into another.  And as such, the mysteries remain.  Remember
rooms within rooms within rooms.  Remember the locks.

That mysteries remain is acceptable, for life is
mysterious and as such, questions endure.  Those mysteries
are in part why we seek to learn, why we teach, why we ask
the questions and hope for answers.

I begin to introduce you to a woman, Piercy Sand, whose
history and experiences affected the way she taught and how
she saw her students.  Piercy had taught for 23 years at the
time of this study, three years at Atwood College (her

college at the time of the study), eight years at a Big Ten

university where she received her doctorate in literacy, and

15 years as an elementary teacher. She was married; her

spouse Mark, was a chairperson of a department at a large

university. She was also the mother of a college-age son,

Johnny.

### The Personal is Political is Pedagogical

What did I see as I *looked* at Piercy? Probably much

the same as other people saw, but in the final analysis,

perhaps I interpreted what I saw much differently. Looking

at women is something that is done consistently and

blatantly in the U.S. culture/s. Men look at women. Women

look at themselves being looked at. Women look at women

often with men's eyes. Appraising. Judging. Rating.

> *Men act* and *women appear*. Men look at women. Women
> watch themselves being looked at. This determines not
> only most relations between men and women but also the
> relation of women to themselves. The surveyor of woman
> in herself is male: the surveyed female. Thus she
> turns herself into an object--and most particularly an
> object of vision: a sight. (Berger, 1972, p. 47,
> emphasis in original)

And so *the look* is very important for women, therefore,

important to the description of Piercy. But the look is

always just from the outside. This looking has the element

of a double vision (McIntosh 1985, 1989) for I was trying to

see Piercy through eyes that were woman-centered versus man-

centered. No easy task. So the look was convoluted and

trapped within androcentric ways, struggling not to be.

What is necessary is what Du Bois (1979) and McIntosh (1985,

1989) have called a double consciousness:

> As women, we inhabit our world with a "double
> consciousness." We are in and of our society but in
> important ways also not "of" it. We see and think in
> the terms of our culture; we have been trained in these
> terms, shaped by them; they have determined not only
> the ways in which we have been able to perceive and
> understand large events, but even the ways in which we
> have been able to perceive structure and understand our
> most intimate experiencing. Yet we have always another
> consciousness, another potential language within us,
> available to us. We are aware, however inchoately, of
> the reality of our own perceptions and experience; we
> are aware that this reality has often not been only
> unnamed but unnameable; we understand that our
> invisibility and silence hold the germs of both madness
> and power, of both dissolution and creation....
> We are observer and observed, subject and object,
> knower and known. When we take away the lenses of
> androcentrism and patriarchy, what we have left is our
> own eyes, ourselves and each other. *We are the*
> *instruments of observation and understanding; we are*
> *the namers, the interpreters of our lives.* (Du Bois,
> 1979, pp. 111-112, emphasis in original)

Piercy was White, with an Irish Italian, working class

heritage.[31] She had dark wavy hair and green dancing eyes.

She considered herself "transparent," and her eyes and face

*did* suggest every emotion she was experiencing. She was in

her forties. She was very attractive. She dressed well and

was fashionable. Her walk was light and she had a spritely

---

[31] I believe it is important to tell of the heritage of White and Black people if one has access to it. Piercy was Irish Italian. I am German. Piercy had come to value her heritage and felt that it has had an impact on who she was. I left Germany when I was four years old and I have not explored indepth how my heritage has affected who I am and what I think. However, I believe that Yamato (1990) makes a very important point when she states:

> This so-called melting pot has only succeeded in turning us into fast food-gobbling 'generics' (as in generic 'white folks' who were once Irish, Polish, Russian, English, etc., and 'black folks,' who were once Ashanti, Bambara, Baule, Yoruba, etc.). (p. 23)

One of the givens of this study is that I ascribe to the theory that all the social constructs of who we are affect our ways of knowing (see Belenky et al., 1986) and our ways of seeing the world.

step. She was quick to smile and quick to laugh. She had a

voice that was imbued with glee and delight. Her hands

gesticulated to punctuate her words. She was slim and

petite. Her tiny stature was a seemingly unimportant

descriptor, and yet, in the final analysis, her small build,

which may have led some to assume that she was diminutive,

could not be more wrong. She was strong and courageous,

bold and passionate. If Piercy was a color she would have

been a bright deep red, vibrant and daring.[32] Stereotypes

about size abound in this society. Although women do not

have to endure abuse the way that men do if they are small

in a culture that values BIG,[33] small is not necessarily

prized. So, from the outside one saw a small attractive

woman who was eager to laugh. So what does one do with that

information? Although a large number of women professors

are in teacher education compared to other disciplines or

fields of study, in the context of the academy where the

norm is a BIGWHITEMALE, a smallWhitefemale was already

challenging the norm.

The academy (and teacher education) concerns itself

with the intellect. Therefore, it would seem superfluous to

speak about physical characteristics. While it is true that

physical characteristics are not often a large part of the

---

[32] I realize that using a color as a symbol within a description could be problematic (i.e., the connotations around white and black); by using the color red I may evoke unanticipated reactions in some people.

[33] The irony is that BIG is only as in tall, not as in large for women. See Orbach (1985) Fat Is a Feminist Issue

descriptions of the teacher educators who have been studied,
I believe it is important in this investigation of Piercy
because women are too often judged by how they look. Their
looks afford them privileges or not. Piercy was tiny--and
yet within this tiny frame was a commanding, assertive self-
assured, secure, poised woman. It seems to me that people
underestimate others based on size--"might makes right"--
small is insignificant.[34]

Some of the descriptors that I use for Piercy are
sometimes used to diminish women. However, I want to
reclaim these: perky, spunky, pert. I want the old
connotations to be brushed away. In the context of the
academy these are often not the words you hear about a
scholar, about a professor. By using them I want to put "a
spoke in the wheel" (SEED workshop, 1991) of tradition.
That is, you can be a professor, a scholar, a teacher
educator and be perky, spunky, feisty, and pert.

It is unlikely that these descriptors would be used for
men and that is in part why they have been diminished. But
here I am describing a woman, and she had these traits. And
they are valuable in my eyes, and therefore they do not
reduce the person they describe. Part of what I am asking

---

[34] Some feminists believe that it is important to describe themselves physically because of this—describing for example if they are "fat" or "thin" (Frye, private communication, 1990) for this affects the way in which the world interacts with them. For example, fat oppression or body fascism becomes part of way the culture interacts with the individual and the individual with the culture. I realize that for some people the argument I am making about physical descriptors may actually backfire. That is, the stereotypes will just be reified. However, I think the acknowledging of how physicality in the U.S. culture (White specifically) is connected to so many stereotypes is important in this study.

you to do is to hear them in a new way.[35] Language has been
constructed within a male dominating sex/gender system.[36]
Therefore, words benefit those who hold the most power.
Many of the words used to describe women have undergone
semantic derogation (Spender, 1985) or have been used solely
to describe women.  It seems to me if this dissertation in
part is to challenge constructs in our heads, the words I
use to describe Piercy need to be heard differently (with
the "Inner ear," Daly, 1985), felt differently and regarded
differently (with the "Third eye," Daly, 1985).

As *you can see* we have a convoluted and complicated set
of physical realities.  She was a smallWhitewoman, two out
of three made her not the norm in the academy, and yet her
attractiveness afforded her certain privileges.  She was
spunky and pert and feisty--all woman-identified
characteristics defined as such by a "man-made language"
(Spender, 1985).  Do you see part of the complexities and
complications?  As such, these physical attributes were part
of her identity in the academy.  But only in part because of

---

[35] See Daly (1978) for her discussion of words located in a male dominating world. For example:

> *Hag* is also defined as "an ugly or evil-looking woman." But this, considering the source, may be considered a compliment. For the beauty of strong, creative women is "ugly" by misogynistic standards of "beauty." The look of female-identified women is "evil" to those who fear us. As for "old," ageism is a feature of phallic society. For women who have transvalued this, a Crone is one who should be an example of strength, courage and wisdom. (p. 15)

Daly goes on to say in her index of new words, "Although many of these are not new in the old sense, they are new is a new sense, because they are heard in a new way" (p.469). In the same way the words used to describe Piercy need to be heard in a new way.

[36] As Marilyn Frye (1990, private communication) pointed out, it is important to use that language that does not suggest that domination is complete or fixed. Therefore I do not use a "male dominant culture..." rather I use the word dominating which suggests to me that it is not a given, but rather something that can be constructed in other ways.

course her physical appearance did not define her. Her presence is imperative to consider, especially in teaching, and she had a presence that was substantial. She was a woman of substance. She packed a punch in her words and in her ways.

## What's In a Name?

The name "Piercy Sand" has special significance. In feminist theory naming is essential (Rich, 1977; Wescott, 1979); it empowers, it describes, it illuminates. Therefore the pseudonym of the woman I studied took on a special importance. For me her name had to connote something more than itself.

Two weeks into the semester we spoke about pseudonyms. I told her that I was thinking that Hope would be a great pseudonym for her. I went on to describe what I felt when I read her journal:

> Corinna: I thought what a great pseudonym [Hope would be] and then I was reading your journal and you were talking about *intellectual caring* and then I thought about Carey as a pseudonym. Hope or Care, both are themes. Just in terms of what you feel more comfortable with in terms of a pseudonym. Or if you don't like either....

> Piercy: That's interesting. Yeah hope is a real theme, we hope that this is going to be better. This optimism is important to me a, *a realistic optimism* but hope is more. *I care because I hope.*

Piercy believed that she had an optimism, but she declared it was a "realistic optimism." I concluded that she was hopeful. But as I came to realize it was more than that,

which she alluded to later on. Caring is engendered because
hope exists. The one precedes the other. During the same
meeting Piercy said, "I think if I don't hope then I forget
about the caring, they go together, yeah. But maybe hope is
the driving force behind caring."

However, later on Piercy stated that she didn't like
the name Hope. The next meeting we had we continued to talk
about pseudonyms.

> Piercy: I was thinking that hope doesn't seem like a
> volatile enough word for me. I mean I like it but I
> think it is a benign word and I don't think that I am
> benign. I think I'm, I don't know, I was thinking
> about desire, but that's not a good name. There's more
> than hope, it's almost, I don't know, there's something
> driving me or something. [Hope is] light and kind of
> bland, and positive. But I don't think that I am that
> way. I think there's something else there, that level
> where we really connect. It's I don't even know what
> it is. There's a vision out there. We are going to
> get there by God. It's that drive, keeping that word
> drive, we are a bit driven by this. It's a little out
> of our control. I don't know if that is exactly what I
> mean or not.

> Corinna: Well think about a name that you'd be
> comfortable with. I want the name to be symbolic but
> it doesn't have to capture everything because that
> would be in the explanation of who you are, right?

> Piercy: But it is more fun and interesting...I think a
> name does have a certain [meaning]. We want this to be
> special, really poignant. I think that maybe it's too
> early to do it because we haven't figured it all out.

Piercy was right. It was too early. It was only after we
had been together for the semester, and I had let the data
dance around in my mind, that I began to see more than hope,
more than care in Piercy.

She said that having a symbolic name would be fun and

interesting.  Piercy saw life, love, and teaching and
learning as fun and interesting.  The first week of class
she told me that she got an "intellectual kick" out of
teaching and learning.

I chose the first name Piercy because it suggested
sharpness.  Piercy was sharp and incisive and insightful.
The name Piercy suggested a person who got to the point,
which she did.  She was direct and honest and she valued and
honored those traits in others.  She also had the ability to
pierce through to the heart of the argument and take a
critical stance.

Piercing eyes is a phrase commonly used to describe
eyes which see through someone or something.  Yet, I think
there is a need to develop the concept of a piercing inner
eye.  I believe that Piercy had this kind of piercing inner
eye and one of her unique qualities was her
introspectiveness and reflectiveness.  Piercy asked the whys
that are often difficult to confront because they are being
asked of oneself.  It takes "[The] Courage to See" (Daly,
1985, p.xxiii), courage to be able to use a piercing inner
eye to look into one's own soul.  Daly (1985) speaks of this
piercing inner eye: "While looking... steadily with her
'ordinary' eyes, she sees...with her Third Eye" (Daly, 1985,
p. xxi).  These Vital Eyes and Inner Eyes ask the deepest
whys.  The Third Eye has the capacity to envision Other
Whys, Other ways, and Other worlds (Daly and Caputi, 1987,

pp. 172-180).

Piercy is also a gender neutral name.[37] I decided to go with a first name that was gender neutral because when we spoke at length about pseudonyms, she wanted to go with the name Earnest. She said that it spoke to a quality that she felt she had. I had felt uncomfortable with the name, feeling that it was not right somehow to have a man's name for a woman who felt being a woman was an important part of who she was as a person and as a teacher educator. When I mentioned that I thought Earnestine would be the female version of it she wanted to go with the male version:

> Piercy: I've got my name, maybe it is Earnest.

> Corinna: Earnestine, it would have to be

> Piercy: No it wouldn't (laughs). I don't want Earnestine. It's one of those fucking things they do to us to make us feminine. How about Earnest? I want to be, it fits. I like it. Aren't Earnies usually tough little suckers?

> Corinna: I don't want, obviously I am going to describe you as a woman and stuff like that, but I also don't want people to immediately conjure up a male type image. Do you know what I mean?

> Piercy: That might be a fun twist though. Why do names have to be a gender thing? Why do we have Earnest and we know the meaning of the word and we don't know the meaning for Earnestine. Right? Maybe that could be your opening statement. That names are gendered. And if you like the sound of a name why can't it be yours regardless of.... Why is not okay for us to have boys' names?

> Corinna: We can definitely think about this. Remember how you said we are going to have to keep track of how

---

[37] Piercy is a gender neutral name for me but I realize for others it may not be. Names of any kind evoke connotations that I cannot foresee. I am aware that the names I choose may be read completely differently than I intend them.

the name changes too.  Because I have a feeling it is going to change (laughter).

Piercy: I would be happy to be [Earnest].  That seems like it fits. What I have had before, Hope didn't fit.

And so it seemed important to me to honor the idea of a name that is gender ambiguous.

Piercy is also the last name of an author I greatly admire, Marge Piercy.  In <u>Woman on the Edge of Time</u> (1976) Marge Piercy's feminist imagination built a new society which stretched my feminist imagination to new possibilities in the same way that Piercy has.  So Piercy seemed to me to be an appropriate fit.

Sand is the last name of the pseudonym George Sand, used by the French author Amandine Aurore Lucie Dupin, Baronne Dudevant, 1804-76.  "A prolific and very influential writer in her time, she is remembered today chiefly for her life style as a passionate, free spirited woman..." ( Tuttle, 1986, p. 283).  Piercy also described herself as "gritty," and celebrated this "grittiness."  Piercy wrote in her journal:

> <u>Hope</u> seems too detached a word--I think I would prefer something with more <u>grit</u> maybe "Sand" Mark Twain's word for common sense--grounded in reality.  <u>Sandy</u> sounds too "flip" Sandra too "formal."  I'm working on it. (undated, Sunday 9:30, a.m.)

Piercy's own passionate free spirit needed to be acknowledged and I believe that Piercy "taught against the grain" (Cochran-Smith, 1991); therefore, the last name of Sand seemed apropos.  Ergo, Piercy Sand.

In this chapter I have indicated the limits of what I as a researcher can do in terms of rendering a portrait of Piercy Sand. I have presented the difficulty of describing a woman, given the androcentric vision I have internalized. By describing Piercy I tell also about myself. The way I interpret and tell of what I have seen and heard tells as much about me as it does about Piercy. I as "the knower [am] an intimate part of the known" (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986, p. 137) and as the painter am an intimate part of the painting. The room that I am painting in the house that feminist imagination builds is about Piercy but also about me.

I have only just begun to introduce you to Piercy in these pages, describing her and telling of the significance of her name. As the chapters unfold you will meet her in new and richer ways. Her actions, her beliefs, her commitments, and her experiences and historicity all combined to create a unique and complex woman teacher educator with feminist imagination. Piercy existed within a particular context which impacted her personally, politically, and pedagogically. In the next chapter I will explore Piercy's context and her courage which help describe and locate her more fully. However, the description remains still only partial.

# CHAPTER IV

## PIERCY SAND'S CONTEXT AND COURAGE: ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

> In building community, some brave soul has to start.
> There must, in truth, be initiatives. One by one
> people genuinely risk rejection or other injury as they
> escalate (or "descalate") the group into ever deeper
> levels of vulnerability and honesty. It is always
> individual, always unilateral, and always risky.
> That's the reality of it. (Peck, 1987, p. 233)[38]

> We must be willing to restore the spirit of risk--to be
> fast, wild, to be able to take hold, turn around,
> transform. (hooks, 1989, p. 54)

In this chapter I will explore Piercy's description and
feminist imagination in context. I will tell of the kinds
of courage Piercy displayed given the context she was in. I
will examine the ways in which the personal is pedagogical.
Piercy's description is integrally linked to her context.
Locating her within a structure tells much about Piercy, and
much about the structure in which she worked.

Piercy worked at a small, private, prestigious liberal
arts college, ranked in the top 50 in the country.
Academics were highly valued at Atwood, and in contrast to
the Big Ten university from which she graduated, Piercy
stated "sports players are looked down on." It was located
in the town of Morrison. Atwood College was a part of the
town, yet also apart from the town. This lush and wealthy
college was ironically located within an industrial town
that was populated by primarily poor and working poor (which

---

[38] Piercy cited M. Scott Peck as one source of her ideas about community.

Piercy described to her students as "underclass") Blacks and
Whites. Piercy stated that "Anything that happens in this
state affects our schools, our college, us, crime--
everything." She explained that some of the small
industries in the town supplied manufacturers in the
automobile industry. And as far as jobs go, the college was
the highest employer, the small factories number two. This
midwest state's economy had been ailing for a number of
years and many people who had secure jobs in the auto
industry no longer did. People in Morrison knew
unemployment. There were dilapidated houses in Morrison--
paint peeling, and falling apart. There were large and
luxurious houses in Morrison--designed after houses of
historic periods, with well-kept lawns and gardens. There
was a stark contrast between rich and poor. Piercy drew the
class' attention two and a half months into the semester to
the fact that the Gray Factory was not right beside the
college. "It is across the tracks in the low income part of
town. The Blacks who live in that particular area are more
affected by the pollutants."[39] Piercy talked often of the

---

[39] Piercy is alluding to the environmental racism and classism that exists within the United States. It is common for poor and/
or Black areas to have factories placed right beside them and also hazardous waste landfills. See the following articles on
these issues:

> Mohai, P. & Bunyan, B. (April/May 1992). Race, Poverty, and the Environment: The Disadvantaged Face Greater
> Risks. In EPA Journal. pp. 6-8.

> Bullard, R. (March/April 1992). In our Backyards: Minority Communities Get Most of the Dumps. In EPA Journal.
> pp. 11-12.

> U.S. General Accounting Office. (June 1, 1983) "Siting of Hazardous Waste Landfills and Their Correlation with
> Racial and Economic Status of Surrounding Communities" GAO/RCED-83-168. pp. 1-13.

children that her student teachers worked with, the poverty
that she and they saw and experienced "close up at a
distance."

When one drove to the college from outside the town it
was almost as if one was entering into an enclosed area.
There were no fences and no walls; however, the buildings
and the tone of the area were like a place apart. And in
some ways it was. The students and the parents of those
students were mostly privileged and mostly White.

These students and their parents wielded a fair amount
of power, based on class and race, in the society at large
and at Atwood. Piercy stated about a month before the end
of the semester:

> These kids do know, and there is a real awareness of
> the power that they do have over people, over their
> professors. And I do think some are abusive. I do
> think some are much more abusive because they know they
> can get away with it, again it has to do with social
> class and paying a lot of money to be here. I have
> heard parents say "I paid $40,000 for my kid to come
> here so far and you flunked her."

However, the people in the surrounding area, who were poor
and/or Black, did not have much power. An interesting
juxtaposition. Another interesting juxtaposition is that
you had rich White students who were going to be teachers
observing and teaching poor and often predominantly Black
children. Atwood students, as Piercy said to me the first
week of class, "see the kind of diversity that most have
never seen in their lives."

## The House of Education and Piercy's Role

Atwood had a beautiful campus. During the time of the study, Atwood's education program was located in a beautiful, quaint house. It was a small program with two people overseeing it--Piercy and her chairperson. Piercy had a wonderful office with a big picture window that looked out onto the campus. It was winter moving into spring at the time of this study. During the winter the snow topped the house (of education) and the surrounding trees in a picturesque fashion. Squirrels were foraging around for food on the front lawn in the snow. When spring came the trees were green and in bloom and birds were chirping in the trees. It was like a storybook house. However, the house was located on a side street a distance from the quad, the heart of this liberal arts campus, "marginalized" as Education was marginal on campus.

Piercy was hired to "shape up" the education program at Atwood. When I studied her she was in her third year of teaching there. This program had a long history of being, in her words, a "Mickey Mouse" program. "Educational Foundations" (ED 277), the course Piercy taught, was seen to be one that students could just slide through. Piercy had been brought in to create change, yet as an untenured faculty person that in itself was a challenge.

The students in the teacher education program at Atwood were all young, undergraduate students. Piercy only had

three post-graduates in elementary education in her first three years. She told post-graduates that it would take longer because courses were spread out and the program was set up for undergraduates. The program did not have the funds or the faculty to do it in a concentrated time frame. Both elementary and secondary students took her ED 277 class, but she oversaw only the elementary students for the three years they were in the program. Anyone was able to enroll in ED 277; students did not need to be committed to becoming teachers.

All the students who were sophomores in the class that I studied were "new program people." Piercy said that the "old program was awful, students took courses in five weeks. In the old program there were dwindling numbers, but the new program is over-enrolled." Piercy went on to say that "I'm concerned about that individual treatment and help. I really know the elementary education students personally, I have a three year relationship with them."

Piercy wanted to create a dynamic and demanding new program. Her chairperson had ties to the old program that she helped to build. Piercy and her chairperson had many personality conflicts and pedagogical conflicts. Yet they needed to work side-by-side until a new chairperson was hired (this chair was retiring and the search was underway as this study was taking place). This was a difficult and unsettling time for Piercy. Her openness to work with me

collaboratively at this time showed she was willing to trust that the benefits of this research overrode the risks and that she was adventurous. Piercy had already begun to change a lot of what was happening in the education program. Its reputation was turning around; enrollments were increasing. The "old ghosts" (Piercy's words) that Piercy talked about were being evicted from the quaint old house.

Atwood's education program was voted in as a department at the time of the study, before the search for a new chair began. When Piercy talked about the search for a new chair, Piercy said that she wanted someone who was committed to diversity and who was not oppressive. Another important feature was that the person would help build community and also help people examine their own thinking and assist them to see in different ways. Even in this comment it was evident how important diversity, community, and getting others to stretch their thinking were for Piercy.

In her syllabus Piercy explained the teacher education program by stating:

> The Atwood College Teacher Education Program prepares teachers competent in subject matter disciplines and in their ability to help their students in the pursuit of personal, intellectual and social growth and responsibility. Given this goal, the purpose of the foundations course is to sensitize students to critical issues in the field of education from a broad interdisciplinary viewpoint. The scope of topics is organized to give a preservice teacher understanding of important ideas and issues that the community of scholars in education have identified as important for improving schools and society. As a beginning course students will observe and discuss impacts of social context on students within schools as a springboard for

proceeding courses. Assignments will become a part of
an on-going professional portfolio that enable students
to assess strengths and continued growth as a
prospective teacher. (Sand, Syllabus Winter 1992, p.
1).

## The Context of "Educational Foundations" (ED 277)

I would suggest that there must always be a place in
teacher education for "foundations" people, whose
fundamental concern is with opening perspectives on the
many faces of the human world. (Greene, 1978, back
cover)

The class took place within a science building. The

building seemed new, clean, and well-equipped. The

classroom was big, bright, and airy. The room was carpeted.

Windows lined the one wall. The desks were new and

moveable. There was a coat rack on the back wall, which I

noticed as a nice amenity. A chalkboard covered the front

wall and had a pull down screen for an overhead. There were

two doors leading into the classroom. Piercy usually had a

VCR and monitor in the room, for she would show excerpts

from movies related to issues being discussed in class.

There was a "teacher desk" at the front of the room with a

portable podium on it for lectures. Piercy, however,

removed the podium and would walk around her desk and at

times sat behind it.

When the students were in small groups, which was

often, she would monitor the groups by walking around or

allowing the students to seek her out when necessary. She

used the "Jigsaw" (Cohen, 1986) technique every week so that

they would begin to develop collaborative interactions with one another.[40]

Except for the first day, students sat in a large circle. With 22 students in the class this was easy to do, given the size of the room and the desks which were not secured to the floor. Piercy most often sat in one of the desks that was part of the circle when she and the students were involved in discussions. I often sat in one of the desks within the circle, on the other side of the room. I sat there and took fieldnotes, audiotaped, and videotaped what was occurring. Researcher presence can be intrusive. However, since I was there from the inception of the class I became a common sight silently sitting there taking notes and watching.

By reading Piercy's syllabus one gets a feel for the kind of course that she created: "Educational Foundations ED 277" is where the students began to "build a foundation for students in the Atwood College Teacher Education Program by emphasizing social, political, ethical, philosophical and personal issues in education.... Issues such as social justice, social class, gender, ethnicity and equity will be the focus of our discussions, paper assignments and

---

[40] Cohen explains Jigsaw as using the "expert technique":

> Divide the class into groups with each group asked to prepare the answers to a different set of study questions. Students are told that they must make sure that each person in the group will be able to function as an expert on the answers to their set of questions in the second phase. For the second phase, divide up the experts so that there is one expert for each set of questions in each group. Then instruct the group to go over all questions in each group. Then instruct the group to go over all questions with the resident expert acting as discussion leader for his or her set of questions. This is an adaptation of Aaronson's (1978) Jigsaw Method. (1986, p. 86)

students' fieldwork on an on-going basis as we observe and reflect on situations in the classroom" (Sand, Syllabus Winter 1992, p. 1). The class met twice a week for two hours and lasted a full semester (in this case from the middle of January to the first week of May).

The course objectives were clearly laid out in Piercy's syllabus. She divided them into three groupings (content, process, and attitude):

Content objectives:

1. Students will synthesize and evaluate current issues [tracking, status of the teaching profession, conditions in the classroom and teacher autonomy today, inequity, hidden curriculum, culture, socialization, social class, race, equal opportunity, sex bias etc. p.3].

2. Students will apply specific concepts and identify equitable social relationships, interaction patterns and assumptions within field sites.

Process objectives:

1. Students will understand how to analyze concepts such as non sex-biased teaching and apply these concepts to experiences in the field.

2. Students will understand how to critically analyze both written and spoken texts.

3. Students will learn how to articulate positions orally and in written texts through collaborative group work.

Attitude objectives:

1. Students will explain their thinking about the purposes of schooling by writing a philosophy statement.

2. Students will self-assess their interest and awareness of critical issues by observing and reflecting on the required text and field experiences. (p. 2).

Piercy selected three required texts for this class:

> Foundations of Education by Ornstein/Levine[41];
> Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality by
> Jeannie Oakes;
> School and Society by Feinberg and Soltis.

And she had them read three chapters from Sadker and

Sadker's Sex Equity Handbook for Schools.

In reading the syllabus there was a definite emphasis

on the issues of equity and diversity. From reading the

syllabus students knew that they would be dealing with

issues of race, class, gender, ethnicity, and equity issues.

From watching her teach Piercy stressed that their attitudes

toward the critical issues in education were important for

them to reflect upon and do some self-assessment. (See

Appendix B for complete syllabus.)


## ED 277 Fulfilling a Gender Requirement: Problematizing Gender, Race, and Class

Atwood college had moved to creating gender and

ethnicity requirements for incoming students. Piercy had

been teaching this class for three years. The year that I

studied her, ED 277 passed the curriculum committee as a

course fulfilling the gender requirement and was listed in

the course catalogue as such. The college saw gender and

ethnicity as important for they had "institutionally

---

[41] Piercy decided after the study was over to go to a different textbook because she felt that this one did not get at the issues in the way that was most helpful. She explained the textbook that she was considering was set up as a "point-counterpoint" dialogue and was written by two women. Piercy said that the tone of the textbook would complement what she was trying to create in her classroom.

legitimated" (Piercy's words) these issues. During the

first month Piercy stated to me that these were "fascinating

times because these issues were being legitimated in a

liberal arts college." Piercy's view was wholly consistent

with the Association of American Colleges report in 1985,

about the need for integrity in the college curriculum.[42]

However, Piercy also stated that there is always a double

edged sword to a mandate such as this. For the students

began to voice the complaint that all they ever heard about

was these issues (which was in part their privilege

speaking, for those who are oppressed often think these

issues are not dealt with enough in teacher education

programs).

Three and a half months into the study Piercy talked

about how ED 277 had changed over the time she had taught

it:

> When I think about the first time I taught this course,
> it is now a whole different course. I know there are
> things that I do every year. I really try to develop
> their thinking, push their thinking beyond a surface
> level. I want them to see beyond the surface of a
> classroom, to look beyond the surface of life, to be
> able to see what is there, be more reflective people,
> to be more perceptive people, those are always things
> that I try to do, they are important. If anything I
> help them develop their writing, whether their thinking
> gets developed along with it, I wonder. I don't know
> if the two are always synonymous, you can express some
> pretty stupid thoughts [We laugh]. I think they all get
> better at writing, they internalize me as their
> audience. I ask them to clarify and state what they
> want to state and tell me what they think, that gets

---

[42] See Association of American Colleges. "Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community." The Association, Washington, D.C., 1988.

developed. But those are all such global things. If
you notice there isn't anything in [my discussion]
about gender. *But it's all about gender.* It's like it
is necessary but not sufficient [all the other things I
try to develop], but you've got to see gender issues or
forget it. (emphasis added)

When Piercy said "it's all about gender," she was
right. Women are half the population and all experiences
affect women, "because everything affects women, every issue
is a women's issue" (Tuttle, 1986, p. 108). However, gender
also implies that both women and men are involved. What
affects women does affect men because it affects humanity.
Also, gender intersects and overlaps with race, class,
culture, and sexual identity; one cannot be facilely
factored out from the other.

Piercy had the students complete a gender assignment,
which she paired with the tracking issues in
Oakes' (1985) Keeping Track: How Schools Structure
Inequality. She felt this helped them develop their
capacity to "see beyond the surface of a classroom to look
beyond the surface of life." Piercy wanted them to examine
the institutional bias in relation to gender, race, and
class that exists within schools. The "Field assignment:
Gender" was used by Piercy to help the students begin
developing a "consciousness of seeing." In this assignment
the students explored the classroom in terms of seating,
displays, language, and task allocation. Teacher-student
interaction was also explored including discipline and the
quality of content. Piercy had students observe the

hallways, cafeteria, playground, and library. She also had them take note of the personnel's gender and the messages that this might be sending to students (see Appendix B for a full description of the assignment).

The subtext of this assignment, as others in her class, was "to explore the politics of print" (Bigelow, 1989, p. 640) and the politics of interaction. Piercy wanted her students to start seeing the subtext of curriculum, activities, and actions within schools. Piercy's curriculum explicitly explored issues such as "survival of the fittest, caste system, hierarchy, tests-stratify [people], and language stratification," which were topics discussed about two weeks into the semester. She wanted them to become critical readers of text, including living text. Piercy also wanted her students to be a critical reader of her. During the second week of class, Piercy said:

> Part of the agenda here is to have them reflect on
> what's happening, not to get me to do all the
> reflecting on what's happening. I'm there to set up
> this environment, to let it happen. Get that kind of
> consciousness, critiquing my [teaching] and letting
> them critique me. That is part of the goal, that's not
> happening yet. I can almost say that's never happened
> till half way through [the semester].

Piercy wanted her students to be critical readers of all they saw and heard. She also wanted them to challenge her because she believed this would promote critical thinking. Piercy valued students giving her opposite points of view because she felt that it helped them develop a questioning stance towards authority (in her judgment a

necessary characteristic of a change agent). As Emily replied in her interview after being asked if felt she could challenge Piercy, "She's made it very clear that is acceptable. Because she is open to our input and she's not beyond critically analyzing her own thoughts, and beliefs, and ideas. That's a wonderful characteristic to have."

## The First Day of Class: A Door Into Community

On the first day of class, Piercy was out in the hall greeting students as they entered. I had known she was a cheerful, warm, and open person, but now I saw it in action in the classroom.

Before the students arrived Piercy wrote the following agenda on the board:

1. Introductions
2. Purpose of the course
3. Jigsaw

Piercy had an agenda every class meeting on the blackboard so that the students would know what was planned for that day.

Piercy introduced herself and me. She told her students that this time as she taught ED 277 she would be doing something very special, she would be studying her own teaching. She wanted to think hard about her teaching especially in regard to fulfilling the gender requirement. She told of her own experiences in graduate classes where she had learned about liberatory pedagogy, and yet

ironically had the most oppressive teachers.

Piercy told them that they would be creating their own philosophy of teaching and that her main philosophy for herself was that she was a learner. Piercy then told them that how she learned was by others disagreeing with her. She stated, "You get points in here for disagreeing versus agreeing with me. I want you to come up with counterpoints to my argument." (In the next class she delineated the role of "challenger" in group work, whose job it was to push their group members' thinking.) Piercy then held up the three books they would use in this course. She told them that the authors came with different perspectives and that "they are just different voices in the collective. You will disagree with some of the things they say. Same with me, if I come up with an argument and you disagree, say so." Piercy then said that she "plants" articles in their readings that she herself disagrees with so that it will generate dialogue. She also said that she "plants" gender biased things that she hoped they would be able to point out and notice.

Piercy gave out the exam questions during this first class. She told them, "I want to take away the notion that you have to figure out what I think." She also gave them a criteria list to follow in terms of writing papers. To illustrate what she didn't want in a paper, she read them an example of a paper with lots of stereotypes in it. She

read, "Parents of children of poverty don't care." She asked the students if they saw any problems with it. One male student responded with, "The person is just stating facts, not supporting them." Piercy agreed and stated that the person made a "pretty big leap" and used circular reasoning by stating "they don't care because their parents don't care." Piercy cautioned the students to look at the complexity of an issue instead of jumping to conclusions.

Piercy then read the definition of a liberal arts college published by Atwood College and keyed in on "self-questioning" spirit. Piercy told them that she wanted them to create that spirit in this classroom. She said that she wanted to help them to disagree and develop their own voice. But she also said, "The first thing we need to do is get comfortable with each other as a collective." She introduced and implemented an activity which would help them "loosen up." She had the students create a mnemonic in pictorial form to help their peers remember each other's names. (For example, I drew a picture of an apple core, so that the students could remember my name, Corinna.) As Piercy encouraged someone to volunteer and go first, she said, "We'll find out who is a risk-taker." Piercy went over to a woman and asked her to share first since "she was hiding," but quickly Piercy said she was teasing. There was lots of laughing going on throughout this exercise. The students seemed good-natured and happy about participating

in this ice breaker.

Piercy then talked about tracking and said that they would be looking for hidden curricula. "What are the hidden messages?" She told them that she would bring in a bulletin board and other materials to find hidden messages in them.

All during the class Piercy was mobile. Her stride was bouncy and buoyant. She laughed constantly and was quick to smile. I sat there and thought what a cheerful and positive teacher she was.

## What's in One Class? The Door Opening to Who Piercy Was

Although this was the first class, it gives us a strong sense of who Piercy was and what she wanted for her students. We saw a cheerful welcoming teacher. She laughed and teased her students and wanted them to be at ease. Within her discussion she showed that she valued risk-taking. She told them that she valued learning about her own teaching. By citing the example of her own experience in graduate school, she told them she did not want to be oppressive as she was helping them to understand liberatory education. She stressed that they were a collective, in a wider collective, and that members of that collective would not always agree. She tried to encourage their disagreeing with her. In essence she invited conflict into the classroom (and in the next class even told them "conflict is positive"). She told them that she wanted them to develop

skills in searching out the hidden curriculum as well as the explicit curriculum. She told them that evidence is very important, that issues are complex and jumping to conclusions was not what she wanted them to do. She gave them the criteria by which they would be assessed, including the final exam questions. During this first class, Piercy did most of the talking, except when students shared the mnemonic for their name. This, however, was unusual. During subsequent classes she urged her students to speak up and out.

Opening the door to Piercy's teaching by entering into one of her classes begins to show how Piercy enacted her ideas, beliefs, goals, and who she was personally in this classroom.

## Piercy's Thoughts on That First Class: Keys to Her Ways of Thinking

When Piercy and I discussed what her overall feelings were after the first class, she said:

> They didn't seem spontaneous, not really guarded, but there was a lack of spontaneity, lack of laughing, lack of, not openness. I don't think I have a read on them yet. I think they are great. I didn't get anyone that looked glazed over. It will be a challenge to get them to come together as a group. There are real differences in the group there. I guess every group you could say that about. Maybe it was me, less interaction, less letting go, I was playing it pretty safe.

Piercy wanted her students to be spontaneous, open, and to have fun. She perceived that they did not laugh much during

this class.  I, however, perceived that they did.  She may have felt that they did not cohere as a group.  Given that this was the first class, it makes sense that they were not completely spontaneous.  They did not know Piercy, each other, or me.  It could be that because this class was being studied added an element of guardedness on the students' part.  But Piercy wanted so much to connect with her students that she picked up on the slightest distancing on their parts.  She then turned in on herself, and asked if maybe it was her.  This was an example of how she was reflective about the things that she said and judgments she made.

I asked Piercy if she felt she was on display because I was there and if she had behaved differently in any way. She replied, "I think so, yeah. I think so a little bit. I don't think what I said or what I thought about was different.  But there was a consciousness."

For Piercy being open was essential and being defensive was problematic.  It was problematic especially for someone who intends on becoming a teacher.  Piercy stated:

> I don't like working with those kind of [defensive] people because it comes from insecurity. I tend to shut them out and push them away.  Part of me worries about that.  Maybe I'm picking a certain kind of person, encouraging a certain kind of person to be a teacher, who isn't defensive.

I then asked Piercy if she thought nondefensiveness was an important quality to have:

> I think it is. Many qualities are needed to make a good

teacher, but I think that I would have to say one of them would be non-defensiveness. I'd even go to say that the people that I've met that are really competent are not defending themselves, they are asking about themselves. To not be defensive is not realistic. But to know your own defenses, to understand them, is how you grow. Some people say that defenses are not good, what you don't do is ever deface a person or make them feel bad. I guess what I would argue is that sometimes you want to take the risk, to be honest enough with the person. Sometimes it doesn't hurt to get a defense routine going. You can't do it with everybody though. I feel good when I get to the point where I can say, "I don't like what you did there" where they can accept it. Then we can talk from that point. Maybe that's not defense routines at all, maybe that's getting to a level of trust.

Piercy saw defensiveness as natural for human beings, and being introspective about one's own defensiveness as important. She stated that she wanted to be able to get to the point with someone where she could be honest with them. As she spoke, she decided that perhaps it was trust that she was talking about.

She went on to say how the students often developed certain dispositions in ED 277 such as feeling empowered as a teacher and valuing group work:

They come in thinking of themselves as a cog in a big machine, and they really can't do too much. Some of them I don't think get too much further than that. I want them to think about that issue of who they are in the larger system. What I talk to them about is how much power they do have. Gaining respect in the community, when you are a really good teacher and you care about kids. That's a type of power. In a hierarchy, on the surface you might not think you do [have power] but you do have power. I want to help them feel empowered. I want to help them feel that teaching is a real empowering role. That is what I get my jollies from, getting the group to see that teaching can be empowering and that they can make a difference. That yeah, they want a job and money, but they are doing something really important. With me, it is real

important at this age to ask themselves, "Ok what do I
really want that will make me happy and successful?
What is it that really moves me inside, and [how does
that compare with] what my parents want me to be?  What
am I going to make money at?  They question at that
point of life.  It makes it fun for me because it's
interesting to them, really meaningful to them.  That
was a real kernel issue: Who will I be and how will I
affect the world?  That's the fun of teaching.

Piercy herself felt empowered and powerful as a teacher.

She knew that she could make a difference in people's lives.

She wanted the same for her students.  So part of her

purpose for ED 277 was to help them see themselves as

"change agents."

Piercy wanted to create a community in her classroom,

where students come to value their peers' ideas and help.

She created multiple opportunities for students to work

together.  She used the Jigsaw technique consistently so

that the students would collaborate.

I want the students to learn to value working with each
other.  No one knew about Jigsaw.  They have never
worked in groups, [they don't see the value in] working
with somebody. I don't think I really get there with
them until I work with them in methods because then
they go out and teach kids and talk about kids, just
like we are doing [referring to her and my working
together].  Then all of a sudden, it is really good to
work with someone else, teaming when they observe. If I
thought of something that was most lacking, is value
working with each other more.  They like it but I don't
know if they value it.

Piercy saw ED 277 as fulfilling certain purposes that

went beyond the content.  There were process and attitudinal

purposes also.  The nebulous purposes of feeling empowered

and collegial were very important to Piercy as well as the

emphasis on being able to "read the word and the world"

(Freire and Macedo, 1988).

## The Purposes of ED 277 and Risky Business

In the context of a small liberal arts college where teaching was valued and a private school where the students paid large amounts to attend, teaching about issues of equity and oppression was never without risk; and these issues created fear and loathing in some. Students who were immersed in privilege and unearned domination (see McIntosh, 1988) might or might not embrace issues of equity and oppression (see Anyon, 1981). Piercy said during the first week of the semester that the students are "usually kind of naive and come from small farming communities."

As Piercy reported to me during the first week of the semester, most of the students loved the diversity that they experienced in the schools of Morrison. "They feel so good that they see things that they have never seen before." She told of one wealthy student who came from a very small town and was working with Morrison children who were poor. This woman during the foundations class was not open to the issues Piercy presented, yet ended up saying, "I now understand issues that I never understood before." Piercy said she was "really impressed with the change in her thinking. She saw the value of the challenge I offered her and she said she valued complexity."

Many students, according to Piercy, were willing to

struggle and grapple with issues of diversity once they encountered children out in the schools. Some, however, were not. Piercy told of a student who was in her last year of the program when Piercy first came to Atwood. Piercy said this student

> did really well in the units she taught kids. But it was just her unacceptance of these really diverse kids. I had to confront her on this. Here she was in her last year. I'm thinking, do I let this slide by? Or do I tell them? Partly out of self-interest and partly out of interest for them, I want to let them know that is unacceptable. I might as well send message early about what this program is about.

Piercy saw a discrepancy between what most students were willing to wrestle with out in the field and in the foundations course. Why was it that in the foundations course these very privileged White students seemed to reject the need for learning about issues of equity, diversity, and oppression? Was it just that they did not see the urgent need for learning about the children's reality since they did not have these children in front of them? Or was it more complicated than that? Did they feel accused of being racist, sexist, or classist when they themselves felt that they wanted to do well by all children?[43] Or was it that without actual children in front of them, they needed to examine how equity, diversity, and oppression played out in their own lives? Did the issues of social justice challenge their very way of being in the world?

---

[43] Doug Campbell suggested this to me after a discussion he had with Eliot Singer about the students at Michigan State University and their reluctance to delve into issues of equity and diversity.

The class that I studied was different than other ED
277s Piercy had taught at Atwood. In the past there had
been African American students in her class and in the
previous year she had a lesbian student who was "out." In
this class there was only one person of color, Tasha, who
was half Filipina and half White. There were only three
people who (seemingly) were not monied: Dan, who worked at
the automobile factory to support his education; Emily, who
worked in a homeless shelter for children full-time as she
went to school; and Keith, who was middle-class but did not
come from a wealthy background. Dan and Emily were older
than the average undergraduate, Keith was nineteen.

In the past, Piercy had students who on their own
confronted the racism and elitism of their peers. This was
not the case during this semester because of the relatively
homogeneous class composition. As Paley (1989) forewarns
us, "It is often hard to learn from people who are just like
you. Too much is taken for granted...in the classroom it
diminishes the curiosity that ignites discovery" (p. 56).
Ellesworth (1989) attests to the significance of class
composition for the teacher educator:

> The terms in which I can and will assert and unsettle
> "difference" and unlearn my positions of privilege in
> future classroom practices are wholly dependent on
> Others/others whose presence--with their concrete
> experiences of privileges and oppressions, and
> subjugated or oppressive knowledges--I am responding to
> and acting with in any given classroom...I am trying to
> unsettle received definitions of pedagogy by
> multiplying the ways in which I am able to act on and
> in the university both as the Inappropriate/d Other and

as the privileged speaking/making subject trying to unlearn that privilege. (p. 323)

Although the students knew from reading the syllabus that issues of race, class, gender, and ethnicity would be discussed, the context of this class was a general foundations course instead of a specialized anti-bias course where students knew specifically what the focus was. For example, the mixed-gender class that Lewis (1990) wrote about was similar to Piercy's in that it was a group of young women and men in an education class; however the class was different than Piercy's in the sense that Lewis' title of the class was "Seminar in Social Class, Gender and Race in Education." In Lewis' class there was self-selection going on, as the students knew what they would be dealing with in the classroom on some level. In Piercy's class they knew it fulfilled a gender requirement, and yet what that meant to students varied. The level of notification about the nature of the content of the course was very different in Lewis' class as compared to Piercy's. Some students in Piercy's class ended up saying that they wanted what I call a "warning label" on the course, stipulating that students would be dealing with sexism.

Piercy's son was a student at Atwood and told his mother that she had a reputation as a "flaming feminist" with the students. Keith, a student in her class, said that he would not consider her a "rabid feminist" or a "raving feminist," but a feminist nonetheless. In his interview he

said:

> I mean, she's, she's not like a rabid feminist. But, I
> mean, she definitely, she knows that women can, I
> dunno, can support themselves and all of that.  I hate
> to use the word "rabid," but "raving," maybe, if that's
> better.  Yeah, like raving feminists.

What the difference between a "flaming," a "rabid," and a
"raving" feminist is, I am not sure.  But the issue of
labels is interesting, especially in the time of "backlash."
What did the students think they would be getting?  Some
students assumed that Educational Foundations would be
dealing with the "how to's" of teaching and that was what
some wanted, certainly not "flaming," "raving," or "rabid,"
or even ordinary feminism.  As Ellen stated:

> Well, this is my first education course. It's not
> really what I expected. I guess I expected more of a
> just, "This is how you deal with the kids," and going
> through, um, you know, like learning how to make a
> homework assignment or just learning more hands-on sort
> of a thing.  And this is, it's a lot different,
> learning about, uh.  I didn't realize we were gonna be
> learning about so much with the gender and the
> tracking.  I mean, I didn't even know what tracking
> really was.  So it's different from what I expected.  I
> mean, I still am learning a lot, but I guess, maybe, as
> I take more classes, it'll be more hands-on.  But this
> class was really wide I guess.

Although Ellen did not suggest that Piercy was a particular
brand of feminist in this excerpt, she did say there was a
dysjunction between what she thought she would get and "so
much about gender and tracking."

Students' concerns about the course added to the
potential risk Piercy faced as a faculty member at Atwood.
The administration placed a lot of value on what students

said about their professors. During Piercy's interim
review--half way to tenure--the committee had used the
previous years' student assessment forms to ask her
questions about them in relation to her teaching. Because
students had a lot of power there and Piercy was untenured,
if the students did not like her, her future at Atwood could
have been tenuous. At one point Piercy was called into the
Provost's office because a parent requested that he talk to
her. This parent was concerned because his daughter had
plagiarized, and therefore she might not be able to get into
the elementary education program. Piercy explained to the
Provost that with the student's low grade point she would
not be able to enter the program because she did not meet
the grade point requirement. Piercy said the second week of
the semester, "I look back on my experience at my last
teacher education position and I haven't ever been as
careful, or as monitoring of myself. I've never done things
that were unfair, and I'm thoughtful, but there are students
like that [who plagiarized] who force you to be on guard."

The president of Atwood was a Methodist minister and
Atwood was a conservative bastion in many ways. For
example, in their bylaws, the administration fought to keep
sexual identity--"homosexuality"--unmentioned in their
policy of anti-discrimination. Darcy, the one woman who
came to speak to Piercy's class about lesbian and gay
issues, did not "come out" until she received tenure. Yet,

despite the layer of conservatism, Piercy talked about the collegial relationships, the intellectual stimulation, and the emphasis on good teaching as facets of Atwood that she highly valued. She felt that morality was a valued topic by colleagues at the college because it was part of the school mission. She believed that the mission at Atwood was to help students develop intellectually, psychologically, and ethically and to become socially responsible citizens, and that this belief was shared by faculty who came to Atwood.

Along with the purpose of students becoming critical thinkers and self-reflective on critical issues in education, another purpose of ED 277 was that it screened out those students who really weren't interested in education. Piercy deliberately planned for students to do a lot of work in this course. For her the teaching profession entailed a lot of work and her students needed to be prepared for this. Piercy thought of work not only in the literal sense of reading and writing papers, but also the hard work of being reflective, introspective, and willing to engage in dialogue with peers around critical issues in education. Piercy expressed her concern about one student who she felt was not sincere and direct. Piercy worried that she would not have what it took to be a teacher. Toward the end of the course Piercy stated:

> For a 200 level course there is a lot of work to do. But in a way it is a good screener for the kids who really aren't that interested in education. Getting out and doing these things, thinking about education,

> reading about it and writing about it, are good ways to
> help them and me to know [whether they should be in
> education]. I think the word gets out on the street of
> how much work it is, then the ones [who don't want to
> work] don't take it. The old history of the course was
> that you didn't have to come and you didn't [have to
> work hard].

She was a hard grader (students' perceptions) and this in

turn could cause some animosity (although she let them

rewrite their papers). She also had the rule during this

semester that all assignments had to be handed in on time to

receive full credit.[44] She took off one grade point per day

until it was handed in (Syllabus, p. 6). Sometimes students

were not pleased with the low grades that they received from

her, or her late policy. It did cross Piercy's mind that

she could be denied tenure if the students complained about

her, and from her statements about a month before the end of

the semester, it was clear her job was extremely important

to her:

> They are not used to having their papers graded this
> hard, but it's important to develop careful thinking
> and writing in teachers. I think if I ever got denied
> tenure--I think I would just die. What would I ever
> do?

Beyond the purpose of gatekeeping, ultimately Piercy's

purpose was to develop a community of people who were honest

and open, and willing to take risks with one another. This

was unusual for many students (who expressed that in some

other classes they did not even know who their classmates

---

[44] Piercy told me that in the past she had run into the dilemma of students handing in all their papers at the end of the semester which made it nearly impossible for her to get her grading done on time. Piercy, however, was understanding of people who were ill or had another legitimate excuse for not being able to get their papers in on time.

were)--for classrooms in many student's conceptions were places where one "sits and gits" information, not where honesty and openness were part of the pedagogical requirements. Students were not necessarily used to this way of being in a classroom and not necessarily receptive to it.

## Ordinary, Transgressive, and Political Courage

Piercy tried to create a community with her students that was different from what they were used to. As Peck (1987) states, it takes "some brave soul...to start" (p. 233) an unconventional kind of interaction. Creating an authentic community takes courage, and, I believe, different kinds of courage. Courage is often seen to be a generic construct and yet, as I saw Piercy move in the world of teaching and her peers, I realized that for a woman teacher educator with feminist imagination there was no such thing as a generic construct. It was very much situated in gender, race, class, and sexual identity. It seemed in Piercy's case, the operative social construct was gender. She was an untenured woman who was trying to usurp the status quo in rich White young people who do not necessarily see any problems (as they state, these issues were an earlier generation's problem, it wasn't a problem in theirs) and she was trying to create relationships that entailed new kinds of connections between a teacher educator and her

students.

Rogers (1993) has delineated courage in girls and
women. Rogers states:

> Courage may be in fact dangerous at times--when
> knowledge is new and fragile: when reaching out for a
> desired connection may lead to a painful repudiation:
> when speaking without any real possibility of being
> heard may lead to betrayal or abandonment. But the
> ways girls and women, and women of different
> generations, negotiate these difficult issues together
> mark the fate of female courage in families and
> schools, and in the culture at large. (p. 281)

Rogers outlined two of the three kinds of courage that
I think operated as Piercy interacted with her class.[45]

There was "ordinary courage" as Rogers describes it:

> In 1300, courage was also linked very closely with
> speaking. One definition of courage was "to speak
> one's mind by telling one's heart" (Simpson and Weiner,
> 1989, as cited in Rogers, 1993, p. 271). At this time,
> the definition of courage drew speaking into relation
> with heart and mind, intellect and love. (p. 271)

Ordinary courage means to speak one's mind by telling one's
heart. Heart and mind, intellect and love go together.
There is not the mind/body split--the passions dissected
from the intellect. Instead it is courageously telling what
one knows on multiple levels. This Piercy did. She spoke
what she felt was true and right and within a context of
uncertainty, about her future and about how much opposition

---

[45] One of the reasons I am distinguishing between the kinds of courage that it may take is because of recent discussion I was
involved in about what it took for the K-12 teachers to do this kind of liberatory and critical pedagogy. I stated that I
thought it took ordinary courage, to speak one's mind by telling one's heart. Joan Hunault was skeptical about the notion of
courage for she felt that dealing with children did not seem necessarily to take courage in the classroom. She distinguished
between dealing with issues of equity and oppression with your students and then with your colleagues and peers. She
suggested that maybe it took a political courage with colleagues and peers. I think in the case of Piercy being at Atwood that
it did takes three different kinds of courage: ordinary courage, transgressive courage, and Joan's concept of political courage.

she would face from her students in regard to issues of
equity and diversity. There were times in the classroom
where it seemed that Piercy's was the lone voice saying--
"Really believe me there are inequities--there are biases--
there are problems--trust me on this." And so this ordinary
courage in a context of risk was no small feat.

She could have taken the safe route and taught her
class without the "hot issues" associated with equity and
oppression. But as Piercy said, she did not feel that was
teaching. We had been talking two weeks into the semester
about how complicated and complex these issues were, that we
had so few models in teacher education of how to teach these
issues, that in many ways we were making this up as we went
along.[46]

> I'll never teach without hot issues. I really mean
> that. I think teaching is meaningless without getting
> at some controversial issues. I don't think that's
> teaching, I really don't. I think that's just talking,
> that's what that is. I don't think that's getting them
> to really think. In order to get people to think and
> to learn, I think you've got to hit at what's core to
> them. Don't you think that's what teaching is all
> about? I guess I'm really self-interested I don't want
> to be meaningless and I do it because I like the
> challenges. So to be honest I do it because it's good
> for students but also because it's good for me. I don't
> think that's wrong, it's critical.

Teaching about these "hot issues" required courage.
However, ordinary courage does not describe all that was
necessary. Piercy had authority in the classroom because

---

[46] When I did an equity workshop in Singapore, Peggy McIntosh said something to me that made a lot of sense to talk about
how we are all struggling with these issues in educational environments, "We're making this up as we go along." There are
no models.

she was the teacher. However, since the students had quite

a lot of power at Atwood, what Piercy did required what

Rogers (1993) calls transgressive courage. "Transgressive

courage involves going beyond the strictures of forbidden

knowledge of relationships, including cultural conspiracies

of silence that surround women's knowledge" (Rogers, 1993,

p. 275). Transgressive courage is different from ordinary

courage in that there is a daring quality involved. As

Rogers states, it involves what is "unspeakable and unspoken

in the public world" (p. 275), speaking of things that may

not be commonly spoken of. Piercy spoke of subjects, and

sought the kind of relationship with her students, that were

not the norm within a teacher education classroom.

But courage does not end with these two kinds, ordinary

and transgressive. For Piercy interacted within a context

of peers. Piercy reported that her chairperson was both

openly and resolutely hostile and passively aggressively

hostile toward her. So with her peers her work required a

political courage, for there were work-related political

ramifications, to speaking one's mind by telling one's heart

in her context. Piercy was candid, frank, outspoken,

truthful, and spontaneous. Therefore, it took political

courage when untenured and students could react badly to the

conflict they might experience and witness.

Although all three kinds of courage are integrally

linked, they remain contextual and complex in their own

unique ways.  All three tell of the ways in which the
personal, the pedagogical, and the political merge.

Piercy's courage in part grew out of a "realistic
optimism" about the possibility for change within a system.
Piercy remained realistically optimistic yet honest about
her dealings with her peers and those who were her
supervisors.   At a dinner for the candidate for Provost
Piercy told the her about the realities at Atwood.  Piercy
stated toward the end of the semester:

> I was honest with her about the problems, but I also
> said there is real potential, real possibility here.
> She could get some support if she really wanted it. I
> don't know, maybe I am being pie in the sky.  I don't
> know. I think there is a time where there is
> controversy,  and then people come to some kind of
> consensus on an issue and that's maybe when change
> happens.  I don't know.  I don't think things will
> change drastically but there are times when there is
> more likelihood that things will happen.

This excerpt indicates the kind of disposition to realistic
optimism that Piercy had.  She recognized the problems, was
honest about them, but saw the potential and possibility.
She could be courageous in the face of problems because she
could envision the potential and possibility for growth and
change.


## Courage, Strength, and Empowerment--the Tension Within: What Doors are Opened But What Windows are Closed?

> As we reach for words, women will do well to scrutinize
> synonyms for *courageous*.  Brewsters will find fitting
> the adjective *brave*, which is derived form the Old
> Italian and Old Spanish *bravo*, meaning wild.  Another
> word describing the Bravery of Wild women is *dauntless*.
> The import of this word is suggested by the verb *daunt*,

which is derived form the Latin *domitare*, meaning to tame, and which means "to sap the courage of and subdue through fear." Refusing to be tamed, sapped, or subdued, Undaunted women become Dauntless and Undauntable. Valuing be-ing, women are Valorous/ Valiant. As Amazons women are Audacious. As Phoenixes we are Intrepid, Fearless, rising from the fires that were meant to destroy, entering the Fire that we mean to enjoy. (Daly, 1984, pp. 284-285)

Along with the context-specific courage, Piercy was also willing to show her rejection of someone's ways of thinking even if the person was powerful. In many ways she was fearless. She told me a story about three months into the semester of being at a function that the dean of her spouse's college gave. The dean was outraged at a recent animal rights action that had destroyed data dealing with animal experimentation. While Piercy talked about him she was laughing. Her amusement about how others like this dean seemed to be taken aback by her showed her irreverence about other people's power, although she was aware that her actions could cost her.

His wife said he called it a terrorist event and I rolled my eyes at that. He just looked at me. I thought, "People lose their lives in terrorist activities, some guy lost his data." I'm transparent and he knew what I was thinking. The guy gave me very little eye contact the rest of the night. He was very guarded, I really didn't mean to be so oppressive. But I thought give me a fucking break. When dessert came I said, "I don't eat dessert." He said "We need some fat guys, those skinny guys think too much," and he looked at me. The whole night was awful. Talk about fucking male White power (laughing) I mean, give me a break.

Piercy did not hesitate to be irreverent and take risks in multiple contexts. These qualities of courage, irreverence, and risk-taking came out in her teaching. The personal is

pedagogical. For example, Piercy's irreverence helped her to be critical of anyone and all written texts. It also affected the way that others perceived her, in favorable and unfavorable ways.

Piercy suggested that she had been oppressive in this instance with her spouse's dean. A disposition that Piercy had was that she was willing to look at herself and admit that she could be domineering. She used oppression slightly differently than I would. She saw her way of being as similar to the ways in which oppressors would behave-- mimicking their oppressive ways. That is, the rolling of the eyes, dismissing another. I think of the word oppression more as Frye (1983) uses it. According to Frye, those who do not have the power in a particular society (for example, White women in relation to White men) cannot oppress those with power.[47] They can be dominating and obnoxious, but Piercy's use of oppressive in this context would not quite fit the way that Frye explains it. The person that she was speaking to had more power than she did; therefore, she did not have the coercive or legitimate power to be able to be oppressive to him.

Yet, the subversiveness that Piercy showed is important in and of itself. Her actions were an example of Piercy's irreverence to authority. And her description of her own

---

[47] Context, however, is an important issue in all of this. For example, given a group of White women and women of color, the women of color can be oppressed by the White women.

oppressiveness is important for this in part speaks to the
way that Piercy saw herself as being empowered, as having
power, and being able to act in oppressive ways. This was
her reality. Therefore, in some ways she saw what she did
and how she acted as possible and attainable by other women,
including her women students. It was seemingly effortless
for her to speak up and out. Therefore, she believed it was
possible for all women. This courage was a wonderful
attribute that Piercy possessed, and was part of her unique
character. However, in what ways did her own strength and
courage blind her to other women's situations that militated
against courage and strength? What windows were shut into
other people's realities?

## Courage and "Whiteliness"

Piercy's courage was an essential part of who she was
as a woman, as a teacher educator, and as a feminist. This
courage opened up her imagination to the power that women
could seize for themselves. But Piercy had a particular
history and set of circumstances that made this courage
conceivable for her. Piercy was White. Although from a
working class background, she was well off financially.
Piercy was heterosexual. And Piercy was well educated, with
a history of success in school and work relationships. All
these circumstances helped her to envisage her own power and
efficacy. Other women may have histories or circumstances

that make seizing courage and/or power inconceivable to them. Any discussion of courage needs to be situated. How much is the concept of courage, empowerment, and risk-taking connected to "white privilege" (McIntosh, 1989) and "whiteliness" (Frye, 1983-1992)? Both McIntosh and Frye are referring to the ways in which being White affords not only conferred dominance but implies a way of being in the world and a way of seeing oneself in relation to the world. Frye explains her conception of whiteliness:

> We need a term in the realm of race and racism whose grammar is analogous to the grammar of the term 'masculinity'. I am tempted to recommend the neologism 'albosity' for this honor, but I'm afraid it is too strange to catch on. So I will introduce 'whitely' and 'whiteliness' as terms whose grammar is analogous to that of 'masculine' and 'masculinity'. Being white-skinned (like being male) is a matter of physical traits presumed to be physically determined; being whitely (like being masculine) I conceive as a deeply ingrained way of being in the world. (1983-1992, p. 151)

As I speak of courage, risk taking, and irreverence, I think that these constructs have different meanings and outcomes for women as opposed to men. They have different meanings and outcomes for White people and people of color.[48] They have different meanings and outcomes for the rich and the poor. Piercy was able to be courageous, a

---

[48] McIntosh (1988) wrote the meaning of her White privilege:

> I remembered the frequent charges from women of color that white women whom they encounter are oppressive. I began to understand why we are justly seen as oppressive, even when we don't see ourselves that way. At the very least, obliviousness of one's privileged state can make a person or group irritating to be with. I began to count the ways in which I enjoy unearned skin privilege and have been conditioned into oblivion about its existence, unable to see that it put me "ahead" in any way, or put my people ahead, overrewarding us and yet also paradoxically damaging us, or that it could or should be changed. (p. 4)

risk-taker, and irreverent in part because she was White and privileged. Also, as I write about Piercy and how I perceived her, the constructs that I use to describe her are situated within my whiteliness, my gender, and my class. I have doors that I can open with the keys I have. But there are windows that I cannot open nor even see through. She and I were sealed within the confines of our identities. Yet we stretched and tried to reach beyond them. Piercy told of what she knew, given who she was, and the experiences she has had. I tell of what I know, given who I am and the experiences I have had.

Although I recognize that the very constructs I use to describe Piercy are undergirded and informed by whiteliness, by gender, by class, and sexual identity, I am still left with words such as: intrepid, fearless, dauntless, indomitable, bold, and brave.

Therefore, the question remains, How do I tease out those descriptors that are Piercy in and of herself--a clear and true portrait of her divorced from my interpretation? The answer, there is no such portrait. I see what I see, I know what I know, I describe what I describe, all the while realizing that some windows are sealed and some doors are closed. This is how the personal is pedagogical and how the personal is political.

## The Personal is Pedagogical: About Piercy and Unexpectedly About Johnny

> [An]...increasingly common practice among researchers,
> including feminist researchers, involves naming one's
> social location--one's gender, race, or ethnicity,
> social class, and (sometimes) one's sexual orientation
> --and the social location of the research participants,
> and saying little more.  Such information has been
> withheld in social science research far too long, to
> the detriment of knowing anything at all about
> researchers or the participants in their research.
> But naming of social location in a given society or
> culture, though important information, does not begin
> to replace the details of subjective experience.  The
> individual voices of researchers and participants
> reveal the complexity of inner life when it is not
> robbed of its own subjectivity.  (Rogers, 1993, pp.
> 267-268)

Who Piercy was, her history and her experiences affected the way she taught and how she saw her students. The personal is much more than her social location.  Her identity has to do with what she has subjectively experienced, for example, that she was married, and she was the mother of a college age son, Johnny.  Johnny at the time of this study was the same age as the young men she was teaching in this mixed-gender class.

The young men in the class, after the first session, sat together in a clump on the side of the room with the windows on it.  Did it have anything to do with the study that Piercy and I were conducting?  In our talks and during the class to the students, Piercy laughingly referred to that section of the room as "maletown."  Right from the beginning of the semester I noticed the affection with which Piercy spoke about these young men.  In part, this seemed to

come from her ability to connect with them because of her
own experience with her son. This was something I could not
identify with. The young men (as well as the young women)
immediately received her "good faith." She gave them the
benefit of the doubt and thought about their learning
deeply. She never dismissed them as young White male
oppressors. I wondered about her immediate affiliation with
what some feminists might see as *the* oppressors, rich White
privileged men.

Piercy and I wrestled with the ways in which we viewed
the world and I began to see clearly how all that had shaped
us shaped our pedagogical stances. Out of our lives we did
make theories, and our identities shaped our theories.
There were no neutral theories, there were no neutral
constructs. There were no neutral pedagogies.

Critical theorists and feminist theorists have been
asserting this for a long time. As Namenwirth states,
"Scientists [and social scientists] firmly believe that as
long as they are not conscious of any bias or political
agenda, they are neutral and objective, when in fact they
are only unconscious" (as cited in Lather, 1991, p. 106).
However, as Ellesworth (1989) alludes to, even critical
theorists are not digging deeply enough into the personal
realities of critical teachers for implications to the
pedagogical. What occurs then is just a variation on the
theme of the universal and generic male.

> When educational researchers writing about critical
> pedagogy fail to examine the implications for the
> gendered, raced, and classed teacher and students for
> the theory of critical pedagogy, they reproduce by
> default, the category of generic "critical teacher"- a
> specific form of the generic human that underlies
> classical liberal thought. Like the generic human, the
> generic critical teacher is not, of course, generic at
> all. Rather, the term defines a discursive category
> predicated on the current mythical norm, namely: young,
> White, Christian, middle-class, heterosexual, able-
> bodied, thin, rational man. Gender, race, class, and
> other differences become only variations on or
> additions to the generic human--"underneath we are all
> the same." (Ellesworth, 1989, p. 310)

In speaking about life, learning, and teaching

extensively with Piercy, I saw how the roles we had and the

identities we embodied impacted our pedagogy. Two and a

half months into the semester, I told Piercy about the "frat

boys" I had overheard registering for classes. I told her

about the sexist and derogatory things they were saying

about women. I then told her about a couple of "nice clean-

cut" fraternity boys, wearing their fraternity emblems, who

I saw in a store one day. The two young men were deriding

each other by calling each other "dirty after-births, cunts,

slashes" and every other demeaning word used about women. I

was disgusted and dismayed. I told this to Piercy and after

she spoke I realized how our life histories affected our

stance toward young men--"frat boys." I had no patience for

these kind of men. They were "write-offs" as far as I was

concerned and I expressed my nausea to Piercy. I could not

be patient nor understanding of them.

> Corinna: I hear these "nice clean cut frat boys" (with
> facetiousness and disgust in my voice) talking and they

do not care who is listening.

Piercy: You have to understand where I am situated, I have a son who is a frat boy. I hope that even frat boys have more complexity to them.

Piercy's son might not have used the words to describe women like the ones I heard, and yet he was still one of the group. Piercy knew that her son was affiliated with the fraternity boys and she loved her son. This allowed her to extend her understanding out and to be more tolerant of them. I was (and still am) intolerant of language and attitudes like that and tended to dismiss the people along with the attitudes. She did not dismiss people and her connection to her son allowed her to feel a certain connection to those young men that I did not have. It was a critical difference between us--a difference that shaped and affected our pedagogies. Piercy helped me to think more deeply about my own tendency to dismiss people rather than just their ways of behaving.

Piercy's relentless faith in the ability of young men to think about issues deeply and the fact that they themselves were complex human beings she had in part learned because she had a son who was college age.

When Piercy spoke about gender relations and pedagogical relations she often talked about not excluding men, about caring for them. Piercy's sentiments, for example, as she expressed the first day of class to me, "It's very self-defeating to exclude men and not to care for

them" reflect Gordon's sentiments:

> I know that to encourage a son to break the molds is to
> encourage him to give up privilege, ease, a certain
> easily accessible pleasure. And every mother wants
> life to be easy for her children; motherhood makes most
> of us sickingly bourgeoise....
>
> I have to want my son to give up willingly the
> privilege that could be his. In return for what? A
> life free of the sin of domination, free from the
> corruption of turning an equal into a servant, of
> taking what someone else ought not to be required to
> give.... So I must want for my son to want not what is
> easy for him but what is just.
>
> In thinking this way, I have developed enormous
> sympathy for the men in the world who are decent and
> struggling, and instead of seeing them as sports and
> freaks...I feel less and less easy with practices and
> categories that exclude men or that write them off.
> Because it is my son they are writing off. He is one
> of them, but he is mine.
>
> It would be unrealistically romantic to conclude
> by saying that I no longer have trouble understanding
> men, that I am no longer tempted to find their behavior
> unforgivable. This has not happened. What has
> happened is that I have given up the idea that men are
> less vulnerable than women, than myself. The nuances
> of their needs and fears have become real to me, as
> have the possibilities of their goodness and their
> sweetness. Most important, for the first time in my
> life I see them as the same species as myself. (Gordon,
> 1986, p. 179 and pp. 186-187)

As Piercy said: "I have good success with those guys

because I argue the male perspective with them. I sincerely

like those kids." Yet one of the things that I did not

sense from Piercy was that she did what many women do, that

is, exonerate *their* men from responsibility. That is, *their*

men are different. Piercy did not exonerate the men in her

life from the sexism they displayed. One of the ways that

she reported that she tried to "raise their consciousness"

was by teasing them about their actions. She saw humor as a

way of countering sexism.

## A Woman Teacher Educator With Feminist Imagination

When I think of Piercy as a teacher educator who was a feminist, I realize that I have to talk about a woman teacher educator who was a feminist who had many identities and roles, all of which affected her. She was not a *feminist teacher educator*, for that levels who she was to a singular monolithic feminism. I would even go a step further, she was a teacher educator with feminist imagination. Imagination suggests fluidity and a dynamic quality that takes into account the historicity she carried in her gendered, White, heterosexual, and privileged being. Piercy operated in life and in teaching as a woman, as an experienced teacher and teacher educator, as a heterosexual and the spouse of a successful man, as a mother of a son, as a White privileged woman, as an Italian Irish woman educated in Catholic schools in her early years--through and between all this she had feminist imagination that affected all these other aspects of her being, as they did her imagination. In addition to there not being generic constructs, there can be no generic feminist pedagogical strategies discovered or recounted after watching a teacher educator who has feminist imagination. We teach all that we are.

Piercy used all her experiences, including her personal life, to understand her pedagogical life. Teacher educators who have feminist imaginations are much more than their

identities, but identities do shape and impact who they are
pedagogically. Piercy felt that who she was allowed her to
speak to the mainstream: "I think I hit a pretty good chord
with the mainstream," she said. Part of her ability to do
this and not to dismiss the mainstream was because she was
part of the mainstream. Yet, in other ways she was not part
of the mainstream. That is, her commitment to usurping the
status quo and challenging pre-service teachers to fight
oppression and empower their own students set her apart.

Piercy's identities impacted her teaching, however, it
is important to remember that our identities are constantly
"constituted and reconstituted relationally" (Scott, as
cited in Lather, 1991, p. 118). Since there is no "arrival"
to one's identity, there can be no static and ultimate
feminist. Are there minimal criteria by which someone can
be called a feminist? How does this apparent relativism
square with a feminist critique of privilege, including
heterosexual privilege? And are there connections between
feminists who are radically different from one another in
terms of their relationships that help maintain a feminist
group affiliation?

## Feminists and Feminisms and Shape-shifting Theory

> As the history of revolutionary movements in this
> century has shown, and as the most recent developments
> in feminist theory confirm beyond a doubt (developments
> that have been prompted by the writings of women of
> color, Jewish women, and lesbians, and that can be
> sustained only by a serious, critical, and self-

critical attention to the issues they raise),
consciousness is not the result but the term of a
process. Consciousness of self, like class
consciousness or race consciousness (e.g., my
consciousness of being White), is a particular
configuration of subjectivity, or subjective limits,
produced at an intersection of meaning with
experience.... Self and identity, in other words, are
always grasped and understood within particular
discursive configurations. Consciousness, therefore,
is never fixed, never attained once and for all,
because discursive boundaries change with historical
conditions. In this perspective, the very notion of
identity undergoes a shift: identity is not the goal
but rather the point of departure of the process of
self-consciousness, a process by which one begins to
know that and how the personal is political, that and
how the subject is specifically and materially en-
gendered in its social conditions and possibilities for
existence. (de Lauretis, 1986, pp. 8-9)

Feminists are dynamic and ever changing; therefore,
feminism is dynamic and ever changing. And context changes
everything. Perhaps the common connection between those
with feminist imaginations is that oppression is wrong and
social justice is right. How that is achieved or even
conceived of has so much to do with our individual
(personal) and collective (group affiliations) identities.
However, these identities change and develop, and evolve,
but not to an ultimate point.

Remember the house that shape-shifts? If feminisms
really are grounded in lives, then Piercy's life, my life,
your life and all our lives are part of the grounded theory,
and they are constantly shifting and being reconstituted.
Our lives and identities ground the feminist imaginations we
have, but just as the house shape-shifts, so too must our
theories.

Our language, our descriptors of people, context, and reality are so bound by the constraints we face that it is sometimes difficult to even retain the semblance of dynamism. But the task for the researcher is to paint a picture that acknowledges the limited nature of the portrait. Piercy and I were specially situated to open some doors, look through some windows, and use some keys. Yet, I never forget that for each door that was opened another remained locked, for each window that was clear another was opaque, and for every key that fit another was miscut. That is what makes learning and teaching and scholarship so intricate as to be almost labyrinthine. You can get locked in the labyrinth thinking that you have "arrived"--when really all you are is lost in a theory that has no capacity to shape-shift.

And so when you read my interpretation of Piercy's presence, remember that by the time you read the words on this page, identity has once again been reconstituted and renegotiated, and her presence and mine are not static. Although these words freeze a moment in time, she and I are not frozen in time. She moves on and through time to become someone different again. I do the same.

In this chapter I have located Piercy's feminist imagination in context. I have told of the kinds of courage Piercy displayed given the context she was in. I have characterized the ways in which the personal was

pedagogical. I have examined how Piercy's identities in part affected her teaching, and suggested that identities are shifting and changing constantly.

In the next chapter I continue to tell about Piercy, and consequently about myself, exploring the kind of presence that Piercy manifested and my own struggles to make sense of what I apprehended.

# CHAPTER V

## PIERCY SAND: LOVING PRESENCE

### "What is Essential is Invisible to the Eye": Epiphanies, Arrogant Presence and Loving Presence

> "Goodbye," said the fox. "And now here is my secret, a
> very simple secret: It is only with the heart that one
> can see rightly; what is essential is invisible to the
> eye."
> "What is essential is invisible to the eye," the little
> prince repeated, so that he would remember. (Saint
> Exupery, The Little Prince, 1943, p. 70)

In this chapter I will examine arrogant and loving
presence. I will delve into some of the manifestations of
arrogant presence, such as, competition, intellectual rigor,
and deep disregard. I will also explore how loving presence
manifests itself through patience, puzzling through instead
of judging, dialogue with humility, self-disclosure,
passion, caring, and compassion.

Ever since the beginning of watching Piercy teach and
speaking with her, I puzzled over something. In her way of
speaking about students there was something I could not put
my finger on. She spoke in such a relational way, a way
that suggested a powerful need to connect with her students.
It went beyond the usual rhetoric of caring about students,
getting to know your students, or having a relationship with
students. There was a commitment and passion there to
connect on some deep and meaningful level. I pondered and
mulled over what her stance could be, but still found it
enigmatic.

I came to understand that it was because she and I were

so different in our conceptions of relationships with students that when she spoke about her students, I found her discourse difficult to make sense of. Piercy was outside of my frame of reference in terms of how she saw her students. Remember those windows. Those are windows into others'/Others' realities. Seeing something so different from what I knew, I found the image through the window blurry. The inability to make sense out of the image says much about the image I was looking at but also about myself. That which I could not see tells me about that which I did see. Sometimes we only see images of ourselves reflected back to us through others, or images of the ideal projected onto what we see.

As I revisited my feminist readings I re-read Marilyn Frye's (1983) chapters on the "Arrogant Eye" and "Loving Eye" (arrogant and loving perception). Epiphany! I exclaimed to myself, "That's it!" that's what was so elusive in trying to capture what was different about Piercy. The difference was becoming clearer. She did not have arrogant perception:

> [A]rrogant eyes...organize everything with reference to themselves and their own interests. The arrogating perceiver is a teleologist, a believer that everything exists and happens for some purpose, and he tends to animate things, imagining attitudes toward himself as the animating motives. Everything is either "for me" or "against me."... The arrogant perceiver does not countenance the possibility that the Other is independent, indifferent.... How one sees another and how one expects the other to behave are in tight interdependence, and how one expects another to behave is a large factor in determining how the other does

behave. (Frye, 1983, p. 67)

Frye uses the arrogant eye to speak about how many men regard women. Yet the concept can be extended. I believe, as Frye does, that many men use arrogant eyes when perceiving women. I think that this in part has to do with power. Those in power perceive the world and others in it differently than those who have less or no power. And that arrogant perception is in part a feature of social and political structures. Those who have power, or those who are learning to be in power, are trained to perceive arrogantly. Institutions of higher learning are places where people are being trained to be in power and these are one of the places where we learn to perceive arrogantly.

I believe what Morales (1983) states, that "class and color and sex do not define people [and] do not define politics" (p. 92-93). I would further this by saying that gender, race, class, culture, religious identity, and sexual identity also do not guarantee or militate against arrogant perception. Women are capable of becoming arrogant perceivers, trying to coerce and annex another into the reality that one imagines and creates (see Lugones, 1987; Lugones and Spelman, 1984). Even those with feminist imaginations, who are committed to hearing "all" voices, can be and act like arrogant perceivers. I have both personally and pedagogically seen others with my own arrogant perception and that is in part why I did not recognize the

"loving perception" (Frye, 1983)  when I encountered it.

Frye's "loving eye" seemed to explain how Piercy saw

the world and those in it:

> The loving eye is a contrary of the arrogant eye.
> The loving eye knows the independence of the other....
> It is the eye of one who knows that to know the seen,
> one must consult something other than one's own will
> and interests and fears and imagination.  One must look
> at the thing.  One must look and listen and check and
> question.
>     The loving eye is one that pays a certain sort of
> attention.  This attention can require a discipline but
> *not* a self-denial.  The discipline is one of self-
> knowledge, knowledge of the scope and boundary of the
> self.  What is required is that one know what are one's
> interests, desires and loathings, one's projects,
> hungers, fears and wishes, and that one know what is
> and what is not determined by these.  In particular, it
> is a matter of being able to tell one's own interests
> from those of others and of knowing where one's self
> leaves off and another begins. (Frye, 1983, p. 75)

> The loving eye does not...try to assimilate [the object
> of perception], does not reduce it to the size of the
> seer's desire, fear and imagination, and hence does not
> have to simplify.  It knows the complexity of the other
> as something which will forever present new things to
> be known.  The science of the loving eye would favor
> The Complexity Theory of Truth and presuppose the
> Endless Interestingness of the Universe.
>     The loving eye seems generous to its object,
> though it means neither to give nor to take, for not-
> being-invaded, not being-coerced, not being annexed
> must be felt in a world such as ours as a great gift.
> (Frye, 1983, p. 76)

I was thrilled.  I could now explain what it was that

was unique and special about Piercy.  There was so much in

the description of the loving eye that seemed ideal to

describe Piercy's stance toward life, learning and teaching.

For example, the loving eye "presuppose[s] the Endless

Interestingness of the Universe."  This was Piercy exactly.

She was always intrigued and magnificently interested in the

complexity of all she encountered. She was thoroughly
interested in her students, in her peers, and in the wider
scholarly community. This loving eye captured the wonder
with which Piercy encountered the world.

The idea then, as I saw it, was to create what Anzaldua
(1983) calls a "network of kindred spirits" (p. 209) and
what I have identified as a *community of critical friends*
developed by loving perception. I use the term of critical
friend as someone who is crucial and significant, and also
critical in the sense of being analytical and discerning,
evaluating and judging. But the friend is not critical in
the sense of being disparaging, contemptuous, disapproving,
derogatory, fault-finding, or belittling. A critical friend
is essential and important to one's learning and growth.

But then as life and scholarship would have it, just
when you think you have "got it" of course you do not. "It"
slips out of that shape-shifting house of theory. I asked
myself, was perception enough--wasn't it more than that?[49]
I let Piercy's way of being somersault around in my mind. I
reminded myself that when I talked about Piercy I talked
about heart and soul, mind and intellect. Vision and
perception were somehow limiting. Something more than
perception--vision--sight--was in order. The soul, the
heart, which are invisible to the eye are so essential. I

---

[49] I am grateful to Lynn Paine who encouraged me to think beyond perception.

had to harness the tone of Piercy's teaching into words.

## What are Arrogant Presence and Loving Presence?

Frye's work gave me indispensable concepts to begin to fashion broader ones for my own work. I ruminated on the ideas until I had a concept which seemed more encompassing. The concept that I found was presence. This included perception, body, heart, soul, imagination, consciousness. In hindsight, perception also seemed more passive than I wanted. I asked myself, What does presence denote and connote? I looked it up in dictionaries and found that the definitions were inadequate.

> presence b: the quality of poise or effectiveness that enables a performer to achieve a close relationship with his audience. Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1984, p. 930)

> presence 5. a person's bearing, personality, or appearance (McKechnie, Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary, 1983, p. 1423)

The definitions only vaguely suggested what I intended. So in the true spirit of feminist imagination (see Daly and Caputi, 1987), I defined presence in my own terms. Presence is a stance and posture that one takes within a context. It means the way one acts, interacts, and reacts in a given situation. The notion of presence also implies that it is something nebulous--something that can't be measured and quantified. It is a way of Be-ing in the world. It implies inclusion of the heart, soul, body, and mind. So presence includes all that Frye is suggesting with

her arrogant and loving eyes, but it pushes the edges of
perception to entail more.

I came to know these new concepts in studying Piercy
(and consequently other feminists and myself in new ways).
These concepts are about Piercy, and are more than about
Piercy. They speak to what one person can be or what an
entire community *can* be. At times we cannot be all that we
aspire to be and reality is infinitely smaller than
possibility. However, to start carving out what loving
presence replacing arrogant presence could be like would
make dwelling in a house that feminist imagination is
building delightful.

## What is Arrogant Presence?

All of us...we were so beautiful when we stood astride
her ugliness. Her simplicity decorated us, her guilt
sanctified us, her pain made us glow with health, her
awkwardness made us think we had a sense of humor. Her
inarticulateness made us believe we were eloquent. Her
poverty kept us generous. Even her waking dreams were
used--to silence our nightmares. And she let us, and
thereby deserved our contempt. We honed our egos on
her, padded our characters with her frailty, and yawned
in the fantasy of our strength.
And fantasy it was, for we were not strong, only
aggressive; we were not free, merely licensed; we were
not compassionate, we were polite; not good, but well
behaved...[we] hid like thieves from life. We
substituted good grammar for intellect; we switched
habits to simulate maturity; we rearranged lies and
called it truth.... (Toni Morrison, 1970, p. 159)

Toni Morrison speaks to what I consider the spirit of
arrogant presence. She poetically captures what I feel is
at the core of so many of our ways of being with one another

in "communities." It is the spirit of one person being "up" by another person being "down." It is driven by the need to "win lest you lose" (McIntosh, 1983, 1990). And the more losers there are the more likely you are a winner. This presence pervades many aspects of life.

Arrogant presence exists within all realms, including teacher education. For example, the criticalness I learned (especially in graduate school) had a violent tone to it, a shredding, tearing, negating, and dismissing tone--keeping the other down--myself up. I was taught that it was just the argument I was shredding, but in actuality it was often the person that ended up being shredded in the spirit of "argument." "Survival of the fittest," and "might makes right," pervaded even my intellectual "conversations" and "dialogues." Criticism was permeated with the hierarchical notion of "the stronger the better." There was not the sense, even in the criticism of one another's work and ideas, that what we wanted was "the decent survival of all" (McIntosh, 1983, 1990).

Arrogant presence does not have a generous spirit; instead it hones in on another's weaknesses and exploits them. It is full of derision and contempt.

It allows the perceiver to feel puffed up and better. "If others are down then I must be up." Trina Paulus (1972), in her allegorical book Hope for the Flowers, tells of the caterpillars' climb to the top of the caterpillar

pillar. One caterpillar, Stripe, has learned to climb

better than the rest:

> Stripe didn't seem just "disciplined" to others--he
> seemed ruthless. Even among climbers he was special.
> "Don't blame me if you don't succeed! It's a tough
> life. Just make up your mind," he would have said had
> any caterpillar complained. Then one day he was near
> his goal. Stripe had done well but when light finally
> filtered down from the top, he was close to exhaustion.
> At this height there was almost no movement. All held
> their positions with every skill a lifetime of climbing
> had taught them. Every small move counted terribly.
> There was no communication. Only the outsides touched.
> They were like cocoons to one another. Then one day
> Stripe heard a crawler above him saying, "None of us
> can get any higher without getting rid of them." (pp.
> 89-92)

Look around, how often do you hear and see what Stripe does

on his caterpillar pillar in the rush to compete? What are

the costs in the fight to succeed? People are unable to

connect for fear of being out-climbed. So only the

exteriors meet. In a classroom, how much connection is lost

because of the rush to get the grade? To score the points?

To win the argument? How much arrogance is learned because

one cannot win without thinking of the other as the loser?

How much contempt has to be inculcated so that others are

less than, and therefore worthy of defeat? "You have to

have contempt for your opponent."[50] We learn this "climb or

be climbed" (Paulus, 1972, p. 25) so early, and much of it

in the classroom:

---

[50] This line was taken from Searching for Bobby Fischer. (1993) Paramount Pictures, Rudin/ Mirage production. Screenplay by Steven Zailian. Based on the book by Fred Waitzkin. This is a film about the ways in which very young children are taught to feel the "win lest you lose" value and contempt for their opponents. However, the young protagonist of the film rejects the notion of contempt for his fellow players. It is a wonderful celebration of "decent survival of all" (McIntosh, 1983, 1990).

At a tender age, children learn not to be tender. A
dozen years of schooling often do nothing to promote
generosity or commitment to the welfare of others. To
the contrary, students are graduated to think that
being smart means looking out for number one. (Kohn,
1991 p. 498)

Last year the whole class had laughed at a boy who
couldn't fill out a form because he didn't know his
father's name. The teacher sighed, exasperated, and
was very sarcastic, "Don't you notice things? What
does your mother call him?" she said. The class
laughed at how dumb he was not to notice things. "She
calls him father of me," he said. Even we laughed,
although we knew that his mother did not call his
father by a name, and a son does not know his father's
name. We laughed and were relieved that our parents
had had the foresight to tell us some names we could
give the teachers. (Kingston, 1989, p. 177)

## Competition

Arrogant presence is in part borne out of a culture(s)

of competition--where the "goodies" seem, and are made to

seem, scarce. Kohn (1991, 1986) tells us of the spirit of

competition that is so well internalized that we do not even

recognize its omnipresence:

Life for us has become an endless succession of
contests. From the moment the alarm clock rings until
sleep overtakes us again, from the time we are toddlers
until the day we die, we are busy struggling to outdo
others. This is our posture at work and at school, on
the playing field and back at home. It is the common
denominator of American life.
Precisely because we are so immersed in it,
competition can easily escape our notice. A fish does
not reflect on the nature of water, Walker Percy once
remarked, "he cannot imagine its absence, so he cannot
consider its presence." (Kohn, 1986, p. 1)

Arrogant presence is all around us, in our classrooms

at all levels, but especially the "higher" one goes.

Teacher education is housed in academia. Teacher education

has struggled to achieve a legitimacy in the hierarchical structure of the university. Carr and Kemmis (1988) state that curriculum theorizing was identified as a "mongrel discipline" (p. 15). The same could be said of teacher education in general. It is not a "proper" discipline, rather it is a field of study. Eble (1983) states,

> Within colleges and universities, arrogance...underlies the pecking order among academic departments.... Such arrogance is particularly devastating to teaching, for colleges of education have been clearly assigned to an irremediable inferiority. (p. 106)

In the attempt to legitimize itself, the press has been to create a knowledge and research base that follows closely the natural sciences. Teacher education has followed in the "expert" model of presenting knowledge and this expertise is often imbued with arrogant presence (see Eble, 1983 for his discussion of three common kinds of academic arrogance). Those who have the high status knowledge, the ability to win, have the currency to succeed--to win out over the other/Other. Arrogant presence is insidious for it gets cast as smartness, acuity, sharpness, and intelligence. Instead, it is as Toni Morrison suggests, the hollow shallow facsimile of intellect and truth, *"We substituted good grammar for intellect; we switched habits to simulate maturity; we rearranged lies and called it truth..."* (1970, p. 159).

Rich (1973-74) states that the university we have presently "is a man-centered university, a breeding ground

not of humanism, but of masculine privilege" (p.127), one

that metaphorically promotes

> defending, attacking, combat, status, banking,
> duel[ing], power, making it...not the passion for
> 'learning for its own sake' or the sense of an
> intellectual community, but the dominance of the
> masculine ideal, the race of men against one another"
> (p. 129-130).[51]

This ethos creates the win lest you lose mentality and it

affects the teacher education community as it does all the

other communities housed in the university. It is also not

just masculine privilege which is at work, but also the

class privilege of the academy (not to mention privilege

conveyed on the basis of race and heterosexuality):

> The democratic ethos of American schooling, equality of
> opportunity leading to social mobility based on
> achieved rather than ascribed characteristics, belies
> the actual commitments of the upper and middle classes
> to retain their class status and the functions of the
> schools in support of their privilege. (Grumet, 1988,
> p. 21)

---

[51] Veblen wrote about the ways in which universities were hostile to women in 1903—many would say women have gained access, yet the old hostility remains in many institutions of "higher" learning:

> The attitude of the schools and of the learned class towards the education of women serves to show in what manner and to what extent learning has departed from its ancient station of priestly and leisure-class prerogative, and it indicates also what approach has been made by the truly learned to the modern, economic or industrial, matter-of-fact standpoint. The higher schools and the learned professionals were until recently tabu to women. These establishments were from the outset, and have in great measure continued to be, devoted to the education of the priestly and leisure class.
>
> The women, as has been shown elsewhere, were the original subservient class, and to some extent, especially so far as regards their nominal or ceremonial position, they have remained in that relation down to the present. There has prevailed a strong sense that the admission of women to the privileges of the higher learning (as to the Eleusinian mysteries) would be derogatory to the dignity of the learned craft.... The sense of class worthiness, that is to say of status, of a honorific differentiation of the sexes according to a distinction between superior and inferior intellectual dignity, survives in a vigorous form in these corporations of the aristocracy of learning. (Veblen, 1899/1994, p. 230)

## Intellectual Rigor

Piercy had a reflective and intellectual presence that was caring and not arrogant. She implicitly directed me to think of new ways of casting intellectual activity that had ordinarily been labelled "intellectual rigor." I now believe that arrogant presence comes under many names; one such name is sometimes "intellectual rigor."[52] In the name of intellectual rigor, human caring gets left by the wayside. I want to reshape what is often called intellectual rigor (and is actually intellectual abuse in many cases) in teacher education and label it intellectual vigor, zest, or intensity undergirded by intellectual compassion. To make this transformation loving presence needs to be established so that errors, fallacies, and foibles are allowed, and intellectual risk is possible. There has to be a spirit of community, but that community has to be one of critical friends, one that is developed by loving presence.

Ironically, academicians have used the concept of "intellectual rigor" to shut down the intellectual risk that is hopefully part of it. That is, it has been used to exclude, to dismiss, to negate thinkers who do not pursue scholarly thought within the approved confines of the established research community. Intellectual rigor has been

---

[52] O'Reilley (1993) points out that there are two kinds of people most concerned with what they are doing being "sufficiently rigorous," teachers and morticians (p. 50).

used against feminist scholars and many others who think and act differently, unusually, or uniquely, those who move against the grain of tradition. Labels such as anti-intellectual, not rigorous enough, and deficient are used to diminish and undermine those who step outside the norms of what "counts" as research and scholarship. Intellectual rigor is used in much the same way as Wong (1993) states literary *merit* is used by anti-multiculturalists, it "reifies historically constructed standards and obscures its consensual, power-imbued nature" (p. 114).

It was when I analyzed Piercy's stance toward learning and teaching, and the language that she used to describe what she valued, that I began to envision concepts that suggested the kind of intellectual energy and zest that those committed to co-creating a community of critical friends could perhaps be comfortable with. About three months into the semester Piercy talked about the notion of "scholarly intensity." She felt that the students that were participating in the study didn't seem to have the same scholarly intensity as those in the fall, a trait that she felt was important. When she talked about the group not having as much scholarly intensity it did not seem pejorative, as the sense of "intellectual rigor" would.

Scholarly intensity and scholarly vigor, intellectual intensity and intellectual vigor are concepts that replace the often oppressive "intellectual rigor" that is used

against people (to measure them, size them up, or compete with them). These phrases suggest loving presence, as opposed to arrogant presence.

Piercy talked about the intellectual violence that is done to people in conversations--in the classroom and with peers. It destroys co-generative dialogue and destroys community. Two weeks into the semester Piercy talked about Nathan, a student in her class. Nathan was a White, privileged male who was quite vocal and verbal in class. There were times when he would dominate the conversation and would speak out of turn when someone else was called on. One time in particular when Piercy asked Tricia to clarify something she had said, Nathan interrupted and explained what Tricia was saying. Piercy stated:

> Even though Nathan is quite insightful about all of this I think that he could be really offended that I see his domination as a bit oppressive to women. More than a bit. In a way another form of, I don't know if I would use the word violence, but it has a tinge of violence. Maybe violence is too strong a word. It is not a physical violence, but it is like an intellectual violence, that's going on there.

Piercy wanted to soften her words. However, intellectual violence is a theme (although not in those words) that has been developed by many feminists in relation to women in universities (see Rich 1973-1974, 1977, 1978, 1984; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986). During this conversation we both agreed that we could not use these kind of words--"intellectual violence"-- with the undergraduates themselves. They would think we were being

melodramatic. Yet, as I reflect on our hesitancy, I ask myself if we existed in a truly equitable culture and institution, a phrase like "intellectual violence" would be something that was deliberated over and considered important enough to be a topic of conversation in many classrooms, especially teacher education classrooms where learning is the subject matter as well as the process.

Piercy was committed to a co-generative dialogue as a way for students to learn and to teach, and for teachers to learn and to teach. This co-generative dialogue was situated within a structure of challenge, but there could be no intellectual or emotional violence done to those who participated. There had to be support. Piercy created an ethos in her class where she encouraged students to listen and respond to one another as critical friends and not to batter one another intellectually or emotionally (see Lugones and Spelman, 1984). Piercy used words that gave me a new language to counter what is called intellectual rigor but is sometimes actually intellectual violence.

## Deep Disregard

Arrogant presence has an air of smugness about it. The person who has an arrogant presence is often smug about his or her perceptions. The students in Piercy's class, like Nathan, displayed this at times. It was not something that was done out of maliciousness. *"He didn't think he was*

*against anybody. He was just doing what he had to do if he*
*was to get to the top"* (Paulus,1972, p.89). Instead, it was
a learned way of Being in the world.

There is a comfort and sense of superiority on the part
of people who have an arrogant presence. The students were
often comfortable with their ways of Being without being
self-critical. This self-satisfaction closes down learning.
It is often demonstrated as a deep disregard for those who
do not think as you do. This arrogant presence is also
historically bound, that is, at certain historical times it
seems particularly easy to deeply disregard those who do not
think as you do. In the 1990s it is called being
"politically correct" or "radically right." Remember too
that this is feminist imagination in the time of "backlash."
Schwab (1976) identified this trend in earlier decades,
"Community is threatened with extinction in American. Our
work involves others, but the others, on the whole, are felt
as competitors or henchmen, superiors or subordinates, not
as fellow human beings" (p. 238). I see it as even more
dramatic in the 1990s. True dialogue and conversation is
lost because of arrogant presence that creates a smugness
within people, labeling all those who see differently as
"competitors, henchmen, superiors or subordinates."

And one's own historicity contributes to the
development of arrogant presence. It can be played out in a
deep inattention to those things that do not seem pertinent

to one's own life or reality. For example, some of the students were deeply inattentive to issues of inequity because they felt that it was not an issue that was applicable to their generation. These students felt that inequity as a concept was a "dinosaur" (Lather, 1991) because their generation was equal now. As Tricia stated, "Gender problems aren't really an issue with my generation, and I don't think it's as big as a problem within my generation. You know—just all people my age and say here, at college, I don't think it's as much as a problem." Piercy stated that some of the students were not "awake." Others however, those who had a deep disregard for issues of equity were often "totally awake and totally aware and [yet] have no consciousness, [they are] totally in the midst of it all but never come to think about [it deeply]."

During the first month of class, Piercy confronted the students after they watched A Class Divided and said that issues of discrimination were problems of the past.[53] She said to the students, "I get the sense from all of you, 'We're so much better now, we're nineties' people, that was the sixties.'" The students were displaying arrogant presence—a deep disregard—which obfuscated the way they encountered the world and learning.

---

[53] A Frontline program aired on WTVS in Detroit, hosted by Judy Woodruff. This is an experience that Jane Elliott, the teacher, did with her third graders where she divided them into groups of students with "blue eyes" and "brown eyes," where one group received privileges and the other did not, merely on the basis of eye color.

## Arrogant Presence and the Community of Teaching and Learning

Being a teacher is not only a role, but a way of Being. To often as teachers we fall into the trap of stating those who do not "get it" are either misinformed, unintelligent, resistant, or wrong. For example, at the "Multicultural Perspectives in Teaching and Teacher Education," Fireside Chat session at the American Educational Research Association Meeting in San Francisco, California, in 1992, a participant said that she "fails students who do not have the right attitude." This arrogant presence has to do with a fundamental belief in dichotomies and with either-or realities, "a world which has only two alternatives: yes/no; right/wrong; top/bottom; win/lose; self/other; success/failure" (McIntosh, 1985, p. 11).

Putnam and Burke (1992) state, "We do not learn from sameness but from the differences around us. The contrasts, the differences, and even oppositions...can be understood as a positive resource" (p. 40). Yet, I wonder how, when we are taught to cultivate arrogant presence, we can truly learn from difference? Loving presence means more than just acknowledging that differences can be learning opportunities. It implies looking into those mirrors that others hold up for us, especially those who are different from us--even when they oppose us intellectually, philosophically, or emotionally. It means seeing those others/Others who see the world very differently than us as

critical friends.

Piercy saw others as critical friends who could help her think about her life, her learning, and her teaching, as evidenced by her stance toward her male students. Even those she shared little common ground with, "opponents," she entered into dialogue with them and took them seriously.

## What is Loving Presence?

[T]he difference between love that is genuine ("Love, thick and dark as Alaga syrup ... I could smell it-- taste it ... everywhere in that house") and "fraudulent love," the idealized love that is, she observes, "the best hiding place" for cruelty and violence. (Morrison, as cited in Gilligan, 1989, p. 2)

Each moment we recall the vision of love *we commit an act of resistance against the oppressor.* (Tijerina, 1990, p. 173, emphasis in original)

In a community which is fashioned by loving presence no one is the enemy; a teacher can't have the enemy in her classroom, dismissing someone because they don't come along. This arrogant idea of you are "either for me or against me" was something I never felt from Piercy. There was a tenacity and a patience to her way of Being that I have come to call "loving presence." Piercy went beyond the "Orwellian despair" (Giroux and Freire, 1988, p. x, in Weiler, 1988) that afflicts some critical pedagogues. She was full of dauntless hope. She was realistically optimistic. She was patient with her students and also tried to teach them that as future teachers patience and tenacity were important.

Although love is not a word used in teacher education,

many feminists, like hooks (1989), write about the need for love, declaring that it is that which allows us to talk across our differences and be the empowering force that helps us stay whole.

> *Embedded in the commitment to feminist revolution is the challenge to love. Love can be and is an important source of empowerment when we struggle to confront issues of sex, race, and class.* Working together to identify and face our differences--to face the ways we dominate and are dominated--to change our actions, we need a mediating force that can sustain us so that we are not broken in this process so that we do not despair. (p. 26 emphasis added)

## Patience

Piercy wanted her students to be collaborative and open to one another in the community. Some students seemed to feel that the class was a community, for example one person on their midterm feedback stated, "It's nice to be involved in a class this cooperative and supportive of all its members." However, another person said, "People have closed minds in class." Piercy could have dismissed the people who were "closed-minded" but instead she used these comments one and a half months into the semester as a teachable moment to talk implicitly about patience, her's and their's, and about not giving up.

Piercy asked the class what closed-minded meant. One student replied that it meant "Probably just set in their ways." Piercy asked the students, "What do we do with people who are set in their ways? How would we get them to

think more with us rather than just shutting people out?"
Piercy and the students talked more about what it meant to
be closed-minded. One student said that it meant "Not
willing to listen to opinions and take them seriously just
being like, you are wrong and shut up." Piercy responded
with "Yeah, not taking people seriously. I think that's an
important thing to think about. If somebody is not taking
you seriously how can you get them to?" A student replied
with "Somehow try to back up your information with more
evidence and more convincing evidence." Piercy then prodded
them to think about "What if they close you out? How could
you do it in a non-threatening way in a classroom like this,
if you saw someone shutting down and closing you out. What
would you do?" The students and Piercy suggested different
ways of drawing someone into a dialogue. Matt then related
the story of how when Tatiana said that "capitalism was a
dirty word" when she was growing up in East Germany, he got
defensive, but then let himself be open to the interesting
things she was saying, and because of that he had learned a
lot. Piercy responded with:

> This is fascinating because all that I read about what
> really makes people learn is when they can get beyond
> their defense routines. What you are saying is that
> immediately you put up a defense routine, and say, "no
> no no no no." But when you let go, you let all of her
> information and the knowledge that she had from living
> in a whole other part of the world come to you, that's
> a critical piece. If you aren't getting people's
> defense routines up and challenging them then I am not
> sure you are teaching them anything.

A student then challenged Piercy:

Yes, but isn't that up to individual person whether or
not they are going to let that down?  Like you can't
make someone like listen or anything, they are going to
listen if they want to.  They can just pretend and just
go along with it so you don't know look at them
anymore.

Piercy responded to the student with, "And when you are a
teacher and you see that happening it's like, 'God this
person didn't learn a thing in my class and it really
becomes...'"  Before she could finish, a student interjected
with "That is their problem."  To which Piercy replied:

Yeah, but I think as a teacher you can say to them,
once we have had this discussion,  I am going to say to
you, "Sally I think your defense routines are up.  You
blocked me."  So you know that it's not that I am being
angry at you.  I am saying, "I want your learning to
happen, that's important."  That is why we are having
this discussion so when you see each other's defense
routines come up, you can say that to each other.

A student then posed the idea of not only talking at
the person who is being defensive, but also acknowledging
that "Maybe I am completely off base, you know I need to
find out where they are coming from."  Piercy went on to say
that that was a critical point "because when we get
defensive that is usually when we learn, so it's not that
you don't want to be defensive, it is that you want to check
your defenses."

At no point during this discussion did Piercy dismiss a
comment a student made.  She kept trying to help them see
the necessity of staying with the dialogue as a teacher,
that their responsibility was to try and help others go
beyond defense routines so that learning could take place.

Even when the student suggested at one point "that's their problem," Piercy patiently spoke to the issue of patience, albeit implicitly, but nonetheless, she modeled what she wanted her students to learn.

## Puzzling Through Instead of Judging

Piercy suggested in action and in words that teaching about issues of equity and justice was an adventure, and that as long as she kept on plugging away she would make a difference. Near the end of the semester, Piercy spoke about a dinner that was at Atwood and about her talking to a woman math professor. Piercy related how this woman stereotyped her daughter and herself as flighty:

> She hasn't been involved [in the women's study group] and she teases the "femmes"--but there isn't a mean bone in this woman's body--she is just funny. She said,"Oh I remember when my daughter was in fifth and sixth grade because she had such a hard time." I said "Marlene that is the exactly the time- there are books and books written that's the time when girls do lose their voice." I was telling her about [Carol] Gilligan's work. [She said] "Oh no, I think she was just flighty like me." It was so funny because she was projecting the same stereotypes on herself. She isn't flighty. She just knew what was going on, that was her way of avoiding it. I met her daughter, she is really bright. So it just gets really complicated. She is an older woman, who is single, was divorced, had a really bad marriage. I think there are some people who learn not to see and to be kind of flip and removed. And that's the way they exist. I don't know, it's so funny because on the other side of me here's this woman who I admire who is the honorary male who buys into all this. It was just a really interesting puzzling night.

Piercy did not dismiss this woman as not getting it, being resistant to ideas of her own oppression, having a "false

consciousness,"[54] or needing to be enlightened. She did not put down the woman who had stereotyped herself and her own daughter. Instead, she tried to understand where the woman was coming from. She did not reject her, as someone with arrogant presence might have. She did not harshly criticize her as being unaware, instead she cast it as an "interesting puzzling night."

This approach to the math professor parallels the way that Piercy worked with her students. She did not reject them as not "getting it" or being "racist," "sexist," "classist," or "homophobic." Instead, she thought about how she could understand where they were coming from and help them develop and grow from that point. Piercy stated during the first month of class that it was important for her to figure out where her students' "heads are at":

> I was thinking after you asked me about my goals, I think I am assessing them all the way up to this point in the class. I do think that I am listening to them and trying to figure out where their heads are at, trying to find common patterns that I've seen before, and differences that I haven't seen. Trying to identify where they are coming from, all those kinds of things.

She saw it as her role to try to understand what would help them flourish as learners.

For example, in the first month after the class had

---

[54] Feinberg and Soltis (1985) explain false consciousness in the following way:

> Members of the subordinate class who express the point of view and share the values of the dominant class exhibit false consciousness. True consciousness of your own class is impeded by your acceptance of the values of the dominant class. When the dominant class is successful in establishing its own mode of thinking among most members of the subordinate class, it is said to have established hegemony over the subordinate class. (p. 50)

watched the videotape <u>A Class Divided</u>, Piercy was concerned

that the students had not noticed the linguistic bias that

was apparent in the 1970's segment.  For example, Jane

Elliot used the phrase "We are all brothers."  But when

Piercy talked about the students, she did not deride them

for not noticing.  She did not conclude they were "blind,"

"unaware," or afflicted with "false consciousness."

Instead, Piercy puzzled through what could have been done.

She asked me, "Were there places where you would have

challenged them in different ways?"  Then she went on to

explain herself, "I don't want to accuse them because I

don't really feel accusatory."  Piercy stated that she

wanted to say to them, "Hey, look at this, we're not too

different" from the people in the video who were willing to

discriminate so easily.  She reflected and stated "Maybe

that's what I need to do."  She then went on to talk about

the ways in which they didn't seem to be able to notice the

gender dynamics in their own classroom, for example the men

speaking more than the women (given the ratio of men to

women).  Piercy asked:

> Why is it that this group seems to be able to
> articulate ideas but not understand the power and the
> effect?  Why is it they can articulate all this but
> they can't see it happening to themselves?  I guess
> that's not unusual, but you know, when you tell them
> it's happening to them, they're saying it is not that
> big of a deal.

Piercy kept questioning, rather than judging.  This stance

left her open to figuring out what to do to best help her

students become aware to the power issues that they were in

the midst of.

## Dialogue and Humility

> Among the reasons that a community is humble and hence
> realistic is that it is contemplative. It examines
> itself. It is self-ware. It knows itself. "Know
> thyself" is a sure rule for humility. (Peck, 1987, p.
> 65)

Piercy was seeking to create a community that had a

certain humility and self-awareness. This was part of

loving presence. Piercy wanted her students to engage in

contemplation--contemplation of themselves and themselves

within the community. Within a community that seeks to

learn about social justice there needs to be the recognition

of the oppressive forces of institutions. However, this

does not suggest taking the posture of a hero "in here" and

oppressors "out there."[55] The community needs to be humble

and self-aware enough to realize how much we all have

internalized oppressive forces and perpetuate them

unwittingly at times. It is important to struggle with the

dialectical and reflexive nature of the human agent within

the structure. It is also important to realize how much our

analysis of heroics and oppression has to do with our own

situatedness and location in the world.

Piercy was not the kind of teacher educator who saw "a

---

[55] In a personal letter, Peggy McIntosh helped me think through the notion of we are all part of what we need to change. She wrote, "I have said for a long time we are part of what we are trying to change. So the dichotomy of 'popular and unpopular' positions points too much to a "blob" "out there" and too much of a hero 'in here.'" (9/27/93)

hero in here." She was willing to look at herself critically and look at her own assumptions. She indicated through what she said that she was aware that she was part of all that needed to be changed. She encouraged her students to help her confront her own sexism. She encouraged them to challenge her—to identify the times she was being domineering and controlling.

The idea of a hero in here and oppressors out there is part of arrogant presence: "you are either for me or against me." Loving presence recognizes that we are all part of what we need to change. We need to critically examine our complicity and our internalizations of the ways in which oppression and privilege are meted out and recognize that there is no arrival.

Freire in his early writings was able to identify the difference between what I have labelled arrogant presence and loving presence. Loving presence needs to have humility to see others as partners:

> [D]ialogue cannot exist without humility. The naming of the world, through which men constantly re-create that world, cannot be an act of arrogance.... How can I dialogue if I always project ignorance onto others and never perceive my own? How can I dialogue if I regard myself as a case apart from other men—mere "its" in whom I cannot recognize other "I"s? How can I dialogue if I consider myself a member of the in-group of "pure" men, the owners of truth and knowledge... How can I dialogue if I am closed to—and even offended by—the contribution of others? How can I dialogue if I am afraid of being displaced, the mere possibility causing me torment and weakness?... Men who lack humility (or have lost it) cannot come to the people, cannot be their partners in naming the world. (Freire, 1968/1985, pp.78-79)

Freire is unlike many other critical theorists, who say we need to be critical (e.g., Carr and Kemmis, 1988), but do not tell us what kind of criticalness it is.

Freire does. He suggests a tentativeness in our views about the world and that we name the world together honors those we learn and work with. That kind of criticalness does not have the arrogant edge.

However, unintentionally Freire has created a criticalness (in this early writing) that is geared toward male theorists. His language and his images are male. Teacher educators with feminist imaginations need to use his ideas, but move beyond them, to fashion a criticalness that is undergirded with women in mind. A further irony is that often those critical theorists who embrace what Freire states embrace the criticalness with an arrogant presence, and teacher educators with feminist imaginations need to guard against this (see hooks, 1994 for a further discussion of followers of Freire).

Loving presence is no small feat. It was what distinguished Piercy not only from other teachers, but also what distinguished her from other feminists who teach. In many ways feminists who teach, myself included, have internalized arrogant presence. It affects the tone we use with our students and with our peers, even if we are committed to inclusivity, diversity, and equity. It can let us act with "cruelty and violence" even when we are

committed to equity and diversity.

Loving presence is part of what I learned from Piercy. She was committed to building a community in her classroom, and in the wider professional community. It was this loving presence that helped her envision a community of critical friends. The community that she was trying to develop was different than the learning community which is talked about in educational literature. This was a place where the relationship between teacher educator and students, and students and students, was governed by loving presence. This was a place, a safe place, yet not the kind of place where conflict was avoided. Instead, it was a place where conflict and struggle were human connectors. Conflict was embraced as helping connect humans in an educational enterprise.

So much of what I have come to call loving presence had to do with my studying Piercy. Yet it went beyond studying her. It had to do with seeing myself in the mirror she held up (seeing what arrogant presence was like in myself and therefore making the leap to what loving presence could be like). It was also studying her students and seeing that the young adults were already well versed in arrogant presence. It was also studying other feminists', profeminists', and anti-feminists' writings that I conceptualized what loving presence needs to be to fight arrogant presence.

## Self-disclosure

Another part of loving presence is self-disclosure. There were many instances where Piercy linked her personal life, her history, to the pedagogical issues being discussed. She considered herself "uninhibited" and this manifested itself in her willingness to share her life with her students when it furthered the issue at hand. During the second week of the semester, Piercy was talking about race and class with the students. Students were talking about the schools that they were observing in. Piercy pointed out that people were not talking about color. It seemed like people were being "color blind," which she went on to say was problematic. Piercy stated, "I think teachers are afraid to talk about being different." Students then proceeded to talk about their experiences growing up in the towns they came from in regard to race. Keith told of the intense hatred against Blacks that existed in his all White town. He talked about his uncle Fred who considered all African Americans "niggers." Piercy then told about her own extended family and the prejudice that existed within it. She heard the word "nigger" also. She said "I worry about my own prejudices. Color does make a difference."

Piercy disclosed a piece of her personal life that made a difference in her pedagogical life. She tried to show the students that the messages they received growing up made a difference in the way they approached diversity. Piercy

explained to me that she had certain purposes for engaging
in self-revelation. She stated that one "purpose of self-
disclosure is to build community." She also stated that she
wanted to "give them views and vantage points" that they
would not ordinarily get from a professor at Atwood. It was
important for her to "be their ally" and that if she were
open about herself it would help them feel comfortable about
being open also. This was evident after she revealed her
own family history after Keith revealed his. He did not
seem uncomfortable, but she seemed to be encouraging self-
disclosure by affirming and validating his by uncovering a
piece of her own family's history. However, Piercy stated
that she "didn't disclose some things" because she wanted to
make sure there was a "political purpose" to what she was
disclosing. She did not engage in self-revelation for its
own sake.

Even though Piercy used self-disclosure for political
purposes, her stance was antithetical to much of the
positivistic and detached scholarship and pedagogy that is
revered in academia. Self-disclosure shatters the notion of
the infallible professor, the all-knowing expert who has
everything figured out, and instead makes the professor
vulnerable. By Piercy telling her students that she was
still worried about prejudices that lay buried within her,
she allowed herself human fallibilities and removed herself
symbolically from the pristine ivory tower.

Torton Beck (1983) speaks to the issue of self-

disclosure in the academy:

> According to patriarchal concepts, anything personal in
> the classroom would have to be considered self-
> disclosure.... (p. 286) Surprisingly, I have decided
> that what is most important is not necessarily the act
> of disclosing, but the state of being ready to self-
> disclose: to be in a frame of mind where self-
> disclosure is possible, when it seems to be most
> beneficial; to know that it is always in your power to
> decide when and what to disclose. That kind of
> readiness means an internal integration and a
> willingness to take risks that allows for the
> unexpected in the teaching process, including the
> possibility of self-disclosing. I think that such a
> stance toward ourselves, our students, and the material
> we teach creates a powerful synthesis where the point
> is not self-disclosure for its own sake, or for the
> sake of political correctness, but because telling
> seems important at a given moment when it is most
> congruent with, and most organic to the teaching act.
> Spending so much time with self-disclosure has also
> helped me to know something I have always believed: *out
> of our lives, we make theories; according to our
> theories, we live our lives. And I do not know which
> comes first.* (p. 291, emphasis added)

Those that reside in the traditional ivory tower are

often silent about their Selves. Yet, to build trust and to

build a community of critical friends requires that one is

willing to engage in self-disclosure and to be vulnerable.

"[T]here can be no community without vulnerability; and

there can be no peace--ultimately no life--without

community" (Peck, 1987, p. 233). I would alter what Peck

states slightly, stating that there can be no community

without "spirited vulnerability."[56] This spirited

vulnerability is the ability to allow oneself to open up and

---

[56] I wish to thank Joan Hunault for giving me this term "spirited vulnerability."

to take risks both emotionally and intellectually.
Vulnerability on its own, without spiritedness, suggests
meekness and passivity. A spirited vulnerability is active
and interactive, a willingness to be generous of Self.

Piercy was willing to take risks in the classroom. She
was honest towards others and about herself to others. This
was where the personal met the pedagogical and the
pedagogical met the personal. We teach our Selves and that
the personal is an integral and important piece of the
pedagogical. Piercy self-disclosed to her students when it
was appropriate, so that her relationship with them went
"deeper than the masks of composure" (Peck, 1987, p. 59)
that teacher educators and students usually function behind.

> In our culture of rugged individualism--in which we
> generally feel that we dare not be honest about
> ourselves...If we are going to use the word [community]
> meaningfully we must restrict it to a group of
> individuals who have learned how to communicate
> honestly with each other, whose relationships go deeper
> than their masks of composure.... (p. 59)

## Passion

Passion is an important piece of loving presence--
passion for living, and learning, and teaching. I use
passion the way that it is traditionally conceived of:

> a compelling intense feeling or emotion; love, ardent
> affection; violent agitation of mind; ardor; an avid
> desire; a display of deep feeling; a pursuit to which
> one is devoted; the subject of an engrossing pursuit
> (The International Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary,
> 1975)

And also the way that Daly (1984) conceives of it:

I have chosen the word *passion* rather than the more modern term, *emotion*, to Name the movements within the soul that express deep Fire/Desire.... (Daly, 1984, pp. 197-198)

Piercy made it clear to her students that she believed passion was an essential part of school reform; as she told them during the first month of class when they were discussing the hidden curriculum, "We're talking about really reforming schools so that they are not passionless places, boring, and with a lack of emotion."

In academia as in all other professions, the love of "work" is not always there; however, for Piercy it was. Much of her language is infused with passion. Her pronouncements were bold when she spoke about the importance of her work, her own learning, and the teaching of her preservice teachers. As she said, "The most important thing in my life is teaching teachers to teach" (Sept. 16, 1993).[57] This was a committed stance, a strong stance in terms of her priorities. Piercy put an enormous amount of intellectual and emotional time in trying to think about her students individually and as a community. Therefore, the way her students responded to her was central for her. One and a half months into the semester, Piercy told the students that she appreciated that they acknowledged on the midterm feedback forms the considerable amount work that she put into the class:

---

[57] Although this particular quote was said after the time of our "we-search," I see it as a quintessential statement on her part.

I think about you hours before this class and I really
work hard at trying to see how I can help understand
your thinking and push your thinking. I really
appreciate that you see the time and work that goes
into the class because it is really important to me.

Piercy used the word love unabashedly to talk about how

she felt about/for others. Passion is something that is not

often seen or written about as an important educational

disposition in traditional educational theories (except for

Schwab, 1978). However, passion is often talked about in

feminist scholarship and thinking. I have come to see it as

a necessary part of a teacher educator with loving presence

(see hooks, 1994).

This loving presence that emotes passion was something

that I sensed (saw and heard and intuited)[58] from Piercy.

Passion embodied itself as a love of students as learners,

as ideas being delightful, and discussions and issues as fun

and exciting. Piercy took pride in what she did. She

herself loved to learn. She attended many faculty lectures

and guest lectures. She belonged to the gender and the

ethnicity task forces. She was devoted to developing the

disposition in her students to love learning and to develop

a scholarly intensity.

---

[58] Belenky et al., (1986) write about intuition and the way that it has been regarded:

> It is likely that the commonly accepted stereotype of women's thinking as emotional, intuitive, and personalized has contributed to the devaluation of women's minds and contributions, particularly in Western technologically oriented cultures, which value rationalism and objectivity (Sampson 1978). It is generally assumed that intuitive knowledge is more primitive, therefore less valuable, than so-called objective modes of knowing. (p.6)

Since this study is in many ways about "breaking the rules" and being "unruly" it makes sense to intuit something about the person that one has studied for such an intense period of time. I am also of the belief that if one had heart and mind, body and soul melded in a positive way, intuition would be a valued and valuable way of knowing.

When she spoke about students it was in a passionately connected way. She paid attention to each student and talked at length about trying to help them grow, learn, and develop. She pondered and puzzled over individual students in her class, and devoted much intellectual and emotional time to speaking about them with me and thinking about them on her own. Even the "mere" fact that she agreed to be part of this study, so as to get better at teaching preservice teachers about issues of equity and oppression, was a testimony to her commitment.

Piercy's passion for her work manifested itself simply as she made herself available to her students more than others might--she had official office hours which were Monday through Friday for an hour each day, and then any other time by appointment (Syllabus, p. 1). She would stay and speak to students after the class as long as they wanted. She would arrive early because it was important for her to be there just to "connect with them" as they came in.

Piercy saw the strengths and the ways her students could and did grow--rather than a deficit model of what they did not know and what they were "resisting." It was similar to what Kohl (1984) states about loving students as learners:

> Faith in the learner leads some teachers to find
> strengths where others see nothing but weakness and
> failure. Such faith...is a form of what I call the
> love for students as learners. It is important to
> pause over the idea of *loving students as learners*,
> which is not the same as simply loving students...[it

comes from a] love of learning and [a] pride in teaching...a job-related affection. (pp. 64-66, emphasis in original)

But for Piercy it was more than this; this loving students as learners was reversed, for it was also loving students as teachers. For Piercy it was also about how students could help *her* grow and learn. Therefore, it was developing a loving presence where all members of the community hold each other in esteem, have faith in their own and the other's ability to grow, learn, and develop.


## Care and Compassion

The "ethic of care" that Noddings (1984) speaks of is a component of loving presence. Noddings describes what she means by caring:

> Caring involves...a "feeling with" the other. We might want to call this relationship "empathy," but we should think about what we mean by this term.... "The power of projecting one's personality into, and so fully understanding, the object of contemplation." That is, perhaps, a peculiarly rational, western, masculine way of looking at "feeling with." The notion of "feeling with"...does not involve projection but reception. I have called it "engrossment." I do not "put myself in the other's shoes," so to speak, by analyzing his reality as objective data and then asking, "How would I feel in such a situation?" On the contrary, I set aside my temptation to analyze and to plan. I do not project; I receive the other into myself, and I see and feel with the other....I am not thus caused to see or to feel--that is, for I am committed to the receptivity that permits me to see and to feel in this way. (p. 30)

Caring, however, is not enough, not passionate or active enough. Perhaps the active quality of passion in compassion is what is needed. *Compassion*. It is important also to

note that the prefix *com* means "with, together, thoroughly"
(<u>Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary</u>, 1984, p. 262).
With passion. Thoroughly passionate. A joining together in
passion.

   Piercy experienced and demonstrated the whole range of
emotions, including compassion. Yet, she told me of an
incident that speaks to what the ethos of the academy does
to compassionate responses. She read out of a newspaper
article, to a previous ED 277 class, about a young Black
girl who had made it out of poverty. She had been accepted
to a prestigious college with scholarships. Her boyfriend
wanted to show her off to his friends because she was "so
pretty." They went to a party at the end of her senior
year and she was accidently shot and killed while she was
there. Piercy talked of her reaction:

> I broke down and cried. I was new at it too and
> [feeling] very vulnerable. I never read it again, I
> felt so embarrassed that I cried. I often cry with
> little kids. When I read a book like <u>Charlotte's Web</u>
> or anything sad, I am crying. It is an aura of the
> public kind of connectedness.

Piercy then talked about "how precious it is to have those
kind of classrooms with that kind of feeling inside it."
Piercy was compassionate, and felt deeply. She wanted her
contexts to allow the whole range of emotion, yet she felt
embarrassed by showing compassion, crying, in the academic
environment. Is it because the tradition in the academy is
for the head to rule, not the heart, unleashing messy
passions? Piercy felt no compunction about crying in front

of young children, but did when the learners were older and housed in the university. What happens to the ability to be fully human as we engage with adult learners?

This calls out the "potted passions" we seem to promote with adult learners in teacher education. These passions, Daly says,

> are "real" in the sense (like a bonsai tree or canned orange juice) but they are less than they should be and therefore dysfunctional.... They are incomplete, and, like lies which are partial truth parading as the whole, they are substitutes for genuine e-motions, deceiving their subjects and those with whom they are connected/disconnected in this deceptive way. (1984, pp. 206-207)

When I listened to Piercy talk of "breaking down," I asked, Why is deeply felt human emotion called "breaking down?" By casting it in the language of "being broken" it suggests being less than, and relegates the emotion into something to be embarrassed about. Yet it is this capacity to feel deeply, to cry, that shows us that we are connected to the world, to other beings, and to our heart. Yet somehow the higher up we go in education the less acceptable it is. I know I have felt the same embarrassment as Piercy did when I have cried in front of adult learners.

However, if we are trying to teach about social justice and equity, is it not important to make our students and ourselves more *humane*? Perhaps the teacher educator with feminist imagination has to unlearn her own embarrassment at being fully human, and help students to do the same. It means that the students connect to one another and to

themselves, exalting in the human capacity to feel deeply,

rejecting potted passions, and feeling passion and

compassion.  As Macy (1992) explains:

> We suffer with our world—that is the literal meaning
> of compassion.  It isn't some private craziness...
> increasingly it is being recognized that a
> compassionate response is neither craziness or a dodge.
> It is the opposite; it is a signal of our own
> evolution, a measure of our humanity.  We are capable
> of suffering with our world, and that is the true
> meaning of compassion.  It enables us to recognize our
> profound interconnectedness with all beings.  Don't
> ever apologize for crying for the trees burning in the
> Amazon or over the waters polluted from mines in the
> Rockies.  Don't apologize for the sorrow, grief, and
> rage you feel.  It is a measure of your humanity and
> your maturity.  *It is a measure of your open heart, and
> as your heart breaks open there will be room for the
> world to heal.*  That is what is happening as we see
> people honestly confronting the sorrows of our time.
> And it is an adaptive response. (p. 266, emphasis
> added)

Caring may not be enough in teacher education, for

caring as an important part of education is bandied about

quite regularly, yet teacher educators and students do not

seem to see injustice much clearer.  Compassion has a more

interactive quality to it, the underlying tenet being our

interconnectedness with all beings.  Compassion is that

aspect of loving presence that needs to be cultivated.

Compassion is described in the dictionary in terms of pity

and sympathy (see McKechnie, <u>Webster's New Universal</u>

<u>Unabridged Dictionary</u>, 1979).  However, these are not the

central features to the ethic for me.  The definition also

includes the notions of fellow feeling, kindness, and

tenderness.  These are the components that somehow need to

undergird the concept, a person stretching to understand the other/Other, who is separate in so many ways, often ideologically, intellectually, psychologically, emotionally, and certainly physically. Stretching to speak with, to listen to, to have fellow feeling for and with another, is what a teacher educator needs to foster.

I saw Piercy try with all her might to understand what her students thought, did, and felt. Teacher educators with feminist imaginations can allow our own compassion and passion to be part of the text of the classroom, not giving in to those feelings of embarrassment at our human responses. Human compassionate response is what needs to be promoted inside and outside of classrooms.

The room that I am painting is full of all the passion and compassion that humans can garner. Yet those kind of responses takes courage to express with adult learners, for they are not the norm.

In this chapter we have examined arrogant and loving presence. We have explored some of the manifestations of arrogant presence, such as competition, intellectual rigor, and deep disregard. Loving presence manifests itself in many other ways, such as, patience, puzzling through instead of judging, dialogue and humility, self-disclosure, passion, caring, and compassion.

Loving presence has implications for the way in which we behold students, teacher educators, teaching, and

learning. It has implications for the kind of metaphors we use as teacher educators with feminist imaginations. To examine the metaphors that we use is an important task, for metaphors suggest the possibilities we envision for the educational structure.

We have been inside the house, but I now explore what one dramatic metaphorical step backwards in the garden offers. We do not start with planting seeds, but rather tilling the soil. In the next chapter I survey the garden.

# CHAPTER VI

## PIERCY SAND: LOVING PRESENCE TILLING THE SOIL

### Teacher as Tiller of the Soil[59]: Or One Important Metaphorical Step Backwards in the Garden

> I talk about how I did *not* plant the seeds too deeply,
> how it was the fault of the earth, the land...I even
> think now that the land of the entire country was
> hostile to marigolds that year. This soil is bad for
> certain kinds of flowers. Certain seeds it will not
> nurture, certain fruit it will not bear, and when the
> land kills of its own volition, we acquiesce and say
> the victim had no right to live. We are wrong, of
> course.... (Toni Morrison, 1970,  p. 160)

In this chapter I explore the metaphors and the

language surrounding consciousness because I believe they

influence the ways in which one envisions teaching and

learning about oppression and privilege.  I believe

employing metaphors that suggest the complex, dynamic nature

of teaching and learning is essential.  These metaphors

should not suggest arrogant presence.

Arrogant presence takes many innocuous forms.  It is

all around us that we do not even recognize the multifarious

manifestations.  After having worked with Piercy, I think

differently about a metaphor I have often used, she and I

---

[59] Although for some the image of the tiller evokes a male persona, and that of a lonely endeavor (emerging perhaps from a Biblical image), in many countries the tilling of the land is done by women. In the Western world it is often gendered labor, that is, men do the tilling of the soil in farming. However, in developing countries it is often women's labor. As I conceived of this metaphor I did not see a male image, nor a large field, but rather a woman tilling the soil as she gardens.

These descriptions of tilling, till, and tiller are the literal meanings:

Tilling is really a way of managing soil so plants can be more easily started, grown and harvested. (Bowles, 1990, p.66)

The best way to improve rooting in compacted soils is to increase the porosity by tillage...(Daniels, 1990, p. 69)

till: to work by plowing, sowing, and raising crops: cultivate (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1984, p.1234)

tiller: one that tills: cultivator (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1984, p.1234)

have used, and I have heard critical theorists, feminist and profeminists use. This is the metaphor of planting seeds.[60] The idea goes: as teachers we plant seeds, that is all we can really do. We scatter around the seeds (ideas) and they either take hold or not.

Within this metaphor is an embedded assumption that the seeds are the right seeds, the teacher has the right way of scattering the seeds and it may just be that they have not been able to germinate in some people, because in the right people they take hold and flower and come to fruition. In the wrong people, no matter how good the seeds, they will not take hold. Some people, like some soil, are not deep enough. Not rich enough. Poor. Infertile. Bad. To me this now sounds hauntingly like "blaming the victim" (Ryan, 1976). Haberman (1987) states that "picking the right people rather than changing the wrong ones" (as cited in Melnick and Zeichner, 1994, p. 8) is the reform that is needed in teacher education. Haberman recommends selection screens before students arrive in teacher education programs, so that the right kind of person is selected and the right kind of dispositions can subsequently be developed.

---

[60] There is a long history of the use of the gardening metaphor in education. Beatty (1989) in her chapter "Child Gardening: The Teaching of Young Children in American Schools" says:

> Friedrich Froebel, the German educator who founded the first kindergarten in 1837, was influenced by Pestalozzi, at whose model school he had studied and lived. Froebel's pedagogy was an idiosyncratic blend of German pietism, idealism, and naturalistic philosophy. His central metaphor, that of the child as plant and the school as a garden, was organic, and he envisioned education as a process of growth based on natural laws of development. (p. 69)

It was only after going back to the conversations that Piercy and I had, and thinking deeply about our use of the metaphor of planting seeds, that something made me uncomfortable. I would not have recognized this discomfort had I not heard Piercy time and time again talk about the growth and development of people who others would have labelled "the wrong kind." It was not only that, it was also her faith that given the opportunity *we all* could grow and learn.

Piercy was the kind of teacher that was realistically optimistic (something she wanted to teach her own students). She would not rigidly determine that certain students were the "wrong kind" but rather through loving presence she was willing to have faith in them and give them the benefit of the doubt. She was willing to persevere, even in the face of hostility and arrogant presence. She was committed to trying to develop a community of critical friends and develop certain dispositions toward equity and diversity.

It is valid to conclude that young teacher candidates who are "culturally encapsulated" (see Melnick and Zeichner, 1994, p. 7) may not be eager, may not see the need for thinking deeply and critically and then acting upon issues of equity and diversity. However, the promise of education is that the "wrong" people may actually change, move, and transform. People may move in ways that we "approve" of or not; nonetheless, movement occurs. Through any kind of

interaction, something takes place--perhaps not what we would hope for or even welcome, nonetheless change occurs. Piercy hoped that the students would transform in ways that made them deeper thinkers about issues of equity and diversity.

Piercy used pieces of text that she hoped would challenge her students' conceptions of people of color. For example, three months into the semester they read a poem called "What Should I Tell My Children Who Are Black" by Margaret Burroughs.[61] This poem, in part, represents Piercy's own stance of acknowledging the complexity of the structural factors of oppression that the individual faces, yet the fervor and determination of the individual to fight that oppression (see Appendix C). This poem reflects the human agent within an oppressive structure. It lays out the overt and subtle racism against African Americans, and yet creates a rich voice of strength and survival in protest to that racism.

Piercy talked about issues like this consistently, trying to get students to question their own assumptions about the teacher's role in creating opportunities for students. Piercy tried to cultivate the students' propensities to think deeply about race and class issues. In many classes she tried to get students to see the

---

[61] Other citation information is unavailable.

complexity in opening up opportunities for children in a White dominating culture, all the while valuing the cultures that the students come from.

One month into the semester, Piercy had been discussing the Functionalist perspective about the purposes of schooling. Emily stated that educating poor people was important so that "they won't live in poverty." To which Keith, playing devil's advocate, countered with "we don't want a society filled with doctors and lawyers, that wouldn't be good. We need garbage collectors otherwise we would have a lot of unhappy rich people." Piercy then raised the question about "whose society is it, when we say 'a' society?" Implicit in her question of whose society is it when they say "a" society was the desire to have the students see that there are many societies within the United States society, and many cultures within the United States culture, and to question how they talk about "a" society. Piercy tried to till the soil and unpack the hardened assumptions about whose society, whose culture gets to define the United States. In this discussion, as others, she allowed many ideas to surface and be considered. She had created a community where seeds she valued were able to be considered along with others.

## Instances of the "Wrong Kind" of People

Piercy's curriculum included films and texts which would address issues of privilege and oppression. For example, Piercy showed the students the film A Class Divided to help them explore the concept of discrimination. In this film, the adults (who had been in Jane Elliot's third-grade class) returned and gave testimony about the enormous lifelong impact this experience had on them. As Piercy's students heard the adults in the film use "incorrect grammar," they began to make fun of their speech patterns. Matt said in a facetious tone, that he had a "question about their speaking skills," and then stated, "They weren't able to speak." Piercy confronted him and the other students stating that she perceived they were "laughing in a condescending way" at the people in the film. They proceeded to talk about their attitudes toward the issue of "correct" language usage.

Later in our discussion at Daly's, Piercy reported that it "is real common [that they make fun of people who are not formally educated], I have had that happen a lot. They will laugh at people, low income people. They won't explore their own assumptions about their own privilege" and not take a "self-critical stance."

Piercy tried to cultivate the students' insights and reflectiveness about oppression and privilege. Piercy believed that students could change and grow, even

judgmental ones. Being judgmental was a disposition in a
preservice teacher that Piercy believed severely harmed
interactions with children. Piercy was concerned about
Joanne, a White, privileged student who appeared detached
and removed, almost hostile in Piercy's classroom. (Joanne
declined to be interviewed for this study and so I could not
ask her what she felt or thought about the class.)

Joanne wrote a paper entitled "Disadvantaged Minority
Students in Education" that Piercy was shocked by. Piercy
indicated she felt Joanne was negative, judgmental, and had
the predilection to stereotype people of color. Joanne
wrote:

> Besides not having these types of stimulating materials
> [books and educational games] in their homes, the
> minority students' attitudes affect their learning
> capabilities. They come to school with a poor attitude
> and teachers try to correct them. The student pays no
> attention to the teacher because he or she does not see
> the teacher as an authority figure. The teacher is
> often seen this way because students in lower classes
> are often abused in order to get them to behave. Being
> constantly yelled at and abused at home has caused them
> to become misbehaved and rowdy. When the students are
> made to behave in school they show no respect and
> become resistant. The obedience that minorities are
> often taught is derived from violence. Minorities
> become more resistant toward the teacher and to
> learning because they are being forced to do something
> that they are unaccustomed to doing, and that is
> learning. (pp. 3-4)[62]

I might have determined that Joanne was the "wrong kind" of
future teacher to be working with a diverse student
population. Yet, Joanne was fairly typical of students who

---

[62] I added an apostrophe after "students" attitudes, that is the only editing of Joanne's text that was done.

had been taught that "White is right" and who are "taught to think of their lives as morally neutral, normative, and average, and also ideal, so that when we work to benefit others, this is seen as work which will allow 'them' to be more like 'us'" (McIntosh, 1988, p. 4).

It would have been easy for Piercy to dismiss Joanne or Matt because they did not demonstrate dispositions that Piercy valued. Joanne's paper was written towards the end of the term, after Piercy had many times explicitly talked with the class about White middle class people's tendency to see their lives as normative. However, Joanne was unable to see the problems inherent in seeing White middle class reality as the norm that all Others should be measured against, and Matt could not see how classist laughing at Others' language usage was.

It seemed that the seeds that Piercy planted about equity and anti-bias teaching did not take hold. Yet, Piercy did not write off Joanne or Matt. She kept pushing Joanne in her paper to cite the evidence for the claims she was making and to explain her comments. Piercy wrote in her response to Joanne that her comments about "minorities" sounded stereotypical. She also required Joanne to rewrite the paper. In Matt's case she challenged him to confront his own classism. Piercy did not come out and state, "That is a classist attitude." Instead, she began a conversation with the class about the laughter she heard and what she

perceived as their assumptions.

At no time did I get the sense from Piercy that Joanne or Matt were hopeless causes.  She did not suggest in any way that they could not learn and change.  She also did not stipulate that they had to "arrive" at the same point determined by Piercy.  Before the end of the third month of class, Piercy told of Joanne's roommate, with whom she had worked, and indicated that the same transformation could happen in Joanne:

> Joanne has been real negative. Her roommate I have as a junior.  I worked with her roommate on being judgmental and negative for almost a year. I told her, "This is not good. You are not going to be successful as a teacher."  She was abrupt, almost crude in how she would talk about kids.  She was so quick with judgments about kids.  Her journals were always very poor because they would be these whole ream of judgements without any reflection.  I thought she'll be dead in the water if she is this judgmental with parents.  She didn't pass the writing competency test.  The writing was really affected by the thinking.  But she really grew and did fabulous work with the kids.  She had real presence.  So once she toned down and became more reflective it really got to be a nice balance.

And during our conversation, after Matt made fun of the people on the video, Piercy commented that she thought Matt "took the challenge well."  Piercy went on to say:

> I didn't think that he was hurt by [my challenge].  I don't think he was offended by it.  Matt has done that a couple of times though.  I remember the first classes he made some real conservative kind of comment, and I challenged him on it--gently.

We went on to talk about how this challenge was firmer and necessary.

It was when I listened to the tapes of our

conversations that I realized our own use of the metaphor of
seeds was ill conceived, because Piercy was actualizing a
different metaphor in her teaching. Her concern and
commitment with developing the kind of community where trust
was built, risk was taken, ideas were challenged, and all
the while self-criticalness was being promoted was somehow
one step back from the planting of seeds. I started to get
the image in my mind of Piercy trying to till the soil.
That is, she was trying to develop a community that could be
honest with one another, open to ideas, and reflective, so
that all sorts of seeds *could* be spread, not just hers, but
others as well. The seeds were not good seeds or bad seeds,
the soil was not good soil or bad soil. Instead it was the
tiller that helped to create a soil that was receptive
enough so that all the seeds could be considered. This was
not a solitary endeavor. Rather as the teacher educator she
needed to prepare the community. She had the responsibility
for cultivating the soil, but the community worked together
with the ideas.

Although we do not know at the end of this study
whether Joanne or Matt changed, we do know that Piercy had
faith that they could change into future teachers who would
think deeply about race, class, and gender issues.

A rigid dichotomy of right and wrong kinds of people
fits into arrogant presence and positivistic paradigms of
growth. Piercy got frustrated at times, even concluded that

perhaps certain students should not be teachers, but she did not dismiss her students.

## Selecting the "Right" Kind of Students?

Piercy had the responsibility to decide who to let into the elementary education program after they took the foundations course. Piercy raised the issue of whether certain people should not be accepted into a teacher education program, for they do not have the right dispositions toward equity and diversity. Three weeks before the end of the semester, we had been talking about Dan (the older White student who worked at the factory to support his education). He was pro-capitalism and pro-"American" in an overt way. This was displayed especially in a discussion that Tatiana (the former East German exchange student) initiated about the "evils" of capitalism. Piercy had been puzzling over where to go next with him. This was at the end of the course and we had been talking about his reactions to certain things. For example, when Darcy (a professor at Atwood) came to talk about her experiences as a lesbian and how teachers need to be aware of gay and lesbian issues, he had sat through the entire class with his body rigid and arms folded. He was detached and showed no emotion. He made no eye contact with Darcy, Piercy, or myself. This was completely unlike Dan who was

usually very engaged and lively in class. His stance was so
uncharacteristic that I knew he was extremely uncomfortable
with the topic of lesbian and gay issues (his interview
proved this). His behavior was in stark contrast to the way
the other students responded, with openness and genuine
interest in what Darcy had to say. Piercy and I spoke at
length about Dan. Piercy said:

> Where to go next is what I think will be interesting.
> If I were to put Dan on the continuum, put him on the
> absolutist side, I think we are moving him slightly. I
> think he would be absolutist in saying that he is not
> absolutist. But I was really proud of them [the other
> students]. I have seen growth, I saw openness, I saw
> genuineness, I saw sincerity, enthusiasm, commitment as
> teachers. The questions that they asked were
> excellent. Emily you can't help but love that woman.
> God she is good. She just always amazes me how
> thoughtful she is. Yeah, I felt really good about
> their responses. I am just thinking about the teachers
> we are helping to grow, then at the back on my mind I
> am asking will Dan grow during his student teaching or
> will his growth be arrested? I can't help worry that
> it will be arrested. He will make some change but will
> it be the amount of change that needs to be made in one
> semester? Has that [one semester] been enough to give
> a forward propelling? I don't know if he has the
> propensity or the tendency to do that. So what do you
> do? *How do you create teacher education programs that
> develop that, or screen out people? Again that
> [screening out] gets all into excluding people, when we
> are talking about nonexclusion.* (emphasis added)

I would maintain that many of us, those who are
fighting for equity and social justice, were not always the
"right" people, but instead, if we are honest, could even
have been glaringly "wrong," and somehow learned and grew,
even reinventing ourselves. This seems to indicate that
others too can change. Piercy certainly believed this. She
seemed to have the stick with-it-ness of a *teacher*, and I

mean that term in the sense that she saw herself as teaching, as making the environment possible so that others grow and change and develop. Piercy did not believe there were "wrong" people. Instead, she thought that given the time and energy, she could make a difference, and she had lots of evidence of students growing and changing.

### Transformation of the Intended and Unintended Kind

If one creates an image of teacher as tiller of the soil, tilling a community, making it possible for critical friendship to occur, then the conception of both teacher and students learning and growing is possible. Piercy was very conscientious and determined to create an environment with loving presence. So much of the feminist literature talks about raising consciousness and making students aware. The implicit assumption is that the seeds of the correct ideas can be scattered and take hold in the right consciousness. Besides that being positivistic, that is not enough. It is positivistic to assume that the ideas you throw out will just germinate where and when you want them to, or at least ultimately because they are the right ideas and therefore should take hold eventually. It is not enough because as we know, the seeds we think we are planting may germinate into something entirely different than we had anticipated. There

is certainly not a one-to-one correspondence.[63] Trans-
formation takes many shapes and forms.

Piercy told of her own experiences being educated in
Catholic schools. From her experience there was no one-to-
one correspondence between what schooling intended and what
the outcome was. The nuns wanted to plant certain seeds;
however, those seeds took hold in unanticipated and
unexpected ways. The interesting paradox in Piercy's life
is that Catholic education provided a disposition for
critical thinking in Piercy. She talked about this the
first month of the semester:

> You learn in Catholic school to shut up and not say
> anything. You get pissed off and smolder because they
> do teach you to think and be reflective, but you are
> not supposed to question authority. I think of the
> oppressive Catholic environment. But in a way they did
> train you to be critical thinkers. They wanted you to
> be a true believer, so they were always critiquing the
> world and making you more critical, thoughtful about
> your values. Little did they know we were using it
> against their arguments.

Piercy said that her Catholic education helped her take a
critical stance. This was an unintended outcome as Piercy
saw it because she said she was taught to be reflective
about the world--yet the nuns didn't want her to question
authority.

As a teacher, you never really know if any of the ideas
will take hold. What you can do is create the environment
that makes what you believe in, what you cherish, what you

---

[63] Susan Melnick talked about goals of a teacher education program and the impact on pre-service teachers not being a one-to-
one correspondence in a class that I was in in 1989 and it has continued to ring true for me.

see as important for pre-service teachers to know, be
possibilities they consider. That is, what you have
"control" over is thinking hard and deep about what kind of
community you are developing, how you are developing it, and
what you can do to have your students genuinely engage and
engage genuinely in the community with you.

It is not a "simple" planting of seeds and watching
them germinate. Instead, it seems the one metaphorical step
back has to be creating the kind of community where
consciousness is challenged and sight/perception is
questioned, not in an environment of blame and condemnation
for not having the right attitude.

The teacher as tiller of the soil churns up the soil
and therefore conflict sometimes occurs. But this conflict
is good for it allows the soil, the community, to be open
and penetrable for inquiry and for the questioning of
assumptions. Piercy wanted to break up hardened soil.
After years of building up walls and defenses it is hard for
a genuine community to develop, for "defense routines" have
formed for years. People become closed to the realities of
others (for example, Joanne who considered "minorities" so
different from Whites that she easily stereotyped them); it
takes a tiller to break up that tightly packed soil so that
common ground can be found--breaking up the hard ground, so
that it can be receptive to seeds. Perhaps, perhaps then
seeds that you have scattered, the ideas you value, may get

internalized. But there are no guarantees. The best you can do is try to create an environment, a community that is committed to inquiry and equity within it, one that establishes (or at least begins to develop) a community of critical friends.

This tilling of the soil metaphor is very different from "All that we can hope is to get one person to think about something they've never thought about before and that really is all you can ask for. It is planting seeds, that is all it can be. And if it is just one little seed...." I said this to Piercy when we met two months after the semester was over and she seemed dismayed by what she perceived as the students not having grappled with issues of equity and diversity in important ways. There was a certain egocentrism in my statement: this sense that I as a teacher plant that one so important idea in the student's consciousness. That is part of what needs to be taken a step back from. Piercy drew my attention to this. Piercy talked about laughing at our own egocentrism two weeks into the course:

> [Teachers] are not aware of what they could be doing
> and by the same token I think we exaggerate our
> importance just as well. I think it's always that kind
> of laughing at your own egocentrism. Yet taking
> yourself seriously enough to be careful about what you
> do.

Language that better describes the process is tilling the soil, that the teacher educator as a member of the community, a community that takes itself seriously enough to

want to grow and develop, creates an environment that allows co-generative and critical dialogue to occur.

Piercy believed that people can learn to be critical thinkers. Yet she was aware of the interdependence within a community. She could try to develop the community of critical friends, but the students had to agree to participate and do the "work" necessary. Piercy talked about Reid about one month before the end of the semester. Reid was a White privileged student who was a physical education major. Piercy was fond of him, in part because earlier in the term he shared a story about his alcoholic father and was willing to make himself vulnerable in front of Piercy and his peers.

Piercy had initiated a conversation surrounding <u>Stand and Deliver</u> (a movie they had watched) and they were talking about the lack of parental support being portrayed for the students' school work. Piercy asked whether they could see this lack of parental support in the community of Atwood. Piercy called on Reid. He shared his own struggles growing up with the lack of support for his homework from his alcoholic father. Reid stated that his father did not value school work and forced him to do so many chores on the farm that he went to school with only four hours of sleep every day.

As Piercy and I walked out of class, Piercy stated, "I could've just kissed Reid." When I asked Piercy why she

said that, she replied:

> He's just such a decent human being. His open honesty
> about the connections he was making. His difficulties
> with his dad.  To have a football player, I know I'm
> stereotyping, but to have this big football player, who
> sits with the "maletown," to say those really sensitive
> things was, I thought, truly special.  And to connect
> it with what he was seeing and analyzing [in Stand and
> Deliver].  The connection of his life work [teaching]
> analytically to what I was asking them to look at.  I
> think I was responding to him as a human being.  He's
> just such a lovable [kid], I just love the kid.  That
> was just my first response, give him a big hug,
> especially since I called on him and put him on the
> spot.  I do that so that eventually they all start to
> contribute.  They know I am going to call on them. They
> know I want to hear from all of them.  I was just
> touched by what he said I guess.

However, Piercy was concerned that Reid was not putting

in the kind of work that was necessary to hone his own

thinking skills.

> I think the ability to be analytic to think sharply can
> be taught. I think he [Reid ] has to do the work
> though. I can set it up and show him, but that's what I
> am worried about I don't think he is doing the work in
> terms of putting the effort into the readings.  [He's
> not doing] the readings and grappling with the issues.
> He is not putting in the thinking he has to put into
> it.  I think he has defined David and Josh as just
> brighter than he is, his self-definition may be part of
> it.  I don't know, I really think there are a lot of
> people who don't think they are bright, so they don't
> become bright because they don't challenge their own
> thinking.

Piercy showed that she thought challenging one's own

thinking helps one to become bright.  This is very different

than just judging a student as bright or not, intelligent or

not.  She also located his self-image of his own

intelligence in relation to two other male students in

class.  Both these students were quite verbal and offered

insightful comments in class.

Piercy, even as she was thinking about one student, saw him in relation to other students. She consistently saw people as located within a community, and her analysis of Reid was in part based on how she perceived he saw himself in relation to others. She kept her mind's eye on tilling the soil and what she could do to make it happen and she constantly asked herself, "Where to go from here?"

The tilling of the community was also being done within a long legacy of competition and individualism in education. The win lest you lose climate in classrooms militates against tilling the soil. McIntosh (1989) uncovers in her greenhouse metaphor the ways in which evaluation has helped create an "on trial" ethos in education:

> [A] quirky old greenhouse. I open the door and smell! It's the smell of earth and of growing things. Here, it is all growth and development. These plants don't feel like they're on trial. Here they are all bodies in the body of the world. The foliage is diverse and green, and has its seasons. The greenhouse helps me to explain to me what I do dislike about grading in education. My aim as caretaker here is not to put plants in competition with each other. Quite the reverse; in gardening, to help each plant fulfill the potential which its seed contained, you *reduce* competition. That is what I try to do in education. In the greenhouse I feel authentic helping differing plants to thrive as themselves and trying to create conditions for that. (p. 10)

This metaphor of the greenhouse has many of the elements that I wish to use with tiller of the soil, trying to create an environment in which students come into their own without the harsh and biting competition that has a long history in

education and the United States society.

Within the idea of tilling the soil is the idea of readiness. No one is willing to accept something they are not ready to hear. People will not listen to ideas until a certain tilling has taken place. This tilling is done within, and with, a community of critical friends. Often the ideas that the tiller wants to have planted will not take hold for any number of reasons. The teacher with feminist imagination needs to come to grips with this reality. This does not mean that she stops trying to develop the community--instead it means that there were no guarantees in a profession like teaching.

This tilling of the soil, allows learning to be mutual, that is, for the teacher educator and her students. It is not a one-way learning endeavor. Instead, both learn and their thinking and imaginations are stretched in a community of critical friends, for the students offer their own seeds also.

The seeds that Piercy valued were seeds such as openness, honesty, self-disclosure, a critical stance, trust, and reflectiveness. There were also equity seeds such as anti-bias teaching, gender, race, class, and sexual identity. These seeds were some of the possibilities within ED 277. But there were also many other seeds being offered in the community by the students, and even perhaps unintentionally by Piercy. What her goals for her students

were may have produced unanticipated results. For example,
she wanted her students, especially her women students, to
speak up and out. She sometimes gently, sometimes
persistently, pushed the women students to do so. Her
intention was that they learn how to articulate their
thoughts within a community of peers. Were they learning to
open up or to shut down? Piercy (and other teachers) often
do not know what kind of growth or change will happen.

**Tilling the Soil, Radically Removing Arrogant Presence**

In my own teaching I have often assumed that by sheer
*force* of my will, students would see what I see, know what I
know. I thought that if they *just* read what I had read
(which I provided), engaged in the activities that I had
(which I provided), then they would see what I saw and know
what I knew. Did I desire they mimic me? Was I trying to
shape them in my own image? I would label that now as
arrogant presence. With arrogant presence I forgot that
students come into the classroom with their independent
selves and their own constructions of the world. That
independence can create a dynamic and interesting community
of critical friends. Piercy did not seem to forget this.
She often said that she did not want her students to mimic
her thoughts, but rather challenge her and challenge each
other. For example, during the first month of class as she
told them about Jeannie Oakes' (1985) <u>Keeping Track: How</u>

<u>Schools Structure Inequality</u>, she asked her students to "read with a critical eye" and to help her disagree with Oakes. She said, "It is hard for me to disagree with her because I like what she says. But I want you to help me to disagree with what she says." She tried to have the students help her push her own thinking.

While Piercy taught undergraduates she also worked in a Professional Development School with the university that she graduated from. We talked often about her experiences with these fourth graders and the links between education on all levels. It was during one of these conversations toward the end of the semester that she linked what she thought about them to the undergraduates that she taught:

> The opposite of the child depravity theory is that all kids are wonderful. Hey, they're not. That is what is powerful it is not just that the teacher is drawing something out, but it is two human beings coming together and something more comes out of it and the same thing that I think about this age level [undergrads] too. You don't know if it was always there, the things they are thinking. I guess it's reciprocity, their reflections of what you are saying, helps you see things from their point of view. You [the teacher] come out thinking differently about what goes on also.

She believed in the co-construction of meaning and knowledge in a classroom and that she could learn much from her students.

She also believed that her students could help her be a better teacher. For example, during the class where Piercy was going over their feedback of her, she stated that she wanted the students to help her check her interpretations of

what they had said and went on to say:

> I think this is an important class because we can make
> some adjustments, we can make some changes. And I can
> understand better what you are getting out of this
> class. I think it is also to me real important in your
> learning to be a teacher because one of the important
> things that you want to do is to be able to interact
> with your students to get their feedback on what they
> are learning.

Piercy wanted to make sure she was interpreting what her
students were saying. She also wanted to understand what
they were learning in the class. Piercy also saw each
challenge and conflict as an opportunity to be self-
reflective and self-critical, two goals and values she held
high. This is part of loving presence. When a teacher
educator rejects that she is <u>the one</u> who draws something out
or raises consciousness, and she sees how reciprocal and
dialectical the nature of teaching and learning is, she is
in part rejecting arrogant presence.

The teacher educator is the primary tiller of the soil,
but not the only one, for there is interdependence in a
community. The teacher educator also has the ability to
cultivate certain seeds that she deems important, her role
allows her to privilege ideas that she is most concerned
with. Yet, what transformations occur within her students
and within herself is a communal process.

This notion of the tiller of the soil is not common
from my readings of critical and feminist theory and
pedagogy. Instead, there is a pervasive image of the
teacher planting the right ideas (seeds) and thereby

altering lives. For example, Henry makes an impassioned and eloquent statement in her desire to transform consciousness:

> I teach because I desire, hope, expect to change lives.
> I believe in the political power of pedagogy, as David
> Lusted (1986) explicates, to transform consciousness.
> In my life/work, I have made a conscious political
> commitment to destabilize existing power relations. As
> a teacher educator, I stress helping my students come
> to understand and challenge sexism and sexist
> domination. (This is often the main emphasis among
> mainstream feminist educators). More importantly, I
> aim to assist their critique of the multifaceted
> dimensions of domination in all its forms under what
> bell hooks (1992) calls "White supremacist capitalist
> patriarchy." (Henry, 1993-94, p. 3)

I did say many of the same things as Henry in my original proposal. Yet after studying Piercy I am left with questions that I had not been inclined to ask before, that Piercy explicitly and implicitly urged me to ask myself. Is this emphasis on the "I" not an egocentric stance and perhaps part of arrogant presence? It seems the metaphorical step backwards has not been taken in Henry's analysis of what she does. In similar ways, I had overlooked the dialectical and reflexive nature of teaching and learning about oppression and privilege.

If we believe in the co-construction of meaning and knowledge then the planting of seeds metaphor is not enough. Where is the community of critical friends that works together to till the soil? And where is the recognition that there will be many seeds, seeds that the teacher will not necessarily like or want, but nonetheless are part of the community's array of possibilities? Where is the loving

presence that realizes the separate and unannexed other/Other? Perhaps the image of the teacher educator as the lone transformer of consciousness is ill-conceived.

hooks states that the work of a teacher committed to the full realization of students is fundamentally radical.

> The work of any teacher committed to the full self-realization of students was necessarily and fundamentally radical, that ideas were not neutral, that to teach in a way that liberates, that expands consciousness, that awakens, is to challenge domination at it very core. (hooks, 1989, p. 50)

Radical means to the root. Tilling the soil allows an even quality of soil to be created, breaks up hard and compact soil, lets the seeds set down in the necessary depth, enables the seeds to take hold, allows the young roots to grow and thrive. Without the tilling, without taking care of the community, liberatory education is not going to the root, is not fundamentally radical. Perhaps the root of any liberatory education has to be working on creating the kind of community where ideas are allowed to be placed in fertile soil. The important act is the creation of an environment where people are open and ready to hear various points of view and not reject them outright, instead, listening as critical friends to one another with challenge and support.

Helping students awaken to new possibilities, to new ideas, by creating a community of critical friends is radical, for it assumes the position that students are independent and that they have the ability and right to work on their own consciousness. As Frye (1983) suggests with

her loving eye, it is the teacher educator knowing and
accepting that as a teacher she has interests of her own,
but so do the students. It is the acceptance of separate
selves and this means separate desires, wishes, needs, and
agendas. The teacher educator with loving presence wants
the community to cohere and grow in positive ways, knowing
that her students are separate and autonomous beings, making
autonomous decisions.


## Falling Through the Trap Door: Raising Consciousness, Becoming Conscious, or Double Consciousness--Are There Subtle but Important Differences?

### Raising Consciousness

Consciousness-raising comes from the Chinese idea of
"speaking bitterness" (Mitchell, 1971). This has been and
still is an extremely important concept to feminist theory.
Its introduction to feminist movement (hooks, 1989) was one
of the major tools to help women (albeit White, middle-
class, heterosexual) come to see that their own particular
personal reality is part of the larger political reality for
women. It later became the tool where lower caste men, and
women of all classes, colors, and sexual identities could
see that the oppression they face (or the privilege they
experience if they are White, middle class, heterosexual
women) in their private spheres is part of the systemic and
interlocking reality of oppression and privilege in the
public sphere. Consciousness-raising has had significance

for many teacher educators who consider themselves feminist (or critical) teachers. Juliet Mitchell (1971) offers a classic feminist definition:

> Many liberationists see consciousness-raising as one of the most important contributions of the movement to a new politics.... The process of transforming the hidden, individual fears of women into a shared awareness of the meaning of them as social problems, the release of anger, anxiety, the struggle of proclaiming the painful and transforming it into the political--this process is *consciousness-raising*...the concept of 'consciousness-raising' is the reinterpretation of a Chinese revolutionary practice of 'speaking bitterness'--a reinterpretation made by middle-class women in place of Chinese peasants.... The first symptom of oppression is the repression of words; the state of suffering is so total and so assumed that it is not known to be there. 'Speaking bitterness' is the bringing to consciousness of the virtual unconscious oppression; one person's realization of an injustice brings to mind other injustices for the whole group.... In having been given for so long their own sphere, their 'other' world, women's oppression is hidden far from consciousness (this dilemma is expressed as 'women don't want liberating'); it is the acceptance of a situation as 'natural', or a misery as 'personal' that has first to be overcome. 'Consciousness-raising' is speaking the unspoken.(p. 61-62)

Although consciousness-raising has been indispensable to feminist movement, for teacher educators (at the very least) it is messy, perturbing, and perplexing in its implications, especially for developing a community of critical friends. It assumes a truth bearer in the form of an "expert" (the "expert" is often the teacher, yet this need not be so) and a naive and ignorant audience. Consciousness-raising does not assume a reciprocity in learning and teaching, nor does it assume that the "expert" may be ill informed, or just plain wrong. It also does not

honor the notion of coming to know multiple representations of truth within a community.

Who speaks for whom is answered implicitly in consciousness-raising--the intellectual (often the teacher) is speaking for the less informed (often the students). This way of being is part of arrogant presence. The raising of consciousness implies that there is an ultimate place where the consciousness is raised to. There are also by implication those who know where that place is. "Raising consciousness" assumes an arrogant presence, yet, it is such an easy trap to fall into, because what one person considers reality, she expects, wants, hopes other will accept. This desire for the others to accept the same reality sometimes becomes annexation and coercion. This is when education becomes a "dogma eat dogma" (unknown author) enterprise.

The seductiveness of wanting to raise the others'/Others' consciousness should not be underestimated. Hendrix (1990) articulates why it is so appealing: "We like to believe that the way we see the world is the way the world is. When [others] disagree with us, it is tempting to think that they are ill-informed or have a distorted point of view. How else could they be so wrong?" (p. 132).

In many feminist writings, including feminist teacher educators, the idea of "raising consciousness" is seen as a powerful tool in their interactions with students. For example, Henry (1993-1994) states, "I remind students that

our goal is to raise consciousness. Our aim must never be

to judge one another" ( pp. 3-4). And Lewis (1989) states:

> Tension [that exists because] consciousness raising [is
> being] done in the context of the embodied presence of
> the oppressor. Defining the social parameters in the
> feminist classroom requires a level of self-
> reflectivity seldom welcomed by those benefitting from
> the present social arrangements. As a feature of
> classroom dynamics the unpacking and uncovering of
> deeply submerged social practices of domination/
> entitlement experienced as subordination/oppression
> which we carry in and on our gendered bodies, in our
> verbal expressions, in the privilege (or lack of it) of
> having choice can become either a powerful force for
> change or a deeply destructive experience ultimately
> resulting in reactionary responses. (p. 5)

## Raising Consciousness or Becoming Conscious?

One of Piercy's main goals was that students develop a

stance of questioning their own assumptions. During a

number of classes during the semester she had people tally

up when men talked and when women talked to get a sense of

the patterns of interaction. The students were annoyed by

this, claiming that Piercy was making something out of

nothing. During the class where Piercy discussed their

midterm feedback, this topic came up. The students claimed

that gender issues and feminist issues were what ED 277 was

all about. Piercy mentioned raising the students'

consciousness during the class when the conflict occurred.

> You are telling me that I am raising your consciousness
> on gender issues, but that's different than saying
> that's been the focus of this course. And I would say,
> that's exactly what I am hoping I am doing. Making you
> more conscious about who [is talking in the class],
> "When am I listening and when am I talking? When I
> have given women the floor when I have given men the

floor." That's what I am hoping that I have developed
as a consciousness. But I want you to separate out in
your minds a consciousness, versus that is all we have
talked about. And then if I do go overboard call me on
it please. But I hope you will continue to be
conscious, because I think you have become more
conscious. I have seen a difference.

Piercy said that she wanted to raise their consciousness at
one point in her talk to them. But then she talked about
making them more conscious and that they have become more
conscious. There seems to be a subtle difference here.
Piercy's stating that they have become more conscious of the
kind of floor time they take, and the patterns of
interaction that the men and women have had in the class,
seems slightly different than raising consciousness. Piercy
rarely used the idea of "raising consciousness." However,
she did talk a lot about having them become more conscious
of what they say and do, having them become more aware of
what they see and hear. This seems to be a slight step away
from the notion of her raising their consciousness. Her use
of "raising consciousness" at the beginning of this excerpt
may seem to be a discrepant piece of evidence to what I have
been saying about Piercy seeing what they do together as co-
constructing meaning and knowledge.

However, she asked her students to call her on her own
sexism, and she also made it clear that she had struggled
with these issues for a long time. For example, during the
third month of class Piercy and the students were talking
about Sadker and Sadker being featured on television,

examining teachers' classrooms for gender bias. David couldn't understand, how, if the teachers knew they were being watched, why they weren't being equitable to the girls and boys. Emily stated that the teachers were not aware of what they were doing. At that point Piercy stated, "I did it for twenty years," telling them that she wasn't aware of gender issues for a long time, just like the teachers in the video. Vanessa then asked Piercy, "Did you not teach gender issues?" To which Piercy replied, "I read about them, but I did not keep track of them in here." Vanessa then stated, "So this is new for you too." By Piercy being willing to acknowledge her own struggles with gender equity, she seemed to indicate that she did not see herself as the "master of truth and justice" (Lather, 1991, p. 164)--the one who raises their consciousness.

Although Piercy used the term "raising consciousness," in relation to gender issues, and another time when she talked about her son and spouse, this occurred only twice in my data collection. Perhaps there was a reason that Piercy did not use consciousness-raising often to describe what she did or hoped for. Consciousness-raising is an inherently problematic term, and Piercy seemed to know this tacitly. Bredo and Feinberg (1982) ask and answer: "Can an approach that is based on the critique of ideology itself become ideological? The answer is of course it can..." (cited in Lather, 1991, p. 79). Piercy veered away from any one

ideology and although she considered herself a feminist, her irreverence helped her accomplish this. Tacitly she seemed to know that consciousness-raising is ideological in nature for teacher educators and their students.

Consciousness-raising is seen as political action which can create change. Consciousness-raising uncovers the ways in which personal experiences reflect a structure of oppression. Piercy wanted this kind of verbal self-examination, and she and her students were engaged in bridging the personal, the political, and the theoretical in the context of the classroom. However, consciousness-raising as a teaching device did not seem to honor participants together uncovering the meanings of social experiences they have had as gendered beings (see Humm, 1990). Piercy based so much of her teaching on all of them coming to know things together. She was in many realms more experienced than her students, and knew about some things more deeply and broadly because of her experience, but raising consciousness implicitly assumed a hierarchy, rather than a reciprocal learning community.

There is a certain amount of arrogant presence that imbues the notion of raising consciousness. There is the unexpressed, and nowadays denied, implication of false consciousness within raising consciousness. Although very few feminist and critical teachers would verbalize that they believe their students are suffering from "false

consciousness," however, just because they do not label it as such does not mean they don't use a version of it. They may call their students naive, ill-informed, not well educated, blind, and so on.

It is also important to acknowledge that thinking that someone is afflicted by false consciousness is compelling and seductive. False consciousness makes sense in a knowledge system that tells us there is an either-or reality, that things are right or wrong, good or bad, up or down. It then becomes a matter of the students resisting the right information, the right attitude, the right seeds.

Lather (1991) addresses the problematic nature of raising consciousness, which concomitantly implies resistance. "'Reasons for resistance' implied that we are right and had an elitist, dogmatic ring to it" (Luedke, 1985, as cited in Lather, p. 134). To see students as resisters to a particular truth is problematic if the theory of knowledge we ascribe to is the co-construction of knowledge, and therefore truth. To buy into resistance presupposes that the naive and ill-informed students are the resisters to the truth bearer, the teacher educator, who dispenses the TRUTH. The teacher with feminist imagination needs to battle this dogmatic and elitist tendency within herself constantly because the concepts of false consciousness and resistance are so powerfully enticing.

## Double Consciousness

Another approach to helping students and the teacher educator come to new understandings of oppression and privilege is that the educator tries to work with the notion of double consciousness (Du Bois, 1979; McIntosh, 1985) and double vision (McIntosh, 1985, 1989). These notions help us examine our own vision and consciousness and the deep assumptions we hold, sometimes so deep that they seem not like assumptions at all. The concept of double consciousness addresses implicitly the perplexing, complex, and sometimes confusing nature of consciousness.

When we are disenfranchised, we are a part of the society but in essential ways we are not "of" it. Therefore, there is a double consciousness that we can access. It is not a raising—it is not a getting rid of false consciousness—but rather it is a coming to know a double consciousness. It means helping others to see that the ways we experience the world is not the same way they do, that privilege and oppression create a different way of being "of the world."

> It means we have a kind of double consciousness or double vision.... if you think only in terms used at the top, you're not likely to have a well-developed "double vision": you really won't have seen everything from within the lateral world. Your account of it will be that of a person who has looked down at the surface of the water in the Caribbean rather than snorkeling in it. The life underneath can't be guessed from the surface. (McIntosh, 1985, p. 15)

This double consciousness is available to many of us,

but often we are trapped within seeing merely through the ways others have observed, interpreted and named for us. That is why we fall into the trap of finding "false consciousness," "raising consciousness," and "resistance" reasonable. Although we may not buy into a positivistic paradigm, "the lust for absolutes" (Lather, 1991, p. 6) lingers. Therefore, ultimate truth about oppression and privilege remain, and those who do not agree are seen as resisting the truth.

Although Piercy did not label what she did as developing a double consciousness, it is what I believe Piercy was reaching for. She never used this term. I never used this term when we spoke together. Yet, when I hear the ways that she talked about women, the ways in which she suggested they have the power within them to create their own lives, double consciousness makes sense. For example, after the first day of class at Daly's we talked about the tensions between the way society places demands on women to be young and beautiful and the ways in which this hurts women to think of themselves as valuable in other ways, including intellectually:[64]

---

[64] See Steinem's (1992) discussion of the ways in which women judge themselves. The following quote by Abbey, (1966/1994) "How to Pick a Woman" seems to me to be the kind of attitudes that put pressure on women. Abbey states:

> That which men call beauty in woman, which lures them on in endless pursuit, mad and helpless as any other animal, is not something abstract or idiosyncratic or in the eye of the beholder only, but rather *her* apparent readiness for reproduction ... What, then, does feminine beauty consist of?
> (1) Youth: between fifteen and thirty—ideal childbearing age—and most naturally found in conjunction with....
> (2) Good health...
> (3) Genetic fitness...
> A "plain" or "ugly" woman, on the other hand, is one whose appearance reveals that she would probably

Corinna: The point I'm trying to make, you and I can be hard on women in terms of them seeing themselves uni-dimensionally, as a toy or as gaining power through their looks, but the reality of the situation is that is how they do get power in a society that values that so much. In the final analysis what really counts is youth and beauty.

Piercy: They devalue themselves in the service of that value.

Corinna: They are complicit in it and that's where I hold women accountable. But they are not at fault and that's a distinction I make. I just recall the messages I got.

Piercy: That's where education comes in. You educate women. In the end you are going to devalue yourself because you buy in, you give up your time and your energy to those goals which in the end because you naturally get older spend all your time looking younger. If instead, you spend time with things that will make a contribution in different ways, you will be valuing yourself in different ways, for who you are and what you contribute.

Piercy seemed to consistently focus on the positive, rather than the negative. I am reminded of Nieto (1992) who in her case studies on students focuses on the success stories, and suggests we pay attention to success rather than always focusing on failures. Piercy tried to shift her thinking from a failure model of gender relations to a success model, to help her students figure out what could

---

not produce sound children--this based on man's instinctive and correct assumption that the offspring will tend to resemble the parent. For example, the woman is too thin or fat or bad-complexioned (indicative of poor health), et cetera; or she is too old, past the ideal childbearing age, this revealed in those symptoms to "beauty": wrinkled skin, lusterless hair, dull or watery eyes, a flabby or run-down body, sagging breasts, wide and sloppy buttocks, et cetera.

And thus we see the pathetic spectacle, in all cultures where aging is not accepted, of woman trying to desperately to preserve her youth (for in that is her essence)--and failing--in an attempt to deceive by imitating with artificial aids the simulacra of the female young: She dyes her hair; she paints, treats, stretches her skin; she caps her teeth; she darkens her eyelids to make her eyes seem brighter; she exercises; she inflates or implants with foreign objects her old, worn-out and useless breasts--a tragic and futile contention with the relentless, irresistible, irreversible process of biology, of aging...of that which we call, simply, time.... Man enjoys a...great advantage as well: Since he dominates the world, controls its power and wealth, he is also able to dominate, control, and buy women.... (pp. 102-103)

and should be done to change the status quo. She wanted to
figure out the elements of success, and build on those.
Toward the end of the third month of the semester she
stated:

> [I want to] turn to the women in a positive sense [and
> say] have there been any men that you have really
> listened to you and you have noticed that they have
> heard your voice when you have said something?  First
> of all try to get them to talk about what has happened
> to them as woman, and get them to encourage the men who
> are attempting to change their ways of being.

Piercy wanted her women students to begin to access the
double consciousness that they have, and also reinforce the
positive around them in order to create change.

### The Teacher Educator, the Students, "A Community Class," and the Knowledge They Come to Together

Piercy tried to go to where her students were and help
them reassess their ideas, look at their assumptions, and
monitor their own arguments.  She watched intently where her
students were at in their thinking and then tried to figure
out individually what they needed and what she could help
them with.  She tried to see what they saw--and understand
and respect where they were coming from, yet all the while
being active versus passive in attempting to get them to
examine what they said and saw.  This way of approaching
students fits into double consciousness.

Piercy also wanted her students to think about
other's/Other's realities.  Gary was shy, self-conscious,
and had a learning disability (self described).  He found it

hard to speak in classes; however, he stated that he felt comfortable in Piercy's class, in part, because of the way the men and women related:

> Gary: She puts us in groups, female/male oriented. That's helped me quite a bit.
>
> Corinna: O.K. When you say the male/female relationship is that because she makes sure there is men and women in every group?
>
> Gary: Yes. I think because of the opinions from the feminist approach and the male approach. Right from the start of class I've seen that.
>
> Corinna: What do you think about that?
>
> Gary: I like it. It's all right with me. I'm all for it.
>
> Corinna: Can you tell me what you think or feel about the class?
>
> Gary: I enjoy it. I realized that I'd never associated with a lot of those people from that class and I've gotten to know them. And it is not a class I get bored in because there is so much discussion. And a wide range of discussion, it's not just one particular topic. It varies and keeps you in focus and interested.
>
> Corinna: Is there anything about the class that you don't find very important, like the things that you talk about in there?
>
> Gary: I really don't. Everyone's opinion is important. *It is kind of a community class.* Everyone says something and believes it is really important and it should stand as a statement.

It seemed that Gary appreciated the different opinions expressed in the class and learned from them. He stated that it was "kind of a community class." Piercy wanted the class to be a place where various ideas were offered up, and where students thought deeply about their own arguments and

listened to and learned from the perspectives of their peers. Piercy wanted her students to begin to forge critical friendships so that they could hear others'/Others' realities. She believed listening and accepting others helped the listener begin to see the complexity of location and identity within a structure.

Lather (1991) examines the notion of consciousness and clearly delineates that it is not something being done to students or happening to students, but rather as she says pedagogy is "the transformation of consciousness that takes place in the intersection of three agencies--the teacher, the learner, and the knowledge that they together produce" (Lusted as cited in Lather, p. 15). This begins to get at the dialectical and reflexive nature that is a classroom. It is not one person doing something to the other and the other resisting this thing being done to them. It is the histories of the teacher and learner and the evolution of the knowledge that can help develop double consciousness and double vision when all merge in the context of the classroom. This is especially possible in a community of critical friends developed by loving presence.

Planting seeds suggests that the teacher is the dispenser of the truth--her seeds. Tilling the soil however, shows the power that the teacher educator has in facilitating a community of critical friends, where ideas are listened to and seriously thought about. Developing a

double consciousness suggests the dynamic and fluid nature
of what can occur in a classroom, the simultaneous awareness
of privilege and oppression, and one's own location in
institutional structures.

In this chapter I examined the metaphors and the
language surrounding consciousness. They influence the ways
in which one envisions teaching and learning about
oppression and privilege. To get to the kind of paradox
that exists, that is, consciousness being the "most stubborn
substance in the cosmos, and the most fluid" (Starhawk,
1993, p. 153) one needs metaphors and language that suggest
the complexity and the dynamic nature that exists when one
is dealing with a teacher educator's and students'
consciousness. In delving into Piercy's practice I saw
someone who tilled the soil, working toward developing
double consciousness in herself and in her students.

However, we are left with a dilemma that keeps
recurring. Implicit in the recognition and validation of
autonomous and separate selves within a classroom, and the
critique of consciousness-raising, we return to the dilemma
of relativism. How is a balance struck between not trying
to annex the other, and yet working toward a non-
relativistic and coherent vision of justice and equity? Is
this possible?

In the next chapter I continue to look at Piercy's
practice, investigating the connection of loving presence to

the development of critical friendship.

# CHAPTER VII

## PIERCY SAND: LOVING PRESENCE DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY OF CRITICAL FRIENDS

*A strong woman is woman who craves love*
*like oxygen or she turns blue choking.*
*A strong woman is a woman who loves*
*strongly and weeps strongly and is strongly*
*terrified and has strong needs.* A strong woman is
strong in words, in action, in connection, in feeling;
she is not strong as stone but as a wolf
suckling her young. Strength is not in her, but she
enacts it as the wind fills a sail.

*What comforts her is others loving*
*her equally for the strength and for the weakness*
*from which it issues,* lightning from a cloud.
Lightning stuns. In rain, the clouds disperse.
Only water of connection remains,
flowing through us. Strong is what we make
each other. Until we are all strong together,
a strong woman is a woman strongly afraid.
(These two stanzas are from a longer poem by Marge
Piercy, "For Strong Women," as cited in Murdock, 1990,
p.71, emphasis added)

In this chapter I explore how significant the theme of

community was for Piercy. For Piercy it was a community

that pursued social justice issues. This community was

inhabited by critical friends defined by central features

such as love, faith, and esteem. Critical friendship

requires honesty, deep listening, and creating a "world"

within one's classroom that goes against the tradition of

"protective postures" (Putnam & Burke, 1992) and "defensive

teaching and learning" (McNeil, 1986).

Listening to the themes that Piercy unearthed,

listening to the themes the students uncovered, I have

become a themester:

> A themester is one who labors at a theme, or one can be themeless, without a theme, and then a theme-maker furnishes a theme or subject.... We are all, fundamentally, themesters.
>> Listening to themes allows us to hear differences in voices. For example, the plainsong of care--its themes of connection and response to others....
> (Gilligan, Rogers, and Brown, 1990, p. 321)

As I themester I heard the theme of friendship from the students and I heard the theme of love from Piercy. Connected, the two themes are more than the plainsong of care. They become the theme of loving presence developing a community of critical friends. In this chapter I explore what it means to create a community of critical friends with loving presence. Loving presence and critical friendship are intimately entwined. One cannot be a critical friend with arrogant presence. That would involve too much of the contemptuous and disparaging forms of "critical." It is friendship that mediates this kind of critical stance.

I first heard the concept of being a "critical friend" from Jan Perry in 1993 over the National Education Association School Renewal computer network.[65] It struck me

---

[65] Recently (September 1994) I came upon an article written by Sagor (1991) where he talks about "critical friends" assisting teachers in 50 schools in Washington on project LEARN, helping them research the answers to their own questions about teaching and learning. He delineates what the guidelines for critical friends are for project LEARN:

> A critical friend is chosen according to the needs and desires of the project participants. The critical friend will not hold a "stake" or "ownership" in the problem being addressed or in the outcome if the project unless such is granted by the participants.
>> o A critical friend is a positive friend, whose primary agenda is to assist the project toward success.
>> o A critical friend may have a personal agenda complementary to the project's. The critical friend will share with the participants his or her motives/intents at the time of the first interaction.
>> o A critical friend is a visitor and participates only at the continued invitation of the project.
>> o A critical friend will respond and act honestly at every juncture.
>> o It is the critical friend's obligation to declare any conflict of interest or conflict of values with the project focus or methods.
>> o A critical friend will assume that the project's interactions, work, and findings are confidential unless the project directs otherwise.

as an interesting term, but it did not jolt me into an
understanding of anything new or different. It was when I
began to analyze the conversations that Piercy and I had,
regarding life and love, teaching and learning, students and
teachers, and watched her in the classroom, a new
understanding developed. Although Piercy never used this
term, it was what I interpret she was yearning for in her
communities. Among these communities are her classroom, her
colleagues, the wider scholarly community, and her
relationship with me. Piercy craved authentic relationships
where people could take critical stances with one another
but with a generous spirit, a spirit of friendship. Ergo
communities of critical friends. I knew there was
something uniquely relational in her teaching tone that I
could not quite discern. It was evident that she was trying
to create a community, for she said that constantly. But it
was a community unlike any I had read of or had seen in
operation. It was an easy analytical move to identify her
as a community builder, but her posture toward her community
was different in kind somehow, and that was what stumped me.
It was when I went back and listened to how Piercy talked
about community, and what she talked about as the

---

o The project participants are expected to assist the critical friend by fully informing him or her of all
agendas prior to each consultation. (p. 7)

This description overlaps with mine in the sense that it stipulates a positive friendship that works toward success of the
project. It also explicitly states that the critical friend will respond and act honestly at all times. However, this description of
a critical friend is dissimilar to mine in that it does not seem as dialectical as the kind that I am suggesting. Sagor's critical
friend seems like a friendly outsider, who enables the teacher to get a fresh perspective on their research problems or
teaching. I am suggesting a more connected insider/outsider role in terms of what Piercy and I had.

characteristics of her community, that I realized she was trying to create a community of critical friends with loving presence.

There are educational theorists who have explained that community goes much further than just a gathering of people for a common purpose. For example, Schwab (1976) described "'community' [as] a state or condition of persons, a set of internalized propensities, of tendencies to feel and act in certain ways with other people" (p. 241). He states that in a communal enterprise we figure out our joint needs and wants and work together to achieve those. Schwab maintains that community can be learned. Schwab's (1976) explanation begins to illuminate the kind of community that Piercy was speaking of. However, for a teacher educator who has feminist imagination there are specific tensions, dilemmas, and propensities that are different than for another educator trying to create a community.

## Piercy's Motif of Community

The motif of community wove itself throughout Piercy's descriptions of what she wanted for her students and what she was trying to achieve in her class. During the second month of the class she stated:

> I like the contributions that they are making. They were getting at issues that I thought were important to them as well as important to me. I was pleased when we talked about the peer counseling, again unwittingly, getting into this notion of school as a community, this trust building, seeing school as social as well as

cognitive. Those kind of issues seem to be important
to them and picking up on them in the text. You know
each classroom develops a theme, that runs through it.
I always try to talk about community but they seem to
be picking up on it more than others. I know we have
talked about the teacher's role in developing
communities and ways for people to learn, that kind of
discussion has surfaced a couple of times. There are a
couple of ways in which [our being a community]
converges [with what we are dealing with in the
curriculum]. We talk about it and it is specifically
addressed in one of the chapters on curriculum reform.
And we see videos too of cooperative groups. It [our
developing sense of what a community is] also starts
happening when we write our own philosophies, it begins
to surface as an issue. I tell them that community is
part of my philosophy and I think that they address it
in different ways. They know that [in the philosophy
paper] they are not supposed to mimic mine but I think
I hear the same sort of themes coming through [in
theirs].

Piercy saw community and relatedness even in the

fiction that she read, where others might not identify it as

such. I had given her a copy of May Sarton's (1990) The

Education of Harriet Hatfield. This is a story of an older

woman who has recently lost her lover (a woman) and opens a

bookstore. I was fascinated with Piercy's analysis of

Harriet's bookstore as a classroom and that it was Harriet's

need to connect to other people that really intrigued her.

During the third month of the semester she said:

Reading Hatfield, I felt like her bookstore was her
classroom, she was building her community. It was her
way of opening up, getting rid of that oppressive
hierarchy. Even though people came in with their
baggage, it was really special. She wanted that
[community] so bad, I could really relate to her need
to do that.

This theme of community pervaded all that Piercy

thought about in her teaching and more broadly in her

construction of concepts and principles. Piercy's
understanding of human agency located each individual within
community. She rejected the notion of the "rugged
individual" and instead believed that who we were as people
and what we did had to be seen within the context of the
communities in which we existed. We were not isolated
beings that acted and reacted. Instead we were intricately
webbed within a system of communities which affect us and we
them. This notion of the interdependence of the individual
and community governed her teaching in many ways. For
Piercy teaching, learning, and being were always seen as the
"self-in-relation" (McIntosh, 1985, p. 9). Piercy tried to
counter the glorification of individualism and instead
wanted to situate the self within the community.

For Piercy, even a concept like self-esteem, usually a
very individualistic psychological construct, was hooked
into community. She critiqued notions of the self as
individualistic and stationed people within systems--
sex/gender, race, class, and other power hierarchies. Three
months into the class we had been talking about Gloria
Steinem's (1992) Revolution From Within: A Book of Self-
Esteem. In this book Steinem links the personal sense of
self within a political reality, and then also links the
political reality people (especially women) face to the
personal self. She flipped the phrase "the personal is
political" (Hanisch as cited in Humm, 1990, p. 162) and

coined the phrase "the political is personal" (Steinem,

1992, p. 17). We had been talking about the notion of

feeling incompetent:

> I guess I balk at the idea of self-esteem because it is
> community esteem. Self-esteem just seems too self to
> me. It really is more situational. Self-esteem always
> seems like this global concept that you have. I think
> we are talking about political esteem, how you see
> yourself fitting in with this group of people, thinking
> about these hierarchical strata of who is on bottom and
> who is on top. Self-esteem to me just seems very self-
> indulgent and very self-focused. And if we see
> ourselves in relation with people that to me isn't
> self-esteem, it's different. I think your own feelings
> of competence are so much colored by who you are with,
> and how you are received, and how you see yourself with
> people. It is about being in relation with people who
> rely on you that see you are important, who give you a
> certain level of trust, a certain level of
> intellectual respect. It isn't even anything about
> what they say overtly. It can be the sharing of
> information and how people fit you into the community.
> How they treat you as part of the community. Do they
> see you as lower, somebody they wouldn't respect to
> trust with an issue?

Piercy talked about her being in the Atwood College's

community, saying that she felt a compatibility with her

peers, yet she was not sure that others felt the same way.

"In professional groups, I feel a real fit here at Atwood,

but I don't know that other people see it." Piercy

consistently located herself as an individual within

community. She tried to see how different individuals,

including herself, fit into the workings of the communities

they were a part of.

Piercy was constantly vigilant about the ways in which

the political esteem (as she called it) affected the

individual's sense of self. She made sense of the

individual specifically located and situated within a context, a context defined in part by hierarchy and a system of unequal power relations.

We talked during the semester about the despair that many teachers who have feminist imagination feel. I told Piercy about a woman who I had lunch with, who said to me that if students didn't hear about feminist issues from her they wouldn't hear about them anywhere. Piercy emphatically replied:

> That sounds self-serving and egocentric. Well, but, I guess it's buying into this individualistic "I'll be better than other people because I can be this wonderful missionary." They have bought into the norm [of individualism] rather than really seeing themselves as part of this community, making a contribution, figuring out who they are in the community and work from that. [Thinking of yourself as a member of a community] is a different way of thinking about who you are and what effect you can have and what your mission is. And the control you have is that you pick what you think you can do and where you can make a change.

Here is the idea of a community of critical friends working for social justice in some way, each enacting it perhaps differently, but nonetheless working as a member of a community. For Piercy community needed to be oriented towards justice. Through her curriculum and through her pedagogy she explicitly stressed the need for teachers to be empowered change agents.

## What Was This Community Like?

What was it that one saw and heard within a community that a teacher educator who has feminist imagination was

part of? During the first month of class Piercy was

talking about stereotypes. She asked Gary, if she were to

label him a "jock," how he would respond. He said he

wouldn't mind. Piercy was surprised and asked, "That's

acceptable?" Gary went on to explain, "It's like a family

in this class.[66] I feel comfortable in this class not like

in some others." Gary seemed to be saying that joking

around, even stereotyping was okay because he felt the class

was like a family. When I asked Gary in an interview, "What

sort of things are really important about the class for

you?" He replied:

> Well, I guess Dr. Sand because she is so personable.
> The teachers I remember most in high school are the
> ones who opened up to me. Who listened to problems,
> where I could go up there and I feel I can do that with
> her, you know. She's willing to help. *She's not just
> an educator but a friend*. (emphasis added)

Gary also said that he was learning to speak up in Piercy's

class and therefore in others also: "The thing that I have

learned most is how to speak in front of a class."

And when asked why, he replied:

> She [Piercy Sand] makes it a comfortable environment.
> She interacts with us all. She puts us in groups,
> female/male oriented. That's helped me quite a bit.
> In other classes too I find it easier [now after

---

[66] This metaphor of a family is a very interesting one. There is the assumption that all is "great" within a family, there is inevitably closeness and connection. R.D. Laing (1971) has written an interesting book entitled The Politics of the Family: And Other Essays. He states:

> We speak of families as though we all knew what families are. We identify, as families, networks of people who live together over periods of time, who have ties of marriage and kinship to one another. The more one studies family dynamics, the more *unclear* one becomes as to the ways *family* dynamics compare and contrast with the dynamics of other groups not called families, let alone the ways families themselves differ. As with dynamics, so with structure (patterns, more stable and enduring than others): again, comparisons and generalizations must be very tentative. (p.3, emphasis in original)

talking in this class]. The heart beat gets going really fast but it comes out.

Emily talked about the ethos that Piercy created in the class by her strategies and techniques and presence:

> I love the atmosphere in the class, I believe it is one of the few classes I've ever had in college that, you know, sits in a circle and are very open. When I see those students on campus, there are always "Hi, Emily." Very, very comfortable. I really like that about the class. I think that is a definite bonus.

When I asked Emily whether she felt she had a voice in the class she responded with:

> Well, that is one of her [Piercy's] expectations. It's different than other classes. That's what she wants. She wants us to have a voice. She wants to hear what we say. She has helped us feel that not only is it important to her, but it is important and necessary for all the other students in the class. It is kind of funny because a few students who have said they've never spoken in other classes, find themselves talking in here and then, they'll, a couple of them have said to me, "I can't believe I just talked for ten minutes in here. I never do that." It is that Dr. Sand has helped create that atmosphere in the classroom. You know, with the very first thing of the physical appearance of the classroom. We weren't in those rows, we were in a semi-circle, all looking at one another. We were closer together and then the small group activities that we do also helped. And, you know, learning everyone's name at the first class and then having people hook up for rides to get their observation assignments and all those things combined really helped everyone to feel comfortable.

As the students said, Piercy helped develop a community of critical friends, where the students felt they had voices and felt comfortable. Piercy was a critical friend to them, and they acknowledged her as such.

There are authors who have talked about this kind of relationships between colleagues. For example,

Fenstermacher (1992) talks about the critical discourse and
dialogical communication that the teacher and "the other"
can engage in about practice.  This alludes in part to what
I am suggesting by critical friendship, but my notion of
critical friendship captures love in ways that other
educational theorists do not broach.

Friendship is often seen as an intimate and private
enterprise.  However, I believe it can be expanded and
incorporated into wanting to know the other/Other,
connecting with another in a way that creates a mutual
desire to know, to find meaning, and to make sense of what
one is learning about.  The critical friendship may not last
forever--but the commitment is there as long as the
participants are together trying to make sense out of the
educational enterprise.

## **Friendship and Love**

Friendship and love are intimately linked, as Daly
(1978) points out:

> It is...important to re-call that the word *friend* is
> derived form an Old English term meaning to love,
> and...is akin to its roots to an Old English word
> meaning free...loving our own freedom,
> loving/encouraging the freedom of the other, the
> friend, and therefore *loving freely....* we are re-
> calling it, re-claiming it as our heritage.  The
> identity named by the Old World *friend* is from our own
> Background.  It names our Presence to each other on the
> Journey. (p. 367)

Friendship and loving presence are intimately linked.

Friendship does not mean to bind the other to oneself or

make the other into the image of oneself. Instead, it is "loving our own freedom, loving/encouraging the freedom of the other, the friend..." (p.336) enough and loving enough to allow the other to grow in the ways she or he needs to grow.

In some contexts, like teacher education classes, we are often connected to people because of an arranged reason, seldom designed with our input or consent. C. S. Lewis (1960) writes that friendship is a unique love because it is a chosen relationship. However, that is not the kind of friendship I am speaking of. I believe critical friendship can flourish in arranged relationships. Regardless of whether the relationship is by choice or not, friendship means allowing the other/Other the freedom to be all that they can be. It is fighting the tendency to arrogantly perceive the other and not recognize that the friend is independent and has needs, desires, expectations of her/his own. For example, Piercy fought the tendency to arrogantly perceive and dismiss Joanne or Matt when they made racist or classist statements, but instead tried to understand them and help them rethink some of their assumptions.

## Faith and Esteem

The dictionary' definition is also appropriate in the discussion of critical friendship:

> friend [ ... OE *freon* to love, *freo* free] 1 a: one
> attached to another by affection or esteem ....

(<u>Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary</u>, 1984, p. 493)

The notion of esteem is important. We may not always feel affection for a student or a colleague that we interact with. However, esteem for the other as a learner, as a person capable of growth and change can be the connection that builds the critical friendship. It is a faith in the infinite capacity for other human beings, as well as ourselves, to reinvent and reconstruct ourselves. And this stance of critical friendship and loving presence rejects the notion that there are "wrong" people/students/ colleagues and "right" people/students/colleagues and, instead, suggests that we all can learn from one another within a community of critical friends.

Piercy illustrated this esteem for and faith in others through her interactions with students, myself, and colleagues in general. She tried to figure out where her students were intellectually, emotionally, developmentally, and psychologically. She then tried to help them grow from that point. In her interactions with me, although we experienced tensions and conflicts of pedagogical, political, and personal kinds; there was always a positive regard that she maintained for me as a learner and as a teacher. She struggled to understand what I was thinking and feeling and to make sense of my reality compared to hers. With her other colleagues she maintained the stance that they could teach her something even if they were very

different from her personally, pedagogically, or
politically.

Piercy loved to learn *with others*. In all her
interactions she wanted critical friendship to help her
examine matters of the intellect, heart, and soul. She was
"driven" to develop a community of critical friends with
loving presence. She held the conviction that as human
beings ultimately we are all in this together, connected on
some fundamental level "on the same side in the struggle";
whether we see each other as oppressors, oppressed,
subjugators, or subjugated. This is not to negate the
differences, for differences are crucial. But on some
level, especially in teacher education classrooms this is
especially important for we are teaching those who will go
out and teach the other/Other. Therefore, to see the
connections amongst themselves to one another, and to the
other/Other is fundamental in the teaching and learning
process. To see another as "alien" and incomprehensible
creates insurmountable barriers. In teacher education we
can come to see that we can be allies to one another, even
when we disagree and even when we have conflicts. It is how
we engage in conflict, it is what we make of conflict, and
how we regard one another during conflict, that creates
either a community of critical friends or a
"psuedocommunity" (Peck, 1987).

I am not suggesting that this friendship is a lifetime

connection. Students and teachers move on and leave that community of critical friends behind. However, what remains is the change that was encouraged by that critical friendship. It is during that time when students and teachers, or colleagues are together that critical friendship can be entered into. "Passionate regard" (Weaver and Henke, 1992, p. vii) and "learning in good company" (Featherstone, Pfeiffer, & Smith, 1993) are central features of this kind of critical friendship.

## Honesty

Within this critical friendship is a sincerity and genuineness that promotes honesty with others and with oneself. There were many instances in which I found Piercy surprisingly honest. I emphasize my surprise. Remember those mirrors. Piercy attempted a new and different kind of relationship with her students. She was honest and connected in a way that few teacher educators manage, one that I seldom managed. Her honesty took me aback, because I am not used to teachers, myself included, being that honest. For example, when Piercy gave my proposal to the students, my first instinct was to go "No, we can't do that." Then I asked myself why. It was my fear that if they were informed of the nature of the study in detail, they might not want to participate. Yet, if we really respected our participants, the right thing to do was make sure they were fully

informed. It was the honest thing to do. I had mixed
feelings nonetheless. What her actions pointed out for me
in the long run, though, was the openness with which Piercy
approached her students. The tenor in their classroom
communicated that "we are all in this together." This was
one instance where she was developing community and trust.
We spoke about it after the first day of class:

> Corinna: There is a part of me that is a little worried
> about us having given out the proposal. When we did
> it, when you suggested it, I thought this is a great
> idea, it's really about informed consent. It's
> educative as well as informed consent. Yet there is
> another part of me that knowing when these students
> look at this paper they go "Who the fuck is this
> feminist man-hater."[67]

> Piercy: I don't think so, my initial read, that one kid
> is going to eat it up, Keith. He's already hooked in.
> We're going to find quieter kids who are hooked in.
> Guys over on the side ["maletown"], Reid is a phys. ed.
> major, he's insightful. Originally I might have had
> low expectations and I know that's my stereotype. That
> group of men that sat together are going to come from a
> very different perspective than Keith. They are going
> to read it and not know what the hell it is and be a
> little threatened by it. But it's going to be great

---

[67] There is a precedent set for this "fear." The following is a poem I wrote after a professional experience where I felt quite
hopeless about the ability of people to speak across differences. The following lines are what people have said to me, or
about me, in relation to the work that I do:

It's so easy...: Reflections on being a White middle class woman

She's just a man-hating feminist
Sticks and stones will break my bones but names will never hurt me...
She must be a dyke
Sticks and stones will break my bones but names will never hurt me...
Bleeding heart liberal
Sticks and stones will break my bones but names will never hurt me...
She's always talking about feminist issues
She's always talking about racism, sexism, classism, homophobia...
She must have had bad experiences with men
She isn't even dating a Native American or a Black man
That's an arrogant thing to say— you White middle-class woman you—
That's an easy thing for you to say— you White middle-class woman you
Actually—none of it's easy for me to say—not easy at all
It would be much easier to say nothing at all.

because I'm going to encourage them. Josh is bright,
he wrote a good introductory paper [to the college]. I
don't know the others.... But it will be interesting to
hear what they have to say about that proposal, some
won't bother to read it. Some who find it too complex
and won't bother to read it since they are not getting
graded on it. I'm not worried that there is going to
be a problem. I think how I handle it will be a
critical piece. I don't want to put pressure on them
but to tell them how important it is for me [to be a
part of this study].

Another example of Piercy's being open and honest with

them had to do with taking a gender count in their

classroom, noting when the men spoke and when the women

spoke. Piercy could have done it covertly, to prove a

point, that in terms of male to female ratio, the men tended

to dominate the discussions. However, she was unwilling to

do it surreptitiously. We were discussing this strategy and

I asked, "I want to know, I think I know your answer, but

why didn't you do it covertly? Why didn't you just have

someone document it? Piercy replied:

Because I think trust is important. I don't want them
to think that [I am deceiving them]. I've done it
before that way, and said, "Well, here you are." I
just think that I don't want to play that role with
them, I don't want to play "I'm going to catch you."
That's not what I want to be with them because it kind
of makes me the smart one and shows them that they need
me. Not only do I feel uncomfortable, it is not
consistent with what I am saying. So, to tell them
about it, and then to ask them, again, when we talked
before, I thought if I'm really sincere about this,
maybe they are right and maybe, in fact, things are
getting better. But we don't know [that], and together
we could figure that out and know if we are getting
better, if together we gather evidence. So that is why
I asked them today to give me some evidence that things
were better. To kind of say, "Okay I'll go with your
thinking but let's figure it out."

Piercy chose to use the power that she had to push for

a relationship that went beyond superficial interaction, a

relationship of critical friendship. She pushed for her

students to be honest with her and with each other about

what they are thought, felt, and assumed about teaching and

learning, and life. She pushed them to be honest by being

honest with them herself. She was sincere about learning

from them, being open to their belief that gender speech

dynamics had changed in university classrooms, that there

was equitable participation by the women and the men. She

was willing to acknowledge that they could be right, instead

of insisting they were naive. Piercy was not using power

over her students. Instead, she used her power to help

change the teacher educator-student relationship. As hooks

(1989) explains:

> To have a revolutionary feminist pedagogy we must first
> focus on the teacher-student relationship and the issue
> of power. How do we as feminist teachers use power in
> a way that is not coercive, dominating? Many women
> have had difficulty in asserting power in the feminist
> classroom for fear that to do so would be to exercise
> domination. Yet we must acknowledge that our role as
> teacher is a position of power over others. We can use
> that power in ways that diminish or in ways that enrich
> and it is this choice that should distinguish feminist
> pedagogy from ways of teaching that reinforce
> domination. (p. 52)

Frye (1990, private communication) states that honesty

is one of the most difficult of all the virtues. To be

honest with others also requires an honesty with oneself.

This means being able to see oneself reflected in the

mirrors that others hold up and figure out what the image

really means. It means being ethical enough to tell the

truth about oneself so that one can be truthful with others.

## Deep Listening

In critical friendship there's a certain patience and a generosity of spirit with oneself and others that needs to be cultivated. It means taking others seriously enough to push a critical friend's thinking (see Rich, 1978) and helping one another stretch across the sometimes great divides that separate us. The differences which can divide us can also connect us if we learn from dissimilarities. Critical friendship requires deep listening, listening as Daly (1985) suggests with one's Inner ear to the silences as well as the spoken words. Piercy, during the first month of the semester, talked about what she wasn't "hearing," wasn't sensing from her students. She said that she didn't sense a passion from them about the need to make things better for the disenfranchised:

> There's no feeling that things are, need to be different. There's no outrage and that we need to do something different. Well, maybe in attempting, I don't know, I was going to say attempting to stir up, that in fact they are trying to placate.

Piercy listened to the tone and nuance of the class and its silences. She was disturbed by their lack of outrage, but then she asked herself whether this may stem from their desire to smooth things over, make inequity seem less egregious. She struggled to make sense of the differences between her urgency and outrage and their seeming lack of

these feelings.

When I listened to the students, I heard the concept of friendship being used to describe the relationship that Piercy and the students had. One student, David, used the concept of friendship on the final feedback form. I found this startling when I first read it. Yet, after analyzing the data, it made sense. Piercy wanted to create a community of critical friends, a "world" in which a teacher educator and students could enter into friendship. The fact that a student saw her as a friend is congruent with her wish for a certain kind of community construction. The final feedback questionnaire was designed so that it would help move students to a collegial way of seeing the class they had participated in. The following is an excerpt from David's questionnaire:

> *Piercy Sand is thinking about redesigning ED 277. You are a colleague of hers on the planning committee. Could you please give her advice on the following:*
>
> *Teacher-student relations*
>
> This was perhaps my funnest and most exciting class I've taken since I've been to Atwood. I felt like I could talk with you about issues that are very sensitive. *I feel that the openness and friendship between you & I helped me be able to enjoy the class and appreciate it.* (emphasis added)
>
> *Student-student relations*
>
> I feel the class fostered good relations between us and I feel a lot of us grew closer over the course of the semester, this may be due to our openness in

discussion.[68]

Through dialogue, deep listening, and connection Piercy attempted to reach out and draw others into her "world" of critical friends.

## Friendship and 'World'-travelling

When I use "world" I use it the way that Lugones (1987) uses it to talk about "playfully 'world'-travelling." This is the kind of stance one needs to take in talking across differences. Lugones talks about loving perception and playfully world travelling between White women and women of color, but the way that she uses the notion of world also applies to a world constructed within a classroom. "[A] 'world' can also be a...non-dominant construction...or it can be...an idiosyncratic construction" (p. 10). A world of critical friendship can be created in teacher education. It requires the development of a "world" that challenges the norms, where people can talk authentically and across their differences. Piercy illustrated "playfully 'world'-travelling" when she asked Darcy, who was lesbian, to come and talk to the class about heterosexism and homophobia. This was an invitation for Piercy's students and herself to explore issues of homophobia and heterosexism—to come face-to-face with the "Other" and to stretch themselves to learn

---

[68] I have corrected spelling in David's feedback response but no other editing of the text was done.

about what it means for someone to feel Other in the educational system. That day a "world" was created where the "Other" was able to tell of her reality and connect across the differences with future teachers.

In this chapter we have explored how significant the theme of community was for Piercy. It was a community pursuing social justice issues. This community was inhabited by critical friends. Critical friendship has central features such as love, faith, and esteem. It also requires honesty, deep listening, and creating a "world" within one's classroom where members can "playfully travel." Critical friendship also means that one does not engage in the kind of criticism that is belittling, disparaging, or contemptuous. The emphasis is on criticism that attends to helping the friend grow and learn, and moves the entire community of critical friends forward in constructive ways.


## Defying Norms

This construction of a classroom as a "world" of critical friends is unusual and defies norms. Being defended is often the norm in classroom contexts, and many undergraduates have had almost two decades of practice in being defended. McNeil (1986) has called it defensive teaching. McNeil talks about how defensive simplification of content, "knowledge control" (p.188) and pedagogy that tries to maintain control have de-skilled both teachers and

students. "Tired, bored, and rushed to cover content, teachers and students meet in a path of least resistance" (p. 176). I argue that, in addition, students and teachers have also been de-skilled in their ability to have meaningful relationships with one another within the context of the classroom.

Putnam and Burke (1992) describe this defensive learning and teaching as "a web of protective postures" (p. 14) within classrooms. This legacy of protective postures and defensive teaching and learning makes genuine and authentic relationships between teachers and students unconventional in many ways. Attempting to break through the defended postures is no mean feat. It may be a daunting task to help others lower their defenses, and it may seem unconventional to try to do so in an education class, yet this was Piercy's vision. She wanted students and teachers to be open, honest, and direct. She wanted them to be critical friends.

It takes an adventurous spirit to be able to go beyond the strictures of what the norm is between students and the teacher educator. To be able to maintain a "spirited vulnerability" while flying in the face of convention takes an adventurous teacher educator. In the next chapter we will examine what it means to be an adventurous teacher educator with feminist imagination.

# CHAPTER VIII

## PIERCY SAND: TEACHER EDUCATOR WITH AN ADVENTUROUS FEMINIST IMAGINATION

> Community-building is an adventure, a going into the unknown. People are routinely terrified of the emptiness of the unknown. (Peck, 1987, p. 95)

> Efforts to make teaching more adventurous, spontaneous, and exciting run directly counter to...conservative tendencies in instructional practice.... (Cohen, 1988, Abstract).

> It appears that college and university instruction has changed little for generations. (Cohen, 1988, p. 21)

In this chapter I will inquire into what adventurous teaching means for a teacher educator with feminist imagination. If we want to be thoughtful about adventurous teaching, I believe it needs to be context-specific. That is, adventurous teaching means different things to, and has different outcomes for, teacher educators who are women who are trying to teach and learn about issues of oppression and privilege, than it does for teacher educators who are men or women and are not trying to teach and learn about these same issues. I delve into the complexity of the unteaching and unlearning which must take place surrounding these issues and what impact this has on the construct of adventurous teaching. I will also examine how the very constructs Piercy and I used to describe our work were undergirded and informed by "whiteliness" and privilege. I will explore a case of adventurous teaching, a case of stretching beyond sexual privilege. As a precursor to the next chapter, at

281

the end of this one I talk about why in any account of a
teacher teaching one needs to talk of students learning.

When I listened to Piercy I heard that teaching was an
adventure for her, exciting and full of intellectual and
emotional risk.  Cohen (1988) talks about adventurous
teaching and also states that the norm in content and
pedagogy runs counter to the adventurous spirit in teachers
and teaching.  Although Cohen does not focus on post-
secondary education, he does link the conservatism in public
schools to the conservatism in universities.  He provides
many helpful features and outcomes of adventurous teaching
and provides a framework which helps us think about what
adventurous teaching could mean for teacher education.

Cohen states that "Adventurous instruction...opens up
uncertainty by advancing a view of knowledge as a developing
human construction and of academic discourse as a process in
which uncertainty and dispute play central parts" (p. 37).
In interacting with her students as she did, taking the
stance that knowledge was constructed, Piercy entered into
uncertainty.  Piercy, as Cohen suggests, wanted students "to
be intellectual explorers, to share their ideas, arguments,
and intuitions with classmates and teachers" (p. 39).  She
invited her students to challenge her and each other.  The
students were not used to this kind of classroom ethos and
interaction.  As Cohen states, "This ordinarily increases
the difficulty of...[teachers'] work, in part, because so

many students seem allergic to it, at least initially" (p. 39).

To illustrate this "allergic reaction," consider a class which occurred two months into the semester. Piercy asked them for their opinions on classroom interaction. Emily said to Piercy, "I was uncomfortable giving you what you wanted. I wanted you [Piercy] to say, 'This is what I wanted.'" Piercy then asked the class, "Does anyone else feel that I should give you the final answer?" Tricia replied, "You've had more teaching experience." Piercy then said to them, "I've tried to pick questions that don't have easy answers." She then tried to assure them that she was not trying to keep answers from them: "My goal is not to withhold from you." Piercy wanted a community where issues were genuinely up for discussion. Still the students saw her as the authority that had the final answer. Cohen seems to speak of the way in which this new self-reliance may make students uncomfortable:

> When teachers embark on an adventurous approach to pedagogy, then, they open up an entire new regime, one in which students have more autonomy in thought and expression, and much more authority as intellectuals. But such autonomy and authority are difficult for many students and their teachers. They find it unfamiliar at least, unsettling, and even threatening. (p. 40)

Cohen identifies that the teacher depends on the students and the teacher must make herself more vulnerable. This new vulnerability opens up the possibility that students may injure the teacher:

> Another feature of adventurous instruction, therefore, is that teachers must *depend* on their students much more visibly and acutely.... Teachers must find ways to extend their own dependence on students, which implies relinquishing many central instruments of their influence in the classroom. Teachers must make themselves more *vulnerable*, offering students opportunities to fail them, and even inflict painful wounds, in order to help them become more powerful thinkers. Such work can be exhilarating and rewarding, but it is not easy. (pp.40-41, emphasis added)

The ways in which Piercy set up the classroom community, where Piercy was open to their critiques of her and her pedagogy, made her more vulnerable. Yet she did this to make them more powerful thinkers, thinkers who could "read the word and the world" (Freire and Macedo, 1988).

Cohen recognizes the vulnerability and the interdependence required in trying to create a community of inquirers. He has even included intuition as a way of knowing that students could share with one another. He talks about the intellectual adventure and taxing lessons (p. 29) and how difficult such work can be. Yet what Piercy helps us do is flesh out what this might look and feel like within a teacher education classroom guided by feminist imagination. She also helps us contextualize it.

Cohen indicates that adventurous pedagogy is difficult. Yet, the risk factors may be different for people who are not White, privileged, heterosexual, and male. As Henry (1993-1994) makes it poignantly clear, her teacher education pedagogy is dramatically affected by the fact that she is an African American woman. Adventurous teaching may mean

something very different for women and men, White teachers and teachers of color, heterosexual and lesbian and gay teachers. Piercy illuminates how adventurous teaching might be different depending on who is doing the teaching, where the teaching is taking place, and what kind of controversial issues may complicate the desire for and actualization of adventurous teaching and learning. She provides us with insights about the added difficulties associated with adventurous teaching and learning. From studying Piercy we are able to think about some specifics--that is, what teacher education with feminist imagination looks like for a middle class, White woman teaching an Educational Foundations course.

## Context-specific Adventurous Teaching

As I write about the educational concept of adventurous teaching to describe Piercy's teaching, I am acutely aware that this term needs to be contextualized. Personal history and context changes everything. Who Piercy was, where she was located, and what she taught affected her capacity to be adventurous. Adventurous teaching can be useful to teacher educators with feminist imaginations, especially if we situate and locate it within a context that deals with the issues we are concerned with.

The kind of vulnerability that is implied for women teacher educators with feminist imaginations may be

different than the kind of vulnerability that Cohen alludes

to. For example, Piercy was teaching privileged White

students about issues of oppression and privilege that they

might not have necessarily welcomed. She was creating an

ethos in her classroom that urged them to engage in real and

authentic relationships, with her and with each other (not

being defensive) that challenged their norms of what it

meant to be a student. The students had a lot of power at

Atwood and their evaluations of her were crucial in

determining whether she received tenure or not. If they did

not like her it could cost her her job. Her "spirited

vulnerability" allowed her to be adventurous, even if there

was much risk involved. However, the wounds that could be

inflicted (as Cohen suggests) were perhaps more severe in a

context such as Atwood, with a majority of White privileged

students, who might not welcome seeing themselves as part of

the problem of oppression (as well as the solution).

Adventurous teaching may also be more problematic when

issues of race, class, gender, social justice, and

oppression are foci of the class. If students are allergic

to uncertainty when the teacher tries to "open up varied

conceptions of knowledge," how much more allergic do they

become if the teacher is trying to unteach and help the

students unlearn? Allergic reactions may be all the more

dramatic and the work all the more difficult if the teacher

hopes students unlearn conceptions of the world that they

are absolutely certain about. Le Guin (1986) writes about

unlearning and unteaching:

> Our schools and colleges, institutions of the
> patriarchy, generally teach us to listen to people in
> power, men or women speaking the father tongue; and so
> they teach us not to listen to the mother tongue, to
> what the powerless say, poor men, women, children: not
> to hear that as valid discourse.
>     I am trying to unlearn these lessons, along with
> other lessons I was taught about my society,
> particularly lessons concerning the minds, work, works,
> and being of women. (p. 151)

Many preservice teachers have learned these lessons well,

but sometimes they don't see the need to unlearn them. A

haunting comment comes back to me, "I didn't know that I

didn't know, and I didn't know that I didn't care."[69] What

was especially important and quite dismaying to Piercy and

myself about the new preservice teachers--the postfeminist

group of young people being "groomed" to become teachers--is

that they believed that all that "stuff" about oppression

and inequality was something not of their generation. They

believed that they were liberated and aware young people and

that things were equal now. As Michelle stated in her

interview:

> I think that women are treated pretty fairly in today's
> society so I don't think it is necessary for somebody
> to point out the differences or similarities because
> there will always be differences between men and women.
> I think it is being made a bigger deal of than needs to
> be because I think we are fairly equal. I think there
> is always going to be a difference, there are just
> certain things that men can do that women can't do,

---

[69] I first heard this comment from Molly MacGregor in (1991, July) at a presentation she made at SEED (Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity) Workshop, Palo Alto, California.

strength wise.  It is just the way we're made.
For Michelle, even if things were "fairly equal" and not
completely equal, it had more to do with innate differences
between women and men and not with oppression and privilege.

Teachers who struggle to be unteachers need a great
deal of ordinary, transgressive, and political courage to
try to grapple with the lessons that they and their students
had been exposed to and may have learned well.  So for
Piercy, as others like her trying to unlearn and unteach,
adventurous teaching may mean serious consequences at times,
and courage all the time.

Uncertainty may also be perceived differently when
women professors display it as opposed to men professors.
In an academy where certainty is the desire and the
knowledge claims need to be certain, uncertainty and
ambiguity are perceived as weak and not "intellectually
rigorous" by both students and colleagues.  McIntosh (1985,
1989) speaks of feelings of fraudulence that many women in
hierarchical institutions experience.  Uncertainty may
create the discomfort of feeling out of place in an academy
that seeks and demands certainty.

McIntosh (1989), concentrating primarily on women
academics, suggests, "The trick is to trust the very
feelings of discomfort that are giving us the most trouble
and try to follow them where they may lead" (p.1).  Those
feelings of discomfort often let us see that something is

not quite right--that the definitions, the constructs, the ways of Being have to be redefined for teacher educators with feminist imaginations.

An added layer to adventurous teaching is that teacher educators with feminist imaginations must unlearn the old constructs that they themselves have learned. There is much to unlearn, peeling away the layers of domination from own minds in an attempt to be "unteachers" for our students. We are unlearning the lessons that cloud our vision--that blind us to truly seeing--that deafen us to truly hearing the voices of those who are often silenced and silent. We need to stretch the concept of adventurous teaching to make room for the students' and the teachers' own unlearning. This entails a different kind of adventure, producing a different kind of risk.

There are no neutral concepts--even the dictionary alerts us to the ways in which constructs are gender specific. I looked up "adventure" in the dictionary and found an interesting gender twist to it.[70] This is what I found:

> adventure 1 a: an undertaking involving danger and unknown risks b: the encountering of risks 2: an exciting or remarkable experience.
>
> adventurer 1: one that adventures: as a a: soldier of

---

[70] In Margaret Buchmann's 1989 class "Conceptual Foundations of Teacher Education" she encouraged us to really study the words that we were attempting to make sense of. I had not used a dictionary's definition since high school, so this was an unusual task that I was being asked to complete. Yet, I soon came to understand how useful this can be. Especially in a constructivist and critical paradigm of knowing, it seems to make sense to create some common ground for the use of certain words and phrases. It is also a wonderful way to see how gender specific certain words are and have become.

fortune b: one that engages in risky commercial enterprises for profit 2: one who seeks unmerited wealth or positions esp. by playing on the credulity or prejudice of others.

adventuresome: inclined to take risks: venturesome.

adventuress: a female adventurer; esp : a woman who seeks position or livelihood by questionable means. (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1984, p. 59)

The last entry is interesting because it gets at what gender issues are all about. This special category of adventuress alludes to a woman in sexual terms, i.e., prostitution (see Spender, 1985; Mills 1989). And it suggests all the other definitions referred only to men. Adventure for women only has sexual meaning or at least is defined for the adventures of men. Language is not neutral. It is laden with generations of a sex/gender, race, and class system. Therefore, the constructs within the language cannot help but be also. And so it is important that as teacher educators with feminist imaginations we make constructs context-specific.

## Too Spirited?

Adventurous teaching requires a spirited attitude. However, a spirited attitude can be part of arrogant presence. That is, adventurous teaching can be so spirited that it is ruthless.[71] A teacher educator with ruthless

---

[71] Just as Joan Hunault provided me with the concept of "spirited vulnerability" she also stated that there was a book that she read that was so spirited it was ruthless.

spiritedness pulls and drags the students on an adventure to

the place she wants them to be. This is a danger that a

teacher educator with feminist imagination needs to be

careful of. To really "honor the life in front of you"

(Hunault, 1994, private communication) means that you do not

try to annex the other and make them come with you to the

place _you_ have deemed best. At the end of the first month

of the course, Piercy talked about trying to get students to

move to a constructivist theory of knowledge. She seemed to

be equivocating, worried that she was pulling them, trying

to change them, yet concluding that she believed it was

important for teachers to see knowledge as constructed.

> When I think of moving people's minds, I do think about
> moving them to this constructivist view. I shouldn't
> see it as moving people, changing people and all that,
> but I can't help it. I do think it is a better way of
> thinking about knowledge. I do think it is a better
> way to think about teaching. I try to be open.

Her equivocation may also be that the way in which she was

approaching this theory of knowledge with the students was

more in the spirit of consciousness-raising. And although

she did not use that term here, reading between the lines,

that is what it may have been and it was creating a

discomfort for her.

For Piercy it was essential that the future teachers in

her class, especially the quiet women, learn to speak up and

out. She felt passionate about this. Piercy talked about

Ellen, a student whom she had urged to speak up in class.

Ellen was absent after the class in which she was prodded to

speak.  Piercy said to me:

> She'll never make it through if she's worried about my
> confrontation.  It would be good if she did drop out
> because this is called the way we live, "I want to know
> from you and I want your challenges."  I mean, that's
> just something I can't live without.  How can I develop
> their thinking if we're not [challenging each other]?
> That's what I try to do in that class is signal them
> what I am all about.  I think I tried to be supportive,
> to let her know that I wasn't going to be mean to her,
> but let her know I wanted to hear from her.  And she's
> going to want to talk.  If she's seeing that as a
> negative then, all of her life, her family was quiet
> and this is the way it should be, "I don't want to
> change."  Okay, I don't think I would change myself if
> I thought people were good teachers, could function not
> having a voice, not speaking out in groups, not being a
> part of it.  I don't see her as a contributing part of
> the community at this point.  I don't, to me that is an
> important thing, an important part of being a beginning
> teacher.  Now maybe there are other roles she'd do more
> successfully.  I'm not pretending that it is objective
> at all, but again, I think a lot of this is subjective.

One can hear how important it was for Piercy that students

entered the community conversation, where they were

contributing and challenging one another.  However, for some

of the students this may have seemed a little too spirited.

Piercy's passion and spiritedness was seen by a couple of

the young women as pulling and dragging them to speak when

they were not ready or willing to.  For the adventurous

teacher educator with feminist imagination there are always

tensions between her goals and the needs and desires of the

students in front of her.


### "Whiteliness," Privilege and Adventurous Teaching

In exploring the concept of adventurous teaching it is

vital to try to tease out the ways in which our particular

social constructions affected this concept. For example, what did being White women have to do with our notion of adventurous teaching? In so many ways Piercy and I dwelled in a White house. We attempted to stretch ourselves to see beyond the walls of our own imagination, and yet within this study we had a White woman teaching mostly White students in a privileged college's teacher education classroom studied by a White woman.

Piercy strove to teach her students to think about "Otherness," equity, diversity, and oppression, asking them to leave their White house for a time, to think about their race, their class, their gender, and their sexual identity. Ellesworth (1989) states:

> I cannot unproblematically bring subjugated knowledges to light when I am not free of my own learned racism, fat oppression, classism, ableism, or sexism. No teacher is free of these learned and internalized oppressions. Nor are accounts for one group's suffering and struggle immune from reproducing narratives oppressive to another's--the racism of the Womens's Movement in the United States is one example. (p. 308)

Part of being an adventurous teacher educator for Piercy meant grappling with how not to be blinded by the privileges of race, class, and sexuality, all the while sealed within race, class, and sexual identity privilege. She struggled with how not to see the world from a narrow, privileged stance and how to imaginatively "world-travel" as Lugones (1987) suggests. She wanted to help her students unlearn the messages they received about dominance. The

tension was that as a White, privileged, heterosexual

teacher she realized her perspectives were bounded by what

McIntosh (1988) calls White privilege:

> My schooling gave me no training in seeing myself as an
> oppressor as an unfairly advantaged person, or as a
> participant in a damaged culture.  I was taught to see
> myself as an individual whose moral state depended on
> her individual moral will.... (p. 4) I was taught to
> recognize racism only in individual acts of meanness by
> members of my [White] group, never in invisible systems
> conferring unsought racial dominance on my group from
> birth...the obliviousness of White advantage...is kept
> strongly enculturated in the United States so as to
> maintain the myth of meritocracy. (p. 18-19)

When White advantage is not addressed in teacher

education classes we create teachers who are complicit in

perpetuating the myth of meritocracy.  Or we create teachers

(like Joanne who wrote about "Disadvantaged Minority

Students in Education") who think that White is the norm

against which everything else is measured and found wanting.

So the task of the adventurous teacher educator who is

battling the myths that permeate this culture means learning

about White privilege and "whiteliness."

Although a teacher may have certain privileges, this

does not mean that she is blind to issues of oppression.

Because Piercy was similar in some ways to the students, she

could reach them.  However, Piercy, like any teacher who

came with privilege on multiple levels, was in a peculiar

position of trying to stretch beyond what she knew, and how

she knew it, locked within her social constructions.   As

Ellesworth (1989) explains, there is little in the

literature on feminist or critical pedagogy that gives much

insight into the various constraints the teacher educator

experiences as she attempts to teach and unteach oppression

and domination:

> The concept of critical pedagogy assumes a commitment
> on the part of the professor/teacher toward ending the
> student's oppression. Yet the literature offers no
> sustained attempt to problematize this stance and
> confront the likelihood that the professor brings to
> social movements (including critical pedagogy)
> interests of her or his own race, class, ethnicity,
> gender, and other positions. S/he does not play the
> role of the disinterested mediator on the side of the
> oppressed group. (p. 309)

## The Fulcrum of our "Whiteliness" and Privilege

To investigate seriously what it means to be

adventurous in our teaching means to disclose how the very

ways in which we are privileged affect the ways in which we

view adventurous teaching and our ability to engage in it.

Sealed in our white skins, our class, our heterosexuality,

and our visions of the world made what Piercy and I said,

and what I write, "ethnospecific"[72] and particularistic,

including all the constructs we used. We could not speak

for all women or even for all women who are White. We could

not speak for all feminists, we could not speak for all

feminist teachers, nor could we speak for all teacher

educators with feminist imaginations. Piercy and I could

only speak for ourselves, I to a greater degree than she

---

[72] McIntosh, 1990, private communication.

within the pages of this study. I can illuminate what I have come to know about us as teacher educators who have feminist imaginations.

Perhaps the most poignant way that I see how we were sealed in our privilege is that when we spoke of gender, when we spoke of women and men, the images in our heads were often White women and men, middle-class women and men, heterosexual women and men. For example, Piercy and I were pondering over what it must be like for men to somehow be aware that their gender will not hinder them. I stated during the second week of the semester:

> There must be something stimulating about knowing that on an unconscious level that you can be president, that you are never hindered by your gender, you are mostly rewarded by it. Power, I think is a very seductive drug.[73]

I did not tease out the ways in which gender intersected with race, class, and sexual identity. I did not qualify what I was saying, adding that lower caste men, or women of color, or poor women were even less likely to be able to conceive of attaining the status of president in the United States. I had a White, middle class, privileged, and heterosexual man in my head, contrasting him with the same

---

[73] Woolf (1929) states that women are seen as being able to enlarge the man in his own mind's eye:

> Women have served all these centuries as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size.... That is why Napoleon and Mussolini both insist so emphatically upon the inferiority of women, for if they were not inferior, they would cease to enlarge. That serves to explain in part the necessity that women so often are to men.... [I]f she begins to tell the truth, the figure in the looking-glass shrinks; his fitness for life is diminished. How is he to go on giving judgement, civilising natives, making laws, writing books, dressing up and speechifying at banquets, unless he can see himself at dinner at least twice the size he really is? (pp. 35-36)

kind of woman.

Both Piercy and I seemed to fall into this trap of "whiteliness." For example, Piercy and I talked during the second week of the course about male elementary teachers being recruited into elementary teaching. She felt that male recruitment benefitted education, since elementary teaching had been "genderized." I challenged this blanket recruitment idea, rejecting the notion of male elementary teachers being recruited simply because they were male. I wanted males who were sensitive, caring, and had other nurturing qualities.[74] Piercy stated:

> I think there is still something valuable about
> crossing gender lines in careers, women crossing lines
> and saying "I can do it." I watch myself, that I don't
> favor the men. I haven't had that many men in
> elementary education, maybe four or five. I try not to
> [favor them]. Most of them have not been the typical
> [kind]. I had one that was typical, [saying] "I want
> to be a principal."

Again, during this discussion we did not appraise the ways in which careers are open and closed to women of color, lower caste men, or those whose class, and sexual identity are "Other."

This is not to say that we did not concern ourselves with women and men of color, or poor women and men, or lesbians and gays. It means that the fulcrum of our "whiteliness" and privilege created images that were White, and middle class, and heterosexual. Like the male image

---

[74] This raises the issue of whether these are dispositions that we can teach as part of the content of teacher education.

that is created in both the speaker and the receiver when the generic "he," "man," "mankind" and so on are spoken (Hamilton, 1988; Spender, 1985; Miller and Swift, 1988), the generic woman and man in our heads were created in our own image. This was a limitation to our visions, imaginations, and this study. I keenly hear the title <u>All The Women are</u> <u>White, all the Blacks are Men, But Some of us are Brave...</u> (Hull, G., Scott, P.B., and Smith, B, 1982) ringing in my ears.

Part of this constrained imagination has to do with how we were schooled to think of ourselves and others/Other's as "women and minorities." The phrase is ubiquitous and reminds me of the ways in which we were educated in racism and sexism in seemingly innocuous ways. On a radio talk show "Like It Is," McIntosh (August 10, 1990) stated:

> Since women are half of every cultural group—The logic of [the] phrase [women and minorities] boggles the mind. The phrase is racist and sexist. First of all, "women and minorities" implies that women are white and minorities don't include women. So it's racism on one hand and sexism on the other hand to even use the phrase. And I've been trying to think of a parallel to it. And I think here's a parallel. You would talk about "parents and men": completely illogical.... Or, let's say you talked about "Chinese and men." Right away, you'd have a colossal uproar. Half of China is male. And we need to have this kind of uproar about the phrase "women and minorities." Women are half of every cultural group; half of all groups that, in the U.S., have been called minorities are female. (pp. 2-3)

Not only did the terms we heard and use soak into our psyches and create these images, but our own positionality constrained what we could see and imagine.

## A Discrepant Case of Color-fullness

The place where we did not seem to be limited in our conceptualization of color was in regard to children. Piercy was teaching fourth grade once a week in a Professional Development School associated with the Big Ten University she graduated from (she was still linked to a research project on literacy). I had recently co-taught in a fifth grade classroom in a Professional Development School.

We talked often about the children whom we respectively taught. Piercy told about her own assumptions and how reading Feinberg and Soltis' (1985) School and Society helped her to think differently about the children she was teaching. For example, at the end of the third month of the semester, Piercy told a vignette about a little Black girl and a little White girl in the class she was a part of:

> In fourth grade we have an editorial board, they ask somebody who isn't their close friend to get feedback. A little girl whose name was Ashley, was voted on the editorial board. Ashley is a little very thin blond little girl who is always dressed up with her little lacy dresses. Her mother remarried a Protestant minister, they have always lived on the poor side on town. And this little Black girl who is interesting physically because she is so different. She is a little Black, stocky little girl, who always wears sweatsuits, and has almost a stoic silence about her, fascinating. And Betsy came to her with her story and it was all about her friend whose name was also Ashley. And it was all about how she went to Ashley's house to play, that she loved to be with Ashley, and they were great friends. Well Ashley asked Betsy to color the faces in brown in her pictures. It was just funny to see because Betsy just went and did it without ever asking why, and just colored them in brown. We are now interviewing the kids to see what they think of the

scenario, how they interpret it. I like to do with
students is basically ask them to say what do you think
happened there? And use functionalist, conflict and
the interpretist perspectives. Maybe she thought her
skin was beautiful, maybe there is a class struggle
embedded. It shows how you need to be careful that you
don't always see racial issues in kids cause maybe they
don't have the same [interpretations]. It brings it so
close to home your immediate impression, "Oh yeah it
was racism." But you don't know what kid's motives
are. Instead of asking the kid to construct the
meaning, asking the kid to make some sense of what they
did, and not overlaying our own constructions is really
powerful. And to be honest I never thought about it
until I taught this course, until I started reading
[Feinberg and] Soltis and trying to be analytic about
my own perspective. When I first saw it I thought
"There's racism here" then when I started thinking
about it, really started to say, "wait a minute."

This is one example of Piercy having seen living gender,

race, and class in her elementary classroom. She described

these children vividly; there was no generic gender, race,

or class used by Piercy in this description. She was able

to see the living social constructions in this context by

having other experiences to reflect on (for example, the

Feinberg and Soltis book). She tried to be reflective about

her way of interpretation, jumping to conclusions about

racism, from an adult point of view. She did not want to

overgeneralize and perhaps erroneously assume that there was

racism in this incident, when perhaps for the children

something else was going on.

I also spoke often about the children that I was co-

teaching, being very specific in terms of race, class, and

gender. With children we did not seem to have a generic

White gendered image in our heads; instead, there was a

rainbow of images in our heads. Why that distinction?
Could part of it be that when we looked out into the room of
ED 277 that there was a mass of White faces, and that was
imprinted in our mind as we spoke of gender? That was not
true when we spoke of our respective elementary classes,
where there were children of color within our gaze. This is
part of the answer. However, this is too easy an answer.
The more "difficult" answer is that we had been well trained
to think of the world as "WHITE JUST LIKE US" and so we did
not push ourselves to see the world more color-fully when we
did not "have" to.

## Adventurous Teaching and the Struggle Against Scapegoating and Inauthenticity

Adventurous teaching, as Cohen states, "opens up
uncertainty" by asserting that knowledge is co-constructed
and that uncertainty, ambiguity, and complexity are inherent
in any academic discourse. These features add difficulty
for the teacher educator trying not to overgeneralize or
undergeneralize issues of oppression, privilege, and
responsibility.

When Piercy and I spoke about race, class, and gender,
there were times when we overgeneralized about the issues,
students, and teaching and learning. Yet, Piercy struggled
(harder than I) not to overgeneralize and yet be clear about
the times when generalization might need to be invoked. Yet
she was aware that there was always a danger of over-

generalizing. In the conversation at the end of the third month of the semester, I told Piercy about Maria-Yolanda, a Mexican American girl in my fifth-grade class who was called "Mexican burrito" in class and I confronted the White boy who did it; I intervened and called it out as a racist incident. We had been talking about teachers interpreting children's actions in adult ways, sometimes erroneously. I admitted that I had perhaps overlaid my racist interpretation of an event, and yet what was interesting for me was that Maria-Yolanda in an interview afterwards talked about how much my intervening meant to her. Piercy responded to my comments by stating:

> Well but you see, I think you have an important point there. I think teachers do know from being with kids, knowing histories. I have a history of knowledge about Dan [the older student who worked in the factory] for example. I think you can use the history to pigeonhole a kid or you can use it to know the appropriate time to surface an issue with them. And I would bet you were probably right on, given what you said about knowing this class, listening to these kids and understanding where they were at, to me that intervention was probably very appropriate. In the art of educating teachers, it is to teach them to intervene appropriately, in the right ways in the right time, given the right signals, *not to overgeneralize, but to generalize.* I think that is where it is really, really hard, really gets tricky, because the things that bad teachers do are also important things that good teachers do. I think we steer away too much from intervening, but knowing when and being careful with it, that's really a hard thing to teach. And when do you have enough data, enough evidence, when do you trust your gut and when do you trust your mind, and do all that. It's really an important issue. And it can be very oppressive to kids or it can be very opening and encouraging and enlightening to kids.

Piercy was sensitive to the balance of generalizing but not

overgeneralizing, and how grappling with this was important and also difficult. Piercy stopped herself short from overgeneralizing and yet saw the need for some generalizing. Piercy pushed both of us to grapple with the issues of overinclusiveness and underinclusiveness. She kept reminding both of us not to be reductionist, and to take all the complexities into account. She pushed her students to do the same.

At the beginning of the second month of the semester, the class was talking about the notion of cultural congruence and Black vernacular. There was a debate going on about whether Black vernacular should be acceptable in its own right in schools.[75] Reid stated that as teachers "we should try to correct them." Keith responded to this by saying that the standard that has been created should be recognized as a "White middle class" standard. He then questioned whether White people were trying to make people of color like them, "Do we want to make them White?"

After class, Piercy and I were talking about Keith and although Piercy recognized that Keith was often politically astute about race and class analyses, she was concerned about his tendency to be reductionist:

> I think that Keith sometimes has a quick simplistic
> analysis. He's done it a couple of times, class
> assumptions. I guess I don't really advocate that sort
> of quick simple classification of something like that.

---

[75] See hooks' (1994) chapter "Language: Teaching new worlds/new words" for a discussion of the ways in which Black vernacular was and is used as a form of resistance.

> I'm looking for something more complex. I think that
> is sort of feeding into the same sort of thinking
> getting into regular [socioeconomic] class assumptions,
> just sort of labeling something that way. I think that
> it is much deeper than that, [the analysis] is much
> more complex, and I think that is where the issue is
> at, rather than saying that is White middle class
> assumptions. I just think that there is so much more.
> I just think there is so much more packed in there than
> we are talking about. I guess I don't want them to walk
> away with some simple cliche's, "Those are White middle
> class assumptions." That isn't what I am after with
> any class. That lets them off the hook too much in
> terms of being thoughtful and self-critical. With
> Keith there's a smugness in responses like that,
> there's a smugness and the lack of kind of critical
> thought.

Piercy wanted to be sure that the students did not walk away

with easy and trite explanations that come from superficial

analyses.

I did not have the language to explain adequately what

the teacher educator in a context of uncertainty, ambiguity,

and complexity struggles with in trying to not over-

generalize or undergeneralize. It was when I read an

article on environmental values that I came upon a piece of

text that illuminated this dilemma for me. Piercy wanted to

steer students and herself away from being reductionist and

engaging in what I now call "scapegoating" or

"inauthenticity."

> Scapegoating can be thought of in terms of
> overinclusiveness. Simplistic analyses target all men,
> all capitalists, all whites, and all Westerners, for
> example, to an equal degree when in fact certain
> subclasses of these identified classes are far more
> responsible for ecolfical destruction than others. Not
> only that but significant minorities of these classes
> can be actively engaged in *opposing* the interests of
> both the dominant culture of their class and those
> members of their class most responsible for ecological

> destruction. Inauthenticity, on the other hand, can be
> thought of in terms of underinclusiveness. Simplistic
> analyses are inauthentic.in that they lead to a
> complete denial of responsibility when at least
> particular responsibility for ecological destruction
> should be accepted. Such theorizing conveniently
> disguised the extent to which (at least a subset of)
> the simplistically identified oppressed group (e.g.,
> women or the working class) also benefits from, and
> colludes with, those most responsible for ecological
> destruction.... (Fox, 1989, p. 16)

Although Fox is talking about responsibility for

environmental destruction, it can be broadened to other

areas of inquiry. Fox' identifying overinclusiveness

(scapegoating) and underinclusiveness (inauthenticity) was

extremely helpful for my sorting out how issues of

responsibility get reduced and simplified, and the danger

that lies within that, both politically and pedagogically.

It is with ease that we fall into the trap of being

either overinclusive or underinclusive. This applies to

responsibility in general areas, as well as the pedagogical.

For example, all White privileged men are *the oppressors*

inside and outside the classroom. While privileged White

men often have been trained to be the oppressors, context

changes much and so do the individual histories of the

privileged White men. Some are allies. Some are critical

friends. Some are profeminists. Others are oppressive. It

becomes a matter of trying to build a community of critical

friends not on the specious basis of skin color, gender,

class, or sexual identity, but rather on them being kindred

spirits (based on their willingness to engage in dialogue

and action surrounding social justice issues). The
adventurous teacher educator struggles to discern when
scapegoating and when inauthenticity are taking place,
guarding against a broadly cast net of "you are either for
me or against me." The tension then becomes how does one
analyze with constructs that make sense and maintain the
complexity, since constructs inherently tend to reduce
things to manageable ways of knowing?

Piercy wanted her students to "make responsible and
responsive decisions" (Susan Melnick, 1994, private
communication). She wanted these future teachers to
question their own assumptions. She wanted them to avoid
easy and facile comments that suggested easy and facile
analyses. She wanted them to be self-critical and not
indulge in scapegoating or in inauthentic classifications.
Perhaps for the adventurous teacher educator the practice of
constantly questioning one's own assumptions is a way to
avoid getting locked into reductionist and simplistic
evaluations.

## Patience

> The sea does not reward those who are too anxious, too
> greedy, or too impatient. To dig for treasures shows
> not only impatience and greed, but lack of faith.
> Patience, patience, patience is what the sea teaches.
> Patience and faith. (Lindberg, 1906/1975, p. 17)

All the while Piercy's students struggled to make
responsible and responsive decisions about teaching and

learning, Piercy was patient. She talked about pace and how there was a development that needed to occur in their thinking. She was able to think about their learning over time and see their learning as stages in a process. During the first month of the course we pondered over whether the students' chronological age was a factor in their difficulty with some of these issues. I commented to Piercy, "What struck me so profoundly is when Keith told me he was 19 years old. Nineteen years old is very young." Piercy agreed and added that they lack experiences:

> When I think of my own son, I think, you know, he just found where we keep the toilet paper. I mean, they are babies. They haven't experienced much of the world at all. We put them in these enclaves called high schools and grade school.

I came away from many of our discussions questioning whether or not the issue was the students' developmental stage, their youth making it difficult for them to readily see social justice issues in their own classroom and in the world. In many ways Tatiana (the exchange student from former East Germany) challenged this conjecture on my part. She claimed it had to do with experience that they had not had, and the privilege they did, not chronological age. Regardless of the reasons for their not readily seeing issues of oppression, I found Piercy patient in her thinking about how to help her students make sense of issues of equity, diversity, and oppression. This patience struck me in part because I was impatient with people surrounding

issues of equity and oppression. I concluded that adventurous teaching seemed to require patience to struggle through the uncertainties, ambiguities, and complexities of pedagogical, political, and personal issues with your students. However, I was compelled to go one step further and ask, "How much is patience undergirded by privilege?"

Piercy and I talked often about the need for patience. However, I think our understanding of patience reached new depths when we connected it to our "whiteliness." About two months after the study was over, Piercy and I met to talk about the students' feedback. We were talking about being true to ourselves and what this meant in terms of teaching about issues of race, class, gender, sexuality, and culture. We were struggling with the competing purposes of the teacher educator who has feminist imagination and the purposes that students bring to the classroom.

Piercy talked about the dynamic that was needed when working with undergraduates. She talked about her reactions to Tricia, being impatient with her because she seemed to be saying stereotypic things about gender:

> I think it is the issue of being outspoken when a
> student really crosses what you think and telling them
> that. Versus, I think with Tricia, I think there was
> a lack of patience on my part, I disagreed so strongly
> with so many things she said. I didn't allow her to
> really go through her argument, because when students
> go through their argument it turns on them usually,
> they begin to see things especially with a little
> nudging and a little pushing at certain points. I
> think with her I used a sledgehammer, rather than
> trying to listen and be reflective about what she was
> saying. I was coming out with my own beliefs and my

own issues maybe a little too quickly. The dynamic
wasn't quite right. Now that's not to say that I
wouldn't be honest with her when I disagree, but the
way I disagree with her, [that's the issue], she is a
very vulnerable person too. I think I learned to try to
let students talk through a point. I think you have to
think of the context [these are] sheltered
undergraduates. There is a different dynamic that
really helps an undergraduate grapple with these
issues. I like working with undergraduates, to nurture
their thinking rather than pound them in the head. I
think I like to talk to them and work things through.
There's just certain times when I just don't do it well
I think. The idea is to hit a chord with them.

Here Piercy was talking about tilling the soil. That is,

she was trying to create a community in which she patiently

"nurtured their thinking," versus "pound[ed] them in the

head." We continued to talk about patience and then I

stated:

Yet as I am talking, patience is such a White middle
class bullshit thing. To tell you the truth we can sit
around and wait until these people come to some sense
of justice and yet here are people dying on the
fringes, you know.

To which Piercy replied:

You know I get upset. Am I supposed to be patient
because I am a short little petite woman, and they are
used to their elementary teachers being patient? A
culture of patience that is ridiculous, we have an
emergency situation here. What we enjoy in life is
unbelievable, to think that we are just going to be
comfortable about it, is that really all you can ask
for?

During this discussion, we acutely felt the tension

within adventurous feminist imagination. There is a need to

be patient while the teacher educator helps the students

develop new understandings of injustice, privilege, and

oppression. However, while the teacher educator and her

students sit around patiently "coming to this understanding," there is a very real emergency situation inside and outside of the schools. People are literally and figuratively dying along the margins and at the fringes. Is this patience just another feature of White privilege, theirs and ours? I suspect it is.

When I read hooks (1989) and Henry (1993-1994) I hear the urgency in their words. Both are African American women who teach and are feminists. Their words do not convey the "Patience, patience, patience...Patience and faith" (Lindberg, 1906/1975, p. 17), that some White privileged teachers have come to value, like Piercy and myself. And so I return to the need to reexamine all the constructs that seem generic, for they are not. They are "ethnospecific" and particularistic. McIntosh (1988) spoke of the ways in which White people carry around unearned dominance and privilege that people of color do not have. Yet, she did not speak to the ways in which the very concepts we use are saturated with privilege.

So, patience is required for the adventurous teacher, but it is an urgent patience. It is a patience that honors students' pace, yet declares loudly for recognition of the injustice and inequity which exists for "Others." People are being killed.

Constructs and themes are not universal and not generic. Often they are just mirror reflections of those

who construct and use them.  Woo (1983) provokes us to

remember,

> "the...White voice that says, 'I am writing about and
> looking for themes that are "universal". [I reply]
> 'Well most of the time when "universal" is used, it is
> just a euphemism for "White": White themes, White
> significance, White culture...." (p. 144)

How we view and employ the constructs of patience and

urgency has to do with our situatedness.  Those generic

constructs, like patience in teaching, can only be

constructed by us because we have the time to wait.  We are

not dying in the streets, not literally, not symbolically.

But people are and their voices are grave.  "We fear our

children will be dragged from a car and shot down in the

street and you will turn your backs upon the reasons they

are dying" (Lorde, as cited by Hurtado, 1989, pp. 853-854).

Urgent voices remind us that there are those who do not have

time to wait:

> I'm marked by the color of my skin.
> The bullets are discrete and designed to kill slowly.
> They are aiming at my children.
> These are facts.
> Let me show you my wounds: my stumbling mind, my
> "excuse me" tongue, and this
> nagging preoccupation
> with the feeling of not being good enough.
>
> These bullets bury deeper than logic.
>
> Outside my door
> there is a real enemy
> who hates me...
>
> Every day I am deluged with reminders
> that this is not
> my land
>
> and this is my land

I do not believe in the war between races

but in this country
there is war (Cervantes, 1990, p. 5)

The adventurous teacher educator, then, has an ironic tension within her pedagogy--how to be urgently patient. How to let students see the symbolic bullets that they have a hand in forging. "The bullets are discrete and designed to kill slowly. They are aiming at my children." How to also remind them of the literal bullets, the very real and deadly bullets that some children face in their neighborhoods and schools every day.

Our political, personal, and pedagogical task, as adventurous teacher educators in a community of critical friends that extends beyond the classroom, is to stretch beyond the privileges that insulate us. Adventurous teaching is about stretching beyond ourselves, all the while aware of our Selves.

## A Case of Adventurous Teaching, Stretching Beyond the Walls of Sexual Identity Privilege

### HOMOPHOBIA

When I came out
to her   she started
calling me
you people.
(Jane Barnes, 1988, p. 6)

As an adventurous teacher educator, Piercy tried to reach beyond the walls and barriers of her own social constructs. This is a difficult exercise for a teacher

educator. Rarely are teacher educators trained to overcome those barriers. How much more complex, ambiguous, and uncertain does this make adventurous teaching?

Piercy admitted that she knew little about lesbian and gay issues, yet she was willing to tackle the issue of homophobia and heterosexism in her classroom. She was privileged in her heterosexuality and it would have be easy to ignore this topic altogether. However, she did not do this. Instead, she invited a lesbian professor, Darcy, to speak to the class during the fourth month of the semester. What was important about this is that Piercy attempted to stretch beyond her privilege to help her and her students understand the "Other." Piercy knew that she was not equipped personally to talk about gay and lesbian issues. So she sought out someone who would be able to speak from personal experience. This was an example of adventurous teaching. Not only because she was entering into "content" that she was unfamiliar with, but also she could not anticipate or "regulate" how her students would react. If they became offended with the "subject matter" that was being discussed in Piercy's class, they could complain about her. Given the conservative nature of Atwood, there could have been ramifications to broaching this topic in the classroom.

Darcy was a science professor at Atwood. She was only able to "come out" after she received tenure. Darcy spoke

about homophobia and heterosexism and identified these as a "unique set of discriminations," which are "particularly connected to sexism." She made a point to relate homophobia to the "hierarchical society" of the United States. Darcy spoke about her own personal experiences, the loss of family and friends, the loss of jobs, the ostracism. She also spoke about high suicide rate among gay youth, and that these issues were "life and death issues," particularly relevant to teachers. The students in the class on the whole, except for Dan (as stated previously), seemed strikingly comfortable with Darcy and the issues of homophobia and heterosexism. They were attentive and seemed engaged by asking many questions of Darcy and participating in the discussion.

Piercy and I spoke afterward about how it went. Piercy said that in debriefing with them she would talk about her own discomfort with gay and lesbian issues. I was curious about her discomfort and on some level I thought she was exaggerating her own discomfort as a pedagogical tool, using herself as an example to help her students access their own discomfort. I asked, "Were you that uncomfortable? I think you need to be honest. If you were really uncomfortable then I think it would be really good to talk about it, but if you weren't, it's almost like putting the idea in their heads." She responded with vigor, "Oh no I wouldn't lie to them. You know I don't lie to them." I asked her to explain how

she was uncomfortable. She replied:

> It isn't completely uncomfortable, I am just much more
> comfortable talking about other things. This is one
> time where I am really afraid I am going be narrow in
> my thinking because I probably am, it's an area that I
> haven't thought much about. This is one issue that I
> have thought about [the least] and I feel least
> knowledgeable. So therefore I feel less comfortable
> addressing [these issues]. When she talked about
> violence toward women, I saw the hackles coming out--
> "So we are going to get into male-bashing." I think we
> are beyond that, I still want to be sure, that isn't
> male-bashing. My concern is, I don't want to hear
> women-bashing, I don't want to hear male-bashing. I
> want to move away from that, to situate in teachers'
> minds that this is a societal issue. It is not a
> gender war. It's a cultural social problem and to help
> them to think about it that way, to move it away from
> men against women. To not jump into "Oh, it's
> bashing," it is violence against men as well as against
> women. When we think about what's happening to people
> I think it's always important to situate it that way.
> I don't think they are used to thinking that way.

Piercy admitted that she was worried at certain points
in Darcy's presentation that the students were going to
perceive what Darcy was saying as "male-bashing." Darcy was
speaking about the U.S. society's attitudes toward violence
against women. Piercy seemed to want her students to see
that gay and lesbian issues, and violence against women,
were societal issues, human issues. In this time of
backlash, Piercy was aware that attempts to talk about
inequity and oppression often result in people stating that
women are "male-bashing." There seems to be an unstated
norm that men dominating women and violence against women--
homophobia and heterosexism are unproblematic, and when
these issues become problematized, the declaration is of
male-bashing and man-hating.

Piercy in her discussions seemed to be echoing what
McIntosh (1983) writes about, that those who are the
oppressors are damaged also. However, it seems to me that
the victims/survivors, as contrasted with the perpetrators,
experience the damage very differently:

> Beginning at fourteen, this identity within a world
> that hated and feared lesbians led me to live a life of
> invisibility where I showed the world only a small
> portion of who I was, and even that portion was a lie,
> an alienated piece of self that indicated to the world
> that I did not live with intimate, social connections.
> Out of fear of loss, I chose a double life, a
> fragmented self for sixteen years.... *I had to put one
> large part of myself in exile. The cost was enormous.
> I could not have authentic friendships because I could
> not talk about my life. My life could not be shared
> with my family which in turn necessitated superficial
> relationships. The stress of maintaining vigilance
> over the lies I had to create for safety made me never
> able to relax. Perhaps worst of all was the damage to
> my sense of self, my sense of integrity.* As a
> woman...with deeply held and mostly unexamined values
> of courage and honesty, I had to view myself as a woman
> who lied because of fear. (Pharr, 1988, pp. xii-xiv,
> emphasis added)

From reading Pharr's (1988) explanation of her damaged Self
and from hearing Darcy speak, the cost to survivors is
enormous. A lesbian or a gay man who is not out cannot be
honest or authentic in many of the relationships she or he
has. Those who do the oppressing, that is, those who are
homophobic and heterosexist may experience damage, that is
they are shutting other human beings out, or participating
in a damaged culture (McIntosh, 1983), but their damage is
not as grave as gays and lesbians experience. For example,
they do not experience hate crimes because of their sexual

identity.[76]

In our discussion about Darcy, Piercy brought up the

strain on human relationships that being "closeted" would

create.

> It was sad listening to Darcy. It [homophobia] is so
> different, it is not like gender, it is not like race.
> It sets off this uneasy trust, uneasy honesty, and
> uneasy relationships. And it is probably why it is in
> my mind so much more complicated to think about and to
> talk about then all the other -isms. There is just
> something about it, there is more tension for me.

Seeing heterosexism and homophobia as an issue of hurting

relationships was one more example of how Piercy saw the

world relationally.

Piercy's way of seeing others in the world has to do

with relationships. Her morality, her way of thinking about

oppression, has to do with the cost to human relationships.

I am reminded of Gilligan's (1982) discussion of the ways in

which many women define their morality in terms of

relationships. Gilligan writes:

> [S]eeing a world comprised of relationships rather than
> of people standing alone, a world that coheres through
> human connection rather than through systems of rules
> (p. 29).... The reinterpretation of women's experience
> in terms of their own imagery of relationships thus
> clarifies that experience and also provides a
> nonhierarchical vision of human connection. Since
> relationships, when cast in the image of hierarchy,
> appear inherently unstable and morally problematic,
> their transposition into the image of web changes an
> order of inequality into a structure of interconnection
> (p. 62).... A consciousness of the dynamics of human
> relationships then becomes central to moral

---

[76] "Gays are the most frequent victims of hate crimes in the United States, according to the U.S. Department of Justice" (Lipkin, 1992, p. 25). See Project 10 Handbook: Addressing Lesbian and Gay Issues in our Schools: A resource directory for teachers, guidance counselors and parents. Friends of Project 10, Inc.: 7850 Melrose Ave.; Los Angles, CA 90046.

understanding, joining the heart and the eye in an ethic that ties the activity of thought to the activity of care. (1982, p. 149)

Piercy seemed to have a strong sense of the "structure of interconnection." Her moral understanding was embedded in an "ethic of care" and an ethic of *compassion*. Her whole way of seeing the world, injustice, teaching, and learning had to do with community building or community dissolution. Her morality and desire for justice and equity were housed in a structure of care and compassion, whether it be a one-to-one relationship or a group relationship. For Piercy, heterosexim and homophobia separated people. Although she did not know much about lesbian and gay reality, she did know that the way society was currently structured hurt the relationships that lesbians and gays were able to establish and maintain, and hurt the heterosexuals who shut them out and oppressed them.

It is also important to emphasize that many teacher educators do not seek out knowledge about gay and lesbian reality. Yet they need to stretch. Piercy did so and tried to bring this reality into her classroom so that her students were also aware of this form of oppression. She wanted them to understand the damage that was done both literally in the hate crimes of gay bashing, and in the psychic and spiritual death of being "invisible" (Rich, 1984; Pharr, 1988). Piercy sought out knowledge of Others so that she did not lock Others out. Piercy realized that

she was part of all that needed to change to create a more understanding and more equitable world. This is part of what is "required" of an adventurous teacher who is working towards social justice. Adventurous teaching is thus about entering into the uncharted terrain of Otherness, something that teacher educators are not often trained to do.

In this chapter we considered what adventurous teaching means for a teacher educator with feminist imagination. We saw that if we want to take adventurous teaching seriously, it needs to be context-specific. Adventurous teaching means different things to, and has different outcomes for, teacher educators who are not White, male, privileged, and heterosexual. Uncertainty is also exacerbated when controversial issues are explored in the teacher educator's classroom. Adventurous teaching is more complex when unteaching and unlearning takes place. Unpacking what adventurous teaching means also helps us see that the very constructs we use to describe our work (such as patience) are undergirded and informed by "whiteliness" and privilege. We looked at a case of adventurous teaching stretching beyond sexual privilege and began to see the intensified elements of uncertainty, risk, complexity, and ambiguity. Piercy helps us think more deeply about adventurous teaching. But what of her students? How do their voices figure into this study?

## One Cannot Talk of Teachers Teaching Without Talk of Students Learning

We have met Piercy and have learned about what she desired and hoped for. From Piercy's interactions, from her curriculum, from her way being, we can see what she wished for her students and herself. Piercy was committed to relationships and wrote in her journal about her students and herself, "we see things together--I wouldn't see without them and they wouldn't see without me." This line comes from a much longer stream of consciousness journal entry in which she wrote about racist/sexist stances and what she wanted for her students:

> There are racist words
> Racist acts
> Racist distances
>        but maybe
> most racist way of being for a teacher is a racist
> stance.--Add sexist for each of the racist above
>
> Racist stance is a way of feeling certain about your
> own way of knowing, your own existent knowledge. Your
> own turn away from others knowledge frames--makes
> cogeneration impossible.
>
> Opposite of racist stance?
> Open stance sounds like golf.
> What is it? Critical stance sounds uncomfortable.
>
> I would like this stance to be curious, questioning-
> hoping for something better--searching, exploring
> stance--insight driven stance.
>
> I think it is a different way of living, a different
> way of viewing learning and teaching. I don't like the
> word fun--connotes self-indulgence without purpose--
> this is maybe "having meaning" rather than "having
> fun"?
>
> I'm not sure of a metaphor yet. I keep thinking about
> reading "A Journey to the Center of the Earth." When

you said journey[77] it brought back to mind a picture of
people climbing together and they kept finding
beautiful places with walls that were full of color and
shine: I think I take my students to this place but I
don't think we are on a journey. I take them there and
then they need to see things—we see things together—I
wouldn't see without them and they wouldn't see without
me. I remember when I read the book how exciting
almost mystical it felt to read those pages—the movie
didn't do it for me. I remember reading some old
historical texts in my undergraduate days and having
the same insight and feeling, like the world makes
sense as you read the page and you leave the page ready
to look for more—I need to leave my students with more
wonder, more questions—especially as they go out to
look in classrooms.... Maybe what I find attractive in
men and women—humor but seriousness—self-invested
concern—(undated, Sunday, 9:30 a.m.)

Her journal shows how she saw teaching and learning as
dialectical and reflexive. Lather states (1991) "[O]ne
cannot talk of students learning without talk of teachers
teaching" (Lather, 1991, p.1). The reverse is also true,
one cannot talk of teachers teaching without talk of
students learning.

Whatever a teacher educator perceives about teaching
and the classroom is in part constructed by the way the
students act, react, and interact in her classroom. Piercy
wanted to leave her students "with more wonder, more
questions—especially as they go out to look in classrooms,"
than when they went in. She wanted her students to become
critical friends with each other and with her. Some
students echoed what she seemed to hope for. For example,
Emily stated, "I think it is a fantastic course. And not

---

[77] The title of my proposal was "The journey of a teacher educator with a feminist perspective."

only for education majors because just the whole atmosphere of the course is different, the climate in the classroom."

After being asked what the class was like, Debra said that sometimes what was being discussed was confusing, but it was also fun. When asked about why it was confusing she stated:

> Because sometimes you don't know what people are getting at and you just don't get the point clearly. And maybe it needs to be defined a little more clearly or maybe in just more simple terms for people to understand a little better. Some people may not pick it up as easily as others. And fun.

I probed for what she meant when she said fun and she explained:

> Because it's like, it's kind of like you are talking with a bunch of your friends or something. You know, it is really easy going and it's just, you know, you want to get your point across and you are really, and a lot of these things are interesting to talk about, so it is not like you are just pushing yourself to think of things to say and, then, I mean, there's just a lot of interesting topics and a lot of the people in there, you know, are really easy going, you know, really nice people and they are all like, well-mannered, I guess, they are not going to do anything that is really going to disturb you.

Debra mentioned that the ethos of the class was easy going, even if what was being discussed was confusing or hard to understand. Implicit in Debra's discussion is that she did not feel she would be put down by other students or the teacher for not understanding. It is significant that Debra felt she was among friends, for that was precisely what Piercy wanted for her students and herself. When Debra said that the students would not say anything that would really "disturb" one another, I believe she was referring to the

way they spoke to, and behaved with, one another. They engaged in pushing and challenging one another's ideas, but not in putting one another down. As Piercy said to her class six weeks into the semester, "I won't allow you to hurt each other and be rude but I would like you to be direct."

Piercy recognized the reflexive and dialectical nature of teaching and learning; what her students made of what was happening in the classroom was essential to her. During the second week of the semester Piercy talked to me about the ways in which a teacher never knows how students will respond to issues of equity and oppression. According to her, what is crucial is that openness to students as co-generators and co-constructors of meaning and knowledge. Piercy wanted the students to become informants about their own realities:

> Something very different could happen but if we are ready for this then we've thought through it and we can go on from there. We are new at that. You don't know what to expect from your students. The responses that you and they get from the knowledge and the thinking that you are giving them. If you think about yourself as trying to help them and you tell them that you don't know about all the ways to help them, then this may be helpful. Then they become informants about their own learning and that's real helpful to you. Sara [Piercy's closest mentor] talks about the two most important things a teacher does is challenge and support, that you challenge them--but you are there to build that safety net.

Students co-construct meaning and knowledge and therefore need to have their voices prominently featured. Perhaps the students do not hold "half a key" in the same

way that I might to explain what Piercy's feminist presence
was like, for they did not have the opportunity to speak
with Piercy as extensively as I had. Yet their perspectives
and perceptions open doors and windows that help Piercy and
all of us see teaching and learning in new ways. Since
Piercy described herself relationally and wanted to learn
what her students thought and felt and experienced, their
voices were vital.

There was so much that occurred during the semester in
ED 277, yet I only focus on a few aspects of the classroom.
This was a room where conflict and laughter occurred.
Piercy invited her students into a community of critical
friends. Some of the students took up the invitation,
others did not. Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, and Cusick (1986)
talk about surrogate learning in secondary classrooms. I
push the edges of this notion further and believe that
surrogate connection and surrogate community occurs in many
classrooms as well; Piercy labeled it pseudocommunity (Peck,
1987). Whether it is because the teachers and the students
"bargain" to get along and therefore do not risk conflict,
or whether it is because teachers and students do not know
how to create an authentic connection and community, or it
is because teachers and students just want to "get through"
the class with as little investment as possible. The result
is the same--hollow relationships.

Piercy wanted her students to develop real and

authentic connections to others/Others, entailing the full range of human emotions, including conflict. For Piercy, conflict was a way to confront psuedocommunity and to be connected in genuine ways. Piercy "[co]-designed classroom culture" (Hunault, 1994, private communication) as a place where conflict *could* occur.

We already know that Piercy had faith in her students' ability to learn and grow. She also had faith in the ways that connections could be strengthened by conflict, and that "the best conflicts are those that lead to more and better connection rather than to disconnection" (Miller, 1986, p. 140).

In the next chapter we will concentrate on Piercy explicitly in relation to her students. It is during this class that what we have learned about Piercy is evident in her interactions with students. It is during this class that we also hear what students thought and felt about what Piercy was attempting to do in her classroom. This "case of conflict" explores the difficulty and the possibility of teaching with feminist imagination.

**PLACE IN RETURN BOX** to remove this checkout from your record.
**TO AVOID FINES** return on or before date due.

| DATE DUE | DATE DUE | DATE DUE |
|----------|----------|----------|
|          |          |          |
|          |          |          |
|          |          |          |
|          |          |          |
|          |          |          |
|          |          |          |
|          |          |          |

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

THE HOUSE THAT FEMINIST IMAGINATION BUILDS: LOVING PRESENCE
DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY OF CRITICAL FRIENDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Volume II


By

Corinna S. Hasbach




A DISSERTATION


Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of


DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY


Department of Teacher Education


1995

# CHAPTER IX

## PIERCY SAND IN RELATION WITH STUDENTS: A CASE OF CONFLICT

> "What is REAL?" asked the Rabbit one day.... "Does it
> mean having things that buzz inside of you and a stick-
> out handle?" "Real isn't how you are made," said the
> Skin Horse. "It's a thing that happens to you.  When a
> child loves you for a long, long time, not just to play
> with, but REALLY loves you, then you become Real."
> Does it hurt?" asked the Rabbit.
> "Sometimes," said the Skin Horse, for he was always
> truthful. "When you are Real you don't mind being
> hurt."
> "Does it happen all at once, like being wound up," he
> asked, "or bit by bit?"
> "It doesn't happen all at once," said the Skin Horse.
> "You become.  It takes a long time.  That's why it
> doesn't often happen to people who break easily, or
> have sharp edges, or have to be carefully kept.
> Generally, by the time you are Real, most of your hair
> has been loved off, and your eyes drop out and you get
> loose in the joints and very shabby.  But these things
> don't matter at all, because once you are Real you
> can't be ugly, except to people who don't understand."
> (Williams, The Velveteen Rabbit, 1922, pp. 16-17)

In this chapter I will explore Piercy in relation with
her students.  The students' voices will be brought more to
the fore as compared to the previous chapters which
highlighted Piercy.  Regardless of who is being featured,
whether Piercy recedes slightly to the background and the
students move slightly to the foreground, or whether Piercy
comes to the foreground and the students recede slightly,
the students and Piercy are present--the relationship is at
the center.

I will be presenting the case, three phases of one
conflict, as "critical incidents" (Newman, 1986) that
occurred during one class session.  I have chosen this
particular case because it best illustrates how Piercy was

in relation to her students. She defined her teaching relationally and there was no better opportunity to analyze what relational meant but during a time of conflict and struggle. I have chosen to concentrate on this one piece of practice because it is multi-layered and is a microcosm of many of the struggles which occurred throughout the life of the course. The case begins to unveil the complexities and difficulties of teaching with feminist imagination in teacher education.

Piercy had an ambitious sense of what she wanted to accomplish in her foundations class. She wanted her students to be engaged in *real* relationships with her and with one another. Real relationships meant engaging in loving presence, "being willing to be hurt, not breaking easily, not having sharp edges, and not having to be carefully kept" (Williams, 1922, p.17). Piercy chose to unearth conflict that teemed under the surface of her class because it reflected Piercy's goal for a genuine community of critical friends.

This case vividly shows Piercy's tenacity and loving presence in the face of arrogant presence and hostility. This particular class session most clearly unpacks how difficult "teaching against the grain" (Cochran-Smith, 1991, p. 279) is when trying to develop a community of critical friends. It also seemed to be a turning point for the class as a community. It raises many issues, one being the

unequal power relations between a teacher educator and the students.

In this chapter, I will be walking the reader through this complex episode. This chapter is almost like slowing down a film to examine it frame by frame, so that the event and the actions can be seen fully. The way in which statements were made and the number of times certain phrases were said is important. For example, the repetition of "too much" feminism is important to hear. I also believe that the words Piercy used are important to *hear*. I have interpreted the kind of tones that were used when people said what they said. I have interpreted what people seemed to be trying to achieve in their discourse and actions. And I have interpreted the "texture" of the phases of the conflict.

Not until the next chapter will I draw on other data to help inform the analysis of factors which contributed to the conflict. One of the reasons that I wait until the next chapter for a deeper analysis is because I believe this is the kind of case that will evoke multiple interpretations from those who read it. The multiple ways in which people account for the conflict is a rich opportunity for dialogue.

The case of conflict is an event, but it is also a symbol of what it means to be "real" within the context of a teacher education classroom, to enter into the foray of all that is human.

## An Entryway to Conflict

Piercy had decided that on February 27, 1992, she would talk about the feedback the students had given her at midterm. Her plans for the day were outlined on the agenda:

1. Forward View
2. Interpretations [of feedback]
3. Video-"Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America"[78]

I regard the class as being divided into three separate but connected incidents, each incident illustrating its own theme or themes of conflict. The class was a little under two hours in duration. The class started at 4:10 p.m. and for about an hour and a half Piercy talked with the students about the feedback forms that they had filled out. This time frame included phase one and phase two of the class. Phase one I identify as Piercy going over the feedback forms with the students and at one point trying to challenge them on their conceptions of facts and opinions. The second phase of the class is the discussion of "too much feminism" in the course. At approximately 5:20 p.m. the students took a break. Ten minutes later they began to watch the video "Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America." The video lasted about fifteen minutes. The next fifteen minutes were spent in discussion. I see the discussion after the

---

[78] Reference and annotation for the video is as follows:

Video: Shortchanging Girls: Shortchanging America. A dramatic look at the inequities girls face in America's schools. Featuring education excerpts and public policy leaders, AAUW poll results, as well as the compelling voices and faces of American girls. (AAUW, 1992, p.117)

Also see The AAUW report: How schools change girls: A study of major findings on girls and education, 1992.

watching of the video as the third phase of the class.  At
6:02 the students started to leave the classroom.

## Phase One: Feedback and Facts

Piercy began the class by telling the students, "This
is a very important class because we will talk about where
we've been and where we are going."  Piercy then told the
students that she wanted to talk about the feedback forms.
Piercy began to go over what she hoped they had been doing
together in the class:

> Some of the sitting in circles having you work
> together, talking together, Jigsaw and so on are ways
> of building community so that we are focusing on
> building social aspects of the classroom as well as
> content.  When you feel more comfortable in the class
> you can more easily say, "Emily, I don't agree with
> your point that you just made."  You have to have a
> certain level of trust that I respect you, to be able
> to do [that] and [know] that it is not to try to hurt
> you but it is to challenge you.  Okay that is different
> than just making a fluff kind of [environment where]
> everybody is polite.  To me a real community is when
> people can really be comfortable as well as challenging
> of each other and of course the content.  I have been
> trying to show you some of the theoretical constructs
> like socialization and culture and all of those
> theories and constructs that I have been talking to you
> about, trying to connect those to bulletin boards,
> videotapes and those kinds of things, trying to go back
> and forth, and across [the ideas].  We will do more of
> that as we move along in the course, the idea is that
> we are sharing the issues and the problems and some of
> the concerns in education.  I can't solve them all for
> you and you can't solve them all, but together we need
> to think about them. Students together, and student and
> teacher together, that is what we need to do.  We need
> to figure these things out, to work together and to
> create new ideas and new solutions and that is where
> building your philosophies comes in.  So again, some of
> the theories we have been talking about this social
> reconstructivism, this is a way of thinking about
> building community.  I think about you hours before

this class and I really work hard at trying to see how
I can help understand your thinking and push your
thinking and [from reading your feedback forms] I
really appreciate that you see that time and work goes
into the class because it is really important to me,
and I think that it is important to any teacher to
understand how your students are thinking, and then to
see how different all of you think, and how different
all of you learn.

In the opening of the session Piercy tried to remind
the students what her stance toward education and toward
developing a community of critical friends was. She
highlighted that trust and challenge were both crucial to
her.

This introduction I saw as an explication of Piercy's
desires and goals for their community. Her inviting them to
give her feedback and her taking the feedback seriously
enough to discuss it with them was an indicator that she
wanted to work with them to move the class forward in the
second half of the semester. She was inviting conflict,
although she did not say it directly. She did say, "Okay
that is different than just making a fluff kind of
[environment where] everybody is polite. To me a real
community is when people can really be comfortable as well
as challenging of each other and of course the content."
She had said similar things in previous classes, for
example, telling the students that "conflict is positive."
She also forewarned them that there were no easy answers or
solutions in education.

In the act of opening up for discussion her own

teaching, Piercy was showing her own "spirited

vulnerability" for she was making public to the class and to

the researcher what the students said about her and to her.

By opening herself up she was modeling what she hoped would

happen in the class. That is, by her showing that she

reflected on her practice the students would learn that it

was important to do.

Piercy had written out the students' comments verbatim

on overhead transparencies about what kind of changes the

students would like to see for the second half of the

semester. Piercy had selected certain responses that seemed

to be a pattern in the feedback forms. She and the students

discussed what had been written down. Often the responses

from the students were contradictory. For example, one

student wrote, "I feel like we have endless discussions with

no positive solutions." Another wrote, "I think discussions

go well in this class. Whenever anyone has an opinion which

they would like to express, they are able to do so." Even

though some statements were contradictory, Piercy did not

dismiss them but rather talked with the students about them.

She was attempting to help her students understand that when

they were teachers the choices they made would affect each

of their students differently.

They decided as a class that they would take

responsibility for moving conversations forward, that it

wasn't just Piercy's responsibility to say when a discussion

had gone on too long or was going off on a tangent. Piercy
then talked about what she thought they could be with one
another:

> I think we are at the point where we can do this with
> each other, that we don't have to pretend anymore. I
> am hoping that we have gotten rid of the pretense and
> now we can really "talk turkey" as they say. Let's try
> it and see. I won't allow you to hurt each other and
> be rude but I would like you to be direct when you
> think we are getting off the topic.

Piercy stressed to the students that in a community
they all needed to drop pretense and be direct with one
another. Piercy, like Peck (1987), knew that in every
community there was a tendency to be polite and nice and
submerge conflict in an attempt to keep things even-keeled.
However, in her comments to the students she made it clear
that by now they could say what they felt and feel what they
said. Again she was inviting students into potential
conflict by encouraging their own honesty, openness, and
directness.

A major motif that arose on the feedback forms was that
students wanted more facts about teaching, learning, and
education:

Student response #1 I would like to see more facts being
discussed rather than just opinions
being stated.

Student response #2 More direct answers after a variety has
been given.

Student response #3 At times I am not sure which is the best
answer.

Student response #4 [I would like] more solid facts stated.

Piercy tried to challenge students' assumptions about clear-cut "facts." She began by stating, "I don't think there is a difference between fact and opinion." She looked around the classroom and saw that there was an empty plastic soda bottle in the trash can. She tried to use this as a concrete example for the students to see that facts are imbued with opinion. Piercy and the students debated back and forth about what the "thing" was in the garbage can.

The students asserted that calling it a two liter bottle was a fact and not an opinion. During the discussion one student stated, "It has to be true to be a fact." Another stated that, "An opinion can be something else." Another student said, "Like trash would be an opinion because you can still use it for something so in that case it wouldn't be trash, [of] course it is in the trash can." Piercy replied, "Okay, so two liters is fact and trash is an opinion?" To which the same student answered "I'd say so." Piercy probed, "Because it is measurable right? What if you had never learned the word two liters, what if you never learned liter?" Another student responded with certainty, "It is still a fact."

There was a relatively lengthy discussion, with Piercy tenaciously trying to challenge students' claims that fact and opinion were divorced from one another. She tried to show them that even something as simple as the "fact" of a pop bottle in the trash can was not clear-cut. The

students did not seem to understand her contention with
their descriptions of the thing in the garbage can. They
were unable to recognize that every description they had of
the soda bottle was infused with layers of their own values,
cultural situatedness, and language limitations. To them a
soda bottle was a soda bottle was a soda bottle no matter
how one described it. Piercy ended the interaction with:

> Well to make a long story short, philosophers of
> science believe that when two people agree that's when
> you have a fact, which isn't a whole lot different than
> an opinion. I want to push you on that because most of
> the things in education are not things that you can
> say, "This is for sure at every single place in time
> that this is going to happen." And if what you really
> want are facts about what education is and what I
> should do, you are in the wrong profession. There
> aren't facts, there aren't hardcore facts about what
> you do for every kid in every situation. Teaching is
> very, very complex and the reason why I ask you to talk
> about your viewpoints is to develop your thinking about
> ideas. And to me this is a critical point because
> there's an awful lot of teaching that gets taught as
> this is fact; this is gospel.

Inconsequential as it may seem, the discussion
surrounding "facts" and the soda bottle in the trash can was
the beginning of the conflict. Piercy and the students
seemed to be speaking two different "languages" at times,
and it was at this point that the conflict emerged. It was
so subtle here, it could have gone unnoticed. But I believe
this was where two different visions of knowledge, reality,
and truth surfaced. It was after this that we enter into
the second phase of the conflict.

## Phase Two: "Too Much Feminism"

After the discussion of the soda bottle in the garbage can Piercy read out several feedback responses about there being "too much feminism" in the class. For example, Piercy read one student's response to the question, *What issues do you see as less important in this class? Why?* "We focus a little too much on femmanism [sic]. I don't think it will help me teach better." And when asked, *What are your overall thoughts about the course?* the person responded "I like it-again, a bit too much femanism[sic] though."[79] After she read aloud the last comment, she threw out the topic for discussion and asked, "What do you think? Have we done too much feminism or what? Yeah? What do you think?" One female student replied, "I don't know." Piercy threw it out again. "Too much feminism?" She paused and asked, "Does anyone want to take a stab at talking about that one, or is that too threatening to talk about?" Tricia responded with, "It is probably different for different people. I mean like some people maybe have like a lot of knowledge and background like sex roles and some people may not at all, kind of hard to say whether it is too much or not. Maybe for some it is. For others it is not enough." Piercy then asked others for their opinions.

This phase of the class was the escalation of the

---

[79] I have left in the spelling error of feminism in this feedback response in part because I find it interesting that the student felt feminism was too much a part of the class and yet the person did not know how to spell the word. It is also interesting that man was the center of "femanism" for this person.

conflict. In this phase the conflict was not as subtle as the first, yet it was not full blown either. When Piercy threw this topic out for discussion, the students seemed very reluctant to pick it up. However, Piercy did not back off. Instead, she named the threat involved in the topic by asking, "Is that too threatening to talk about?" When Tricia responded that it might be different for different people, Piercy again could have dropped it and moved on to another issue. Rather she pursued it, asking the rest of the class for their opinions.

It seems to me that there were many junctures at which Piercy could have avoided the potential conflict, gone the path of least resistance, and the community could have remained fairly tranquil and polite. However, this was not Piercy's choice, and this would not have reflected Piercy's commitment to push for authentic relations between a teacher educator and her students.

When Piercy asked for other opinions, Matt entered into the conversation, stating that he didn't know if there was too much in the class, although he felt that feminism had been stressed. He went on to say with adamancy and a hint of vexation that "in everyday life we are bombarded with feminism" and, because of that, when the topic came up in class students "put up a block" because it "all becomes too much." His comments are very important for he was suggesting that this feedback was not only about Piercy and

what she was doing in her class, but also what was occurring in their personal and political lives outside of the class. He was implying that what they hear outside of the classroom affects what they react to inside the classroom. This was where we begin to get a hint that the personal and political was pedagogical in these students' lives.

Matt then said that Piercy sort of "led into it" when they got the dissertation proposal at the beginning of the semester. Piercy responded with, "I kind of set you up to thinking about feminism the first day. It's interesting they say what you do with people on the first class is really what colors their thinking a lot." This piece of evidence suggests that my participation, my study, affected their perception of the focus of feminism in the class.

Matt then said, "Well, there's other things that you do." He went on to tell her that keeping a count of when the men and women spoke in class was an example. Emily then raised the question, "Why is that feminism though? I mean it's just men and women interacting?" Piercy laughed. Jackie then stated, "But it's always directed toward women which makes it sound feminist." Piercy asked, "Because we are keeping male and female counts, does that make it feminism?"

Emily's question alerts us to the tendency for some students to see that whenever a subtext of gender becomes the explicit text, there is an assumption that it is

"feminist." Emily was able to critique what seemed to be a tendency of some of these students, that whenever the relationship between genders was being explored, it was a "woman's issue" or a "feminist issue." Gender was equated with "women" or "feminism" in many of these young people's minds.

The students then talked about why the counts were taken and one female student stated, "I think that maybe what he is saying by doing counts like that you are trying to say that there is a difference between, or you are trying to see if there is a difference between...." Piercy broke in with emphasis, "Yes, I thought it was." This student seemed to be saying that by Piercy pointing out differences she was pointing out problems. This is revealing for it seemed that some students endorsed that problems should be left alone.

With a mixture of humor and perplexity in her voice, Piercy then stated that the issues they had been talking about do not fall into the purview of feminist issues as she saw them. She named this kind of work as "gender equity in the classroom."

> People we haven't done any feminism. If you want to read some feminist scholarship, I'll give you some. We are just talking about gender equity in classrooms, having balanced views of sexes, we haven't talked at all about feminist issues, and that is a whole other course, Intro to Women's Studies, Feminist Issues.

A male student then said, "Just disregard it." Piercy chuckled and reiterated, "Just disregard it, okay."

Again, Piercy could have chosen to do just that, drop the issue and move on. But she did not, although I sensed the students would have preferred this. I think they were getting the sense that this could escalate into a conflict because Piercy obviously disagreed with their take on what feminism is and what it is not.

Piercy then turned to Reid and with urging in her voice asked, "What do you think Reid?" She implored, "Tell me honestly." At that point there was general chuckling and murmuring from the students. Reid responded seriously, "I don't know, I don't think there's too much feminism." When Reid indicated that there was not too much, Piercy could have dropped the discussion. Instead, she probed, "Too much gender stuff though?" When Reid said "No," and before Piercy could again make the decision whether this would be enough of an answer to move on, Gary interjected and prodded Reid with a disbelieving and chiding tone, "You are lying. You were telling me about all that stuff." At that point general laughter and clapping broke out. Gary punctuated his earlier statement with, "He's a liar."

This was all said humorously, yet what Gary was telling Piercy and the class was that what Reid was willing to say to Piercy, and what he actually said to his friends, were different. Gary uncovered an important issue, whether he realized it or not. Most classrooms are not necessarily the most honest of places. That is, Reid was very aware that

Piercy in her role as teacher educator had the power to evaluate him and even fail him if she wanted to. Here is where we begin to see the unequal power relations between a teacher educator and her students emerge. As a student he needed to decide what was okay for him to say to her and what was not. The differential power arrangements between Piercy and her students were enacted in small ways like this. Reid told his friends one thing but told Piercy another. In this seemingly insignificant episode we are alerted to the ways in which the structure of schooling promotes "a web of protective postures" (Putnam and Burke, 1992, p. 14) and "defensive teaching and learning" (McNeil, 1986).

The response by the rest of the class is important also. They laughed and clapped. This was probably due to three factors. One, a certain amount of good humored glee that a classmate was "caught" by a friend telling an "untruth." I did not sense that this was malicious in any way, just that someone being "caught" fibbing was humorous to them. Two, I think they were laughing because this was not a serious transgression in either their eyes or Piercy's. It was almost as if it was expected that a student tell a teacher an untruth to salvage his image of being a "good" student in her eyes. Three, I also think that it was "comic relief." The heat was being turned up by Piercy asking people directly what they thought, and this

was a chance for people to express in laughter some pent-up
tension.

After this, Piercy beseeched them to tell her whenever
she had "gone overboard" on the gender issues. The chiding
of Reid by Gary and Piercy's response seemed to be an
entryway for people to feel more comfortable saying what
they felt. They saw that Reid did not "get into trouble,"
so David talked about Piercy pointing out the seating
segregation which took place in the classroom, referring to
"maletown." With sincerity David stated:

> Sometimes I get the impression, I don't know if it is
> threatening to me, but it seems like you talk about it
> a lot. Like you always, when you mentioned it early
> on, I don't really feel that comfortable with you that
> much when you started saying "Why do the boys always
> sit over here why do the girls always sit over here?
> Why is that like that?" Because to me it wasn't a big
> deal, to me it was like you were trying to draw
> attention to it. That's what got me at first, because
> a comment about my "support group," to me that was
> another thing that threatened me. I mean I understand
> it, what you were saying, it threatened me and I know
> that it did my friends too. It's like classifying us.
> That is very threatening to me because I don't classify
> anybody else in here, and we like sitting down [here].
> And talking about why do the boys sit on this side and
> the girls over there, I don't know, that is a very
> threatening thing because it is making a difference.
> You are making a point, to point that out and I think
> there's too much of it in society, of trying to point
> it out, where you are actually creating problems. I
> think that carries over into this class especially if
> you said the first day that we would talk about it a
> lot. It sets an overtone for the whole class.

As David talked he seemed to realize that he was
threatened when Piercy talked about the sex segregation.
David mentioned what had been alluded to earlier, that in
pointing out differences, he felt that Piercy was actually

creating them, "You are making a point, to point that out...where you are actually creating problems."

Again, Piercy could have chosen to let it go but she wanted to hear from other students; she asked if anyone else felt threatened and defensive. In this action she was showing a great deal of "spirited vulnerability." Piercy cared about how her students felt, she was not intentionally going out of her way to make them feel uncomfortable.[80] Yet she was willing to talk about what it was that they were uncomfortable about in her practice of uncovering sex segregation and speech patterns. To listen to critiques of her teaching took courage. She had encouraged open and honest dialogue about the students' feelings and emotions. This was not a "safe" choice, there was no hiding behind content, or with detachment talking about the ways in which others react to discussion of sexism or oppression. Rather this was bringing the issues up "close and personal" in ways that these students were probably not used to, given what we know about the common discourse patterns in classrooms (see Jackson, 1986) and in college classrooms (see Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986).

Darlene responded haltingly and seemed to have

---

[80] Piercy wrote in her pre-survey to attend the Liberal Arts College workshop in response to the question what salient issues arose from the evaluation of your teaching:

> I have been working with a doctoral student who is studying feminist pedagogy in my class. I am interested in understanding student change, resistance and growth in understanding gender issues. I feel threatened by my students' feelings of feeling threatened.... We've had an interesting semester and worked through a great deal, but I'm trying to figure out what happened. I'm not sure how to think about what counts as success.... How do I know when I see it? I feel that many students grew, but I'm not sure how to describe it.

difficulty in expressing what she was trying to get across:

> I didn't, I don't know, threatening is just a strong
> word, but um it was just the fact that like I have
> never had a class where we have ever talked about [she
> pauses] gender issues so much in my whole entire life.
> We talk about it every day. It's like drilling it in
> my head, and it's like ahhh. It's just been quite a
> change for me and I don't feel that that is
> threatening. I think it is something new that, it's a
> new experience that I should have just like we were
> talking about how new students this freshman year have
> a gender requirement now. I think it's a good idea
> because you know, I, I, I admit I was kind of you know
> was set aback, "Why is she always talking about it?" I
> mean just, but why should it be a problem when you talk
> about it?

Darlene seemed to be indicating that for some of these young people gender issues, feminist issues, had been moot points before Piercy's class. Inequity, oppression, and privilege had not been issues that they had been discussing. She stressed that in part her feelings were due to gender discussions being a new experience for her. Yet she did say that she thought it was a good idea to have a gender requirement.

With curiosity in her voice Piercy asked, "I wonder if it's the defensiveness and feeling like, 'Wow we are under attack here,' that made it seem like a lot or if it really was?" Piercy paused and considered seriously, "Maybe it was a lot." Darlene, trying to dispel the notion of attack, responded, "Not that like under attack, but just like in the beginning maybe, just because of what I said, I'm not used to hearing it all that much, do you know?" Darlene seemed uncomfortable with the strong phrase "under attack," as she

had been with the word "threatening." She seemed like she was trying to soothe the tone of the conversation into not being such a dramatic event. In this phase of the conflict she seemed to be taking on mediator, adaptor, accommodator, and soother roles (Miller, 1986).

Nathan then confidently declared that he did not feel threatened but that he felt gender issues were "being read into" everything they were doing. Piercy asked him, "It's not that important?" Nathan responded that "pointing out where girls and guys sat was not as important as other issues" that could be talked about. Piercy, with a shade of skepticism in her voice, probed, "So you don't feel defensive about it?" Nathan responded with conviction and a hint of annoyance, "I don't feel defensive about it. Just a lot of times I sit there and we are talking about it, and I'm like well 'Why are we spending so much time on it?'" Nathan did not seem to feel that sex segregation was as important as other issues.[81] (Piercy in later discussions with me wondered if the students would have been concerned if there had been race segregation in the classroom instead of sex segregation.)[82]

Piercy then called on Tricia, who had her hand up. In a conciliatory manner Tricia stated:

---

[81] See the chapter entitled "Sex Segregation and Male Preeminence in Elementary Classrooms" by M. E. Lockheed, 1984 for a discussion of elementary sex segregation and the effects on gender relations.

[82] See Sadker and Sadker (1994) for a discussion of the ways in which gender segregation is seen as inconsequential whereas race segregation is not.

> I think this goes back to what David was saying, kind
> of what Matt was saying, that we make the point to like
> separate us, like to separate us to say boys are doing
> this, girls are doing that, and maybe that's good
> because it shows there are some differences, and that
> maybe we need to change that. Maybe in some ways it is
> bad because it makes us feel kind of separate and more
> different. You know what I am saying?

Piercy asked for clarification, "Bad that I pointed it out?"

Tricia answered:

> Pointing out that there's difference, I mean, I like
> to, I mean when I look at a kid or something like that
> I don't see he's so much different than me because he's
> a guy and I'm a female, or whatever. It's just all in
> the same class we are going into education.

Tricia then went on to say that when gender issues were

examined it seemed like there was a big difference because

it was being pointed out. Then she seemed to check herself,

and qualified her last statement by acknowledging there was

a difference. Tricia seemed to be trying to see both sides

of the argument. She also seemed to have conflictual

feelings. That is, she wanted on some level to know if

there were differences between men and women because without

knowing them they couldn't be changed. But not pointing out

differences between men and women would allow them to feel

united and not separate. Feelings of difference and

separateness made her feel uncomfortable and "bad."

Like people who value "color-blindness" as a way of

believing there are no differences between White people and

people of color, (see Nieto, 1992 and Paley, 1989 for

discussions of "color-blindness"), these young people, like

Tricia, might feel that to ignore differences between women

and men is actually more "equalizing" than pointing out the differences. Tricia seemed to be struggling with the notion that "gender-blindness" (or "gender-free") might be fairer than "gender-sensitivity."[83] Piercy obviously believed that the inequity (difference) needed to be addressed.

Piercy looked around the room and pointed out that the students were not segregated as much today and asked why that was. One male student laughed and replied, "Part of it is because it is a joke." With good humor Piercy reiterated, "It's a joke, okay." Reid had his hand up and she called on him. Reid jokingly stated, "I said you are going to yell at us." Piercy chuckled and with a kidding voice said, "I am going to yell at you, punish you with grades and stuff like that?" Both the students and Piercy seemed to be keeping the good natured tone in the conversation alive.

Although there was tension in the class, the students and Piercy were aware that they could still joke and tease about these issues. Piercy had made it clear from the beginning of the semester that she could laugh at herself and also liked to tease and joke and the students were aware of this.

Piercy then called on Jackie, who had her hand up. Jackie said, "I think a lot of things are, I didn't say that

---

[83] See Bem, 1987a; 1987b; Houston, 1885; and Ayim, 1985 for discussions relating to the notion of being "gender-free."

right, we make too much out of a lot of things." Piercy asked, "*I* make too much out of a lot of things?" (with the emphasis on the "I"). Jackie laughed, "Not just you, everyone...." Jackie then seemed to return to what she really wanted to say, "You too could." Piercy stated with sincerity in her voice, "I appreciate you being honest." Throughout this entire conflict Piercy seemed to welcome their comments and thoughts on her practice. When she thanked Jackie for being honest, she meant it.

Jackie continued, "About the seating and stuff like that I don't think it is that big a deal." Jackie then talked about a teacher she knew who let kids sit wherever they wanted because he wanted them to be comfortable. She then emphasized, "We just have become comfortable and it doesn't matter, I didn't know her [pointing to the woman beside her] before and now I know her. And it doesn't matter, you know what I mean? And it's like, it's made too big, it's too big of a deal." Jackie then said with exasperation, "Like feminism also, we make a big deal out of it and I know it is a big issue but it is exaggerated so much. Like no matter what we do it is worked into it, and racism."

Piercy then restated, "That is a theme you find is just too much." Jackie said with conviction, "Yeah." Jackie seemed to hesitate, maybe wondering if she could risk being honest, implicitly criticizing a teacher, given that she was

a student. Piercy seemed to want to be sure she was getting what Jackie was saying, "We've got too much of a focus on it? We are too concerned about it?" Jackie seemed to hedge at first, "Well just," but then she decidedly stated, "Yeah." Piercy probed with a touch of disbelief in her voice, asking about it not being a central issue they should be concerned about in life, "Not really that kernel an issue in life?" What Piercy was rhetorically asking was whether Jackie believed that equity (such as feminism and racism) was not a core issue that the students needed to be concerned about.

For Jackie, as for others in the class, education and issues of oppression often seemed separate. Jackie made it clear that there were times when feminism and racism did not belong in the conversation, that they were peripheral and tangential. Piercy, on the other hand, did not see privilege and oppression as separate issues from education. One of the functions of education for Piercy was to educate for a just society. Social justice was not tangential or peripheral to education. These two ways of seeing what education was all about came into conflict most clearly in this classroom episode. The students wanted to learn "how to" teach, and in their opinion awareness of gender or feminist issues would not "make them better teachers."

Soothingly Darlene replied to Piercy's query about it not being a kernel issue with, "No it is." She then tried

to explain that it was just not what people expected, "It is just an overall theme across the whole entire class and I mean I think, you know it wasn't written in the little green book about the class [she laughs] you know what I mean?" A male student then laughed and underscored what Darlene said with "Yeah." Darlene continued:

> It is your foundations education class. You know I mean it didn't say, it is going to have a feminist attitude, or overtone, or I don't know. It is so drilled into our class and such a part of our class.

Darlene then seemed to say that if the students were told that the course would be like that, with feminism at the center, then it would not be seen as negative as it was.

Darlene raises an important theme here. That is, these students were used to having classes that were androcentric, and biased in favor of males, and they would not have seen any problem with that. However, if women and girls became more central in the curriculum or the pedagogy, then the students immediately expected to be alerted to this "bias." As Darlene suggested, if the students had been warned that feminism was going to be part of the class content, the "warning" might have dispelled some of the negativity. Ironically, the course was listed in the catalogue under "gender requirements."

Piercy then talked with the students about whether gender had been the focus of the class. One female student said that it had not been the focus. Jackie, slightly annoyed, emphatically stated:

We are teaching boys and girls. That's the whole idea
of why we have to look at gender issues, but we don't
have to work it into everything we talk about though,
because it is so much, we don't have to talk about it
forever and ever, and every little subject and every
topic.

Piercy asked with incredulity, "And we have?" Jackie

answered with certitude, "Yeah." Jackie seemed to be

expressing that gender was a series of issues you learned

about, but that you could "get" them and move on. Jackie

did not see gender undergirding or informing multiple

relationships and experiences in and out of school. Her

conception of gender reflected the conception of knowledge

of gender--bits of information to learn and then move on to

other bits of information on other topics. From Jackie's

response and other women's responses, it was clear that some

of them were as annoyed as the men by the attention to

gender issues.

Piercy then asked them to check their perceptions and

asked them to think about what David had said about feeling

threatened. Piercy asked with genuine interest, "Why did

David feel defensive do you think?" One woman replied,

"Maybe because it was about males." Piercy then tried to

convince the students of the difference between what she was

asking them to do and "women's issues." She asked, "I

didn't even say anything about men. I mean, it's the same

thing as number counts, keeping track of when men and women

speak, why is it a women's issue? If I talked about men and

women, why is that blaming men?"

At this point, Emily entered the conversation and tried to make sense of this phenomenon by saying that in the society at large the ways in which men and women are separated out is seen as a feminist issue. She was trying to mediate between Piercy's position and the students' positions. "Just because a lot of times in society now if you separate things into men and women, it becomes a feminist issue." Emily continued, "That is just the way things are now, separate." Emily's comments remind us that what was happening outside of the classroom affected what the students perceived inside the classroom. The political climate of the times affected the pedagogical times within the classroom.

Piercy responded with concern in her voice, "But is that how we classify things, we say feminist issue. In a way isn't the assumption here that this is a woman's issue and not for men?" David, with a suggestion of aggravation in his voice, said that it felt to him like every session they analyzed the hidden curriculum, bulletin boards, and were asking questions like, Why girls are portrayed as helpless? He commented, "I thought we were concentrating on gender issues just a little too much."

Instead of seeing the different ways in which Piercy was approaching gender and race in the educational institution (i.e., looking at the ways bulletin boards presented men and women, and White people and people of

color) as important for them to pay attention to, David was

suggesting that the different ways were tedious to him.

From his comments, and others like them in the class, I get

the impression that topics like gender and race need only be

brought up once. If gender or race is mentioned multiple

times in multiple contexts, it is going overboard, it is

monotonous, it will not add to their own understandings of

the issues, and "it will not help them become better

teachers."

Piercy asked them to question themselves as to exactly

how much gender there had been. She said that it was true

that they had done number counts and that she had wanted the

small groups to be mixed-gender. Then with puzzlement in

her voice she stated, "But I am not sure where you are

seeing having this heavy focus came. It is in the book

under 'Gender Requirements' so definitely this course has

been accepted."[14] The students then talked about when the

requirement was instituted. Piercy said, "When you signed

up for it, it was under that, so it does have a gender theme

through it. But where you see that this has been a focus is

fascinating to me because, again, I see the focus on equal

opportunity."

Emily, jumped in to support Piercy, "See that is

---

[14] The college had moved to having a "Gender Requirement" and an "Ethnicity Requirement" as part of the course of study that incoming students would take. Piercy submitted her ED 277 for consideration of fulfilling one of the gender requirements that the students could take. Her course was accepted and at the time the study took place the course was listed under "Gender Requirement" in the catalogue of course offerings.

exactly what I have been dying to say." She continued:

> I am just trying to listen to everybody because I'm
> just, I feel, I feel like there's like defensiveness or
> uncomfortableness about this issue. Um, I certainly
> didn't mean to cause any discomfort with any comments I
> made, but I think that we are looking at it wrong. The
> gender issue is a symptom just like the tracking is
> symptom of what some of the problems are in the schools
> system. We *have* to look at gender issues. I believe
> it is a major symptom. Just like if you read the
> article that we were supposed to read for today about
> the textbooks and the materials [Sadker and Sadker] and
> all that stuff. If we want to be good teachers and
> want to help, look, come out with some strategies to
> help solve you know some of those symptoms then I would
> say that we have looked at tracking and gender issues
> about the same, and a lot of people feel that we have
> done tracking, tracking all the time every day, and
> when I asked about this course some people who have
> taken the course told me "You will talk about tracking
> the whole time." They told me that.

Emily in some ways seemed to be the lone voice that understood that Piercy was trying to help them see, that to be "good" teachers they had to care (and care deeply) about the inequities within the educational system. Emily was also the only one who seemed to see gender as just one category, while the other students saw it as *the* category.

Emily at many points in this conflict seemed to be trying to help both the students and Piercy see what the other was saying and why they might be responding as they were. Emily played the role of the mediator in this conflict, but not necessarily in the same way that Darlene had. I did not get the sense from Emily that she wanted to suppress the conflict, but rather she wanted both sides to understand one another.

Piercy and the students continued to talk about gender

and tracking. Nathan went on to say it was not that all
these issues like gender, race, and tracking weren't
important, "It's just that it gets real old hearing about
them *every day* when we come in here and it always seems to
end up in the discussions." Matt concurred with what Nathan
said, "But it seems we are having the same discussions over
and over again and it's like not that important anymore."
Even though Emily had tried to emphasize the importance of
these issues, both these men returned to the argument that
they heard these issues "every day" and therefore the value
was reduced.

Piercy then asked if discussions of this kind should
stop. Gary emphatically responded with "No, no." Piercy
asked them to look at the evidence because she thought they
had not talked about gender that much. She asked them to
rethink their assumptions, suggesting that "it is because we
hit a defensive nerve here. I hear you all saying, 'It is
all your generation's problem, it is not our problem.' I
think we've hit a defensive chord here, that maybe we need
to explore our own interpretation, that would be critical
here."

By this point Piercy seemed pretty sure that they were
reacting the way they were because they had "hit a defensive
nerve." She brought up that she heard consistently from the
students that gender issues were an earlier generation's
problems and that they were no longer of concern. Piercy

had heard students say this a number of times before, and this belief seemed to be the underlying tension point during this class. As far as the students were concerned things had changed enough that issues of equity were not something they needed to concern themselves with as much as Piercy thought they needed to.

Matt, with an odd mixture of placation and annoyance, stated that feminism hadn't been the focus, but that wasn't the point. The point for him was that he already knew about these issues, "To me it is tiresome hearing about it every time I come in here, and it's not that I don't think it is important. It is just that it's like we are talking and I keep thinking to myself, 'Well I know that. Let's just get on with the more intricacies of what we need to talk about.'"

Matt, like others, felt that once they had heard about an issue they knew it. This ties into their conception of facts. Gender, race, and class are merely facts that they learn and once they have learned them they don't need to hear any more about them.

Emily then urged the group to move on and there was laughter. The laughter in part came from the earlier part of the discussion where they all agreed they would take responsibility for moving discussions forward. Piercy laughingly concurred, yet stated with a more serious tone:

> But to be honest we are coming up on the gender issues.
> We haven't done them. We are coming up on them. But I

think you will be amazingly surprised.  I think you all
think you know a lot more than you do.  Excuse me for
telling you but [a couple of females laugh] I think
that the one thing that I would like to work on is sort
of your attitude toward this, I see a lot of "we got
it" and "you got the problem, lady." [One woman laughs]
And "we are going be fine and the kids out there are
doing, are going to be fine."  And that's what I feel
real problematic about.  Now if you ask me what I want
from you, what I would like you to stand back from
those assumptions that you have, wait a minute and
say, "I *think* we have been talking about it like that,
but if I look back through my notes maybe I would
really be able to check my own thinking, check my own
assumptions about what you think we are focusing on, to
make a statement and then to back it with evidence I
think is real important.

Emily had taken responsibility for moving the group

forward.  Although the discussion could have ended here,

Piercy felt she needed to tell the students what she felt.

Matt and others may have wanted to move on, "be direct," but

Piercy was also a member in the community, having a large

say in the direction that the class would move in.  Here she

was tilling the soil, calling them on their arrogant

presence.  Piercy challenged them to look at themselves and

not assume they knew all there was to know.  She made it

clear that she was troubled by their smug assumptions that

equality had already been achieved.  Piercy had gone from

questioning them to concluding that it was their

defensiveness that was causing their perceptions that gender

and feminist issues were excessive in the class.  At this

point she came out and told them that as a teacher she had a

problem with their self-satisfaction about their own

knowledge.  She stressed that they needed to look for

evidence in making the statements they made.

A male student responded to Piercy's comment by saying that he felt as Matt had suggested, not that it was always being discussed but rather "an underlying thing so that it is on our minds as we talk, it is something that always seems to be there, something in the back of our heads as we are talking."

Piercy responded to him with enthusiasm:

Great okay, well that, the consciousness then, you are telling me is that I am raising your consciousness on gender issues, but that's different than saying that's been the focus of this course. And I would say that's exactly what I am hoping I am doing, making you more conscious about who is talking when, [asking yourself] "When am I listening and when am I talking? When have I given women the floor, when have I given men the floor?" That's what I am hoping that I have developed as a consciousness, but I want you to separate out in your minds a consciousness versus that is all we have talked about, and then if I do go overboard, call me on it, please.

Emily, in an effort to explain that the language that Piercy used might make students defensive, pointed out that Piercy's comment of, "'When do I give women the floor, when do I give men the floor?' I think that makes people uncomfortable." In an attempt to have Piercy explain her reasons, Emily asked, "Why did you have to say that?" Piercy explained, "Because I want you to be more conscious of that." Emily, trying to make sure her comments and questions weren't misunderstood, stated that she was just trying to say what others might be thinking. Piercy, realized what Emily was trying to do, and responded with,

"Hmmhmm good."

Emily played mediator again. She tried to make Piercy
cognizant that her statement about wanting the students to
be aware of their own behaviors made the students
"uncomfortable." Emily seemed to be saying that when Piercy
compelled her students to look at their own behavior they
then became uncomfortable.

Emily situated herself in a unique position. She, more
than any other student, tried to create a middle ground
where both sides could come to understanding. She seemed to
empathize with Piercy and the ways in which the students
were critiquing her, but being a student she wanted to help
Piercy see what the students perceived she was doing. This
part of the conversation seemed to end, not finished, yet
somehow at a stage where Piercy and the students needed to
contemplate what had been said.

Piercy then said that they would be watching the
videotape and it "will show you what's happening in schools
and what's happening academically." She then went over some
other feedback forms that she thought indicated the students
were beginning to self-evaluate their own thinking. She
also read out a feedback form where the student requested
"More input from teacher on beliefs, values." Piercy
laughingly kidded with them, "Well you got them tonight!"
Then with emphasis and vigor, after reading a response that
mentioned consequences that children face because of

teachers' actions, Piercy stated:

> That's what I am talking about. We have got powerful
> consequences on our kids in classrooms, both boys and
> girls. The articles you are reading, I specifically
> chose because they talk about how this is hurting our
> young men as well as our young women.

She explained that she chose Sadker and Sadker because they

delineate what disadvantages both women and men. She went

on to say:

> I purposefully pick things so they aren't saying all
> White men are bad and evil because I don't believe that
> is true. I wouldn't have been married for twenty years
> if I felt he was a bad and evil type person. I think
> he is a wonderful liberating person, but anyway,
> [students laugh] I have really chosen these articles to
> help men and women, boys and girls in classrooms. But
> I hope you will continue to be conscious, because I
> think you have become more conscious.

Piercy tried to convince them that she was not trying

to "blame men." She related her own history as evidence

that she did not personally believe this. Piercy seemed to

feel that the students were alienated from her and wanted to

assure them that she was not scapegoating men, rather she

was stating that issues of gender inequity hurt both men and

women.

Piercy seemed to be trying to convince the students

that these issues are human issues and not just women's

issues, or issues women not men are concerned with. On some

level Piercy was aware that this charge of "she must hate

men" may have been going through her students' minds and she

felt she must reassure them that that was not the case at

all.

Piercy then asked the students if she had gotten them so defensive that they would no longer speak to her. Her making this statement seemed to ease the tension, and the students laughed and Piercy also laughed. This statement also expressed her view that relationships were central to learning.

Piercy then went on and said that someone on the feedback form had stated that the person had been speaking more in ED 277 and also in other classes because of it. Piercy stated, "That was exciting to me because it said they are gaining a voice and they are able to say that, and I thought that was pretty exciting information." Piercy then in a worried yet spirited way asked, "So have I gotten you too defensive? Have I blown you away so now you won't talk to me at all?" There was general laughter and Piercy laughed also. With sincerity in her voice she stated, "No but honestly, I do want you to tell me if I do go overboard, I want to know it. And you get extra credit if you do. If you can get me to be defensive, get me to learn, you get extra credit." Good naturedly, she rhetorically asked, "How's that?" In saying this to them, she was saying that she believed defensiveness was not all bad, that it could help people learn.

A student then asked about the next paper and Piercy and the students talked about the upcoming paper that was due. The tension seemed to be broken and without official

notification, the break began; some students remained in the class and others left.

After a ten minute break Piercy set up and showed the video "Shortchanging Girls: Shortchanging America." The kind of statements the students heard on the video were:

> Females make up the only group in society who consistently leave the education system worse than when they began.

> Our schools discourage ambition and achievement in girls.

> We realize that teachers want to change, want to be fair, they simply lack the tools and resources to make that change. When we show teachers what happens in the typical classroom, they can't believe it, it's like a conversion experience.

> Discouraged in the classroom, turned off by what they see in textbooks and testing materials. Tracked away from the fields of the future, our girls are shortchanged in the schools.

> It's a matter of simple justice. And it's a matter of survival, because when we shortchange our girls, we shortchange America.

The students watched the video and there seemed to be mixed non-verbals. Some seemed interested by watching intently. Others were looking around the room and did not seem interested.

This marked the movement into the third phase of the class. The video was just the kind of activity that punctuated what Piercy had been saying all along, that gender bias was real, alive and well in the 1990s, gender equity was not the dinosaur issue that the students were suggesting. Therefore, this video set the climate for the

final stage of the conflict.

## Phase Three: After the Video

The videotape ended and Piercy asked, "Okay. What did you think?" Tasha was the first one to speak up, "I thought it was kind of stupid." Piercy seemed not to be expecting this response and with surprise asked, "Stupid? Why was it stupid?" Tasha responded, "It just seemed like the first whole segment was just everybody repeating what everybody else was saying."

Tasha's comment about repetitiveness is fascinating, for her criticism of the video paralleled many students' criticisms of Piercy in the earlier phase of the class. Was Tasha indirectly telling Piercy that her concentrating on gender issues as much as she did was also "stupid?"

Piercy did not accept Tasha's generalization of repetition and pushed her to tell her what was being repeated. With consternation on her face Piercy asked, "What did they say that was repeated?" Tasha answered, "It was the same concept, but it seemed like this person was saying it and then it switched to this person saying it. And then this person said the same thing and this person was repeating." Piercy probed with skepticism, "Well, what was it that was repeated? What was it that they said?" Tasha explained, "It was just the whole thing, girls are getting low self-esteem between these years. It seemed that that

was all they, I don't know, it just seemed really
repetitive. It lost my interest." Piercy replied, with a
slight perturbation, "So you didn't hear it. You just sort
of tuned it out?" Tasha explained, "Well yeah, I started to
hear it and then I was just kind of looking at the ceiling,
fifteen lights on the ceiling." Piercy, did not let up, "So
you never heard why or how girls were disadvantaged?" Tasha
laughed and said, "Well, no." Piercy continued, "So you
couldn't tell me right now how girls are disadvantaged in
schools and what they said?" Tasha stated:

> Well they said that teachers give more feedback to
> males. They get different feedback. Um, girls when
> they come with a problem teachers solve it for them.
> And the males uh, teachers say, "You can do better, try
> it again." With females it is, "This is how you do
> it."

Piercy replied with slight disbelief, "HmmHmm. So they said
that over and over again? I only heard them say that once."
Tasha stated, "I don't know. It just seemed, maybe it is
just the way they set it up. It's just, it wasn't
interesting to listen to."

Tasha had avoided identifying the repetitions by saying
that basically she tuned out, but Piercy continued to urge
and challenge her, not letting up. The exchange between
Piercy and Tasha paralleled the second phase of the class
where Piercy would not let the students make claims of
repetition without evidence.

Piercy then asked what others thought. Reid answered,
"There seemed to be a lot of facts which was boring." The

students laughed. Piercy smiled. Neither the students nor Piercy missed the irony of this; they had just asked for more facts about teaching and learning. Piercy asked, "What was boring?" A female student said, "It just kept on going on." A male punctuated what she said with "Yeah." Piercy then confronted them, asking them:

> So what did you want to hear? I thought you wanted more facts. I thought that was one thing you wanted, more facts, like the percentages, and what happened over the years. Now why is that boring?

Darlene quickly commented that it wasn't the facts, but rather the format of the video:

> That part was good where they showed, you know, those percentages, and stuff and that got my interest but just one dialogue after another. And then this music came "de de de de de de" [mimicking the music]. It could have just been the format. It did have good information. I think the way they, the way they ran it together, the format was just...

Nathan jumped in and declared, "It was too much of a sales pitch. It sounded like a commercial video." Darlene agreed with laughter, "Commercial, yeah it did [sound like a commercial]." He reiterated, "It was."

In the discussion about there being too many facts and a "sales pitch," the students were critiquing much more than the video. Nathan seemed to be directing some part of the criticism toward Piercy, saying that this was a sales pitch that she was using to back up her point about the reality of gender bias in schools. Had this video been shown at any other time during the semester, I speculate that the criticisms of it would have been of a different nature.

That is, the subtext of their criticism was of Piercy, which
I believe resulted from the first two phases of the class.
At another time, different criticisms would have arisen.
The immediacy of the first two phases of the class would not
have "driven" their critiques. They might have been bored,
but not shown as much hostility toward the video.

Tricia entered the discussion by stating that she would
have liked to have seen more classrooms being shown because
her experience didn't confirm what the video was saying:

> What I thought would have been interesting is if they
> said studies have shown this, but we could have seen an
> example of the study. If like they had like videotaped
> a classroom, shown what was happening instead of just
> generalizing about it. They were kind of generalizing,
> well this always happens in classrooms. You know the
> classrooms that I have observed which have been more
> than this one, I have noticed that the girls are more
> talkative and buddy buddy, well seemingly buddy buddy
> with the teacher than the boys, the boys were kind of
> for themselves.

Tricia continued to speak and then Piercy began to talk
over her. Piercy had been collected and composed throughout
the entire discussion, which I found amazing. I could not
have remained as calm and as steady as she had. But at this
point Piercy interrupted because she couldn't contain
herself. It was impossible to figure out what either said
because they were both talking at once. But when Piercy's
voice came through clearly, she challenged Tricia, "Okay,
but that's what they said the problem was that girls were
buddy buddy, but the boys were being challenged in the
academic areas. That's where the problem is. That's what

this video tape was saying." Tricia said, "See not really in the classrooms that I've watched, I'm not really saying this...." Piercy interrupted with the question, "Have you ever measured it though? Have you ever taken down evidence to look at that? [For example] to count how many times?" It seemed that at this point Piercy was getting frustrated because she believed Tricia was making generalizations without evidence (another theme that had arisen in phase two of the class). Tricia responded, "Well, when I was in the twelfth grade I didn't make charts of how many girls went to the teacher and stuff." Piercy responded, "So you see what I am saying? You are making a generalization without evidence."

> Tricia: [With emphasis and exasperation in her voice] I am not making a generalization. What I am saying, according to what they are saying, that is not what's most common. I'm sure it's not. I guess it's not. That's what I guess that's what they are saying on the video.
>
> Piercy: [Trying to convince] But they went out and gathered evidence.
>
> Tricia: [Agreeing] Right!
>
> Piercy: And these are people that are experts and that have been experts in the field and went out to count how many times people...
>
> Tricia: [Interrupting and with tension in her voice] I understand that. What I am saying they didn't, what I am saying is that they made it sound like all of them. What I am saying is that I understand, that what I am saying is, is this may be the exception more than the rule. That's what I am saying.
>
> Piercy: Well...
>
> Tricia: I would have liked to have seen that...

Emily: [Trying to help Tricia out] What she is
saying...

Tricia: [With frustration] I'm just...

In this part of the dialogue Piercy and Tricia were
talking past one another, unable to make the other
understand what she meant. Tricia kept trying to tell
Piercy that she wanted to see more evidence in the video,
and Piercy kept hearing that Tricia was disagreeing with
their findings without providing any evidence of her own.

Piercy and Tricia talked past one another for a while
and then other students started to try and mediate the
discussion. Emily tried in a conciliatory way, by calmly
explaining, "She is saying that she has experienced
something different and obviously that was not being
accepted."

Tricia: [With further frustration] What I am saying is
that ...

Nathan: [With annoyance] She was... [he keeps talking
but it is inaudible because Tricia is talking]

At this point Tricia had her head down and her hand covering
her face. It looked at first like she was crying but later
it did not seem like she was.[15]

Tricia: [With a beseeching tone] I would have liked to
have seen that because what I have noticed is the
opposite.

Piercy: Oh, I see what you are saying, but what I am
saying is, you, we don't know, what we've seen until
you look at it carefully and analyze it.

---

[15] However, Darlene in her interview seemed to believe that she was crying.

Nathan tried to intercede for Tricia, in an aggressive manner with aggravation in his voice, he stated, "That's what she is saying, that she would have liked to have seen more." Emily and Nathan tried to intercede for Tricia, but in different ways and to different ends. Emily tried to help both parties understand each other. She played the interpreter in an attempt to turn around the talking past one another that was occurring between Tricia and Piercy. Nathan, on the other hand, seemed to interpret for Tricia to turn the discussion and have Piercy once and for all "get it."

The talking past one another continued between Piercy and Tricia.

> Tricia: [Trying to explain] I believe what they are saying. I would just have liked to have seen that.

At this point Piercy seemed to understand what Tricia was trying to say and thanked the students for pushing.

> Piercy: Okay. [Students are talking over one another] Okay, that is what is coming up next we are going to see some examples of how this is happening. Thanks [students laughing], thanks for pushing, because I really didn't understand what you were saying. [To another student] Yes?

Piercy, noticing the looks of frustration on the students' faces, asked, "Why are you so frustrated?" She was frustrated, the students were frustrated, and I was feeling very uncomfortable, not knowing where to look or what to do to be inconspicuous.

At this point the conflict seemed to have become full

blown. The tension and frustration that many people were feeling was brought to a head when Darlene, in a manner unlike her previous interactions, stated with tempered boldness, "Since we are being so open today...."

> Piercy: Yes? [Puzzled, and then concurs] I hope we will continue...

> Darlene: [Interrupts with resolution] I think you were kind of badgering her.

At this point there was nervous laughter from the students. Nathan then jumped in, seeming to want to get in on the action of labelling what occurred as "badgering." He emphatically stated with a loud sigh, "Thank you!" and then laughed. Darlene then turned to Tricia and with care and concern in her voice reproached Piercy, "She is flushed, she is, she is like drained," and then laughed nervously.

As this was going on, Piercy seemed perplexed and mystified. She asked, "So by pushing her that is being mean to her? And badgering her because I was pushing her?" Nathan, with a nod belligerently stated "Hmmmhhmm."

Piercy did not seem to understand how the students could see what she had done as "badgering." Piercy consistently pushed her students to clarify their statements and to show evidence for generalizations they made. She also pushed her students, especially her women students, to speak up and out. In this class session, Piercy was not engaging in discourse patterns that were completely foreign to her students.

She then tried to question the students to clarify why
in this instance she was perceived as badgering Tricia.

> Darlene: [With a tempered reproach] I feel as though
> you were badgering her.  I mean you could have as
> easily just toned it down a little bit and had a
> conversation with her, instead of...

> Piercy: And so...

At this point both Piercy and Darlene were talking at once.

> Darlene: [Seeming to almost withdraw her reproach] I'm
> sorry...

> Piercy: No [almost as if trying to ease Darlene's
> feeling badly], because I am emotionally involved in
> this issue...

> Darlene: [With a beseeching tone she jumps in] because
> you are the teacher and you are ...

> Piercy: [With consternation] Yeah.  And I am not
> supposed to be emotionally involved.  I am supposed to
> be distant.

> Nathan: [Jumping in] No it's...

> Darlene: [Quickly discounting Piercy's statement] No
> no, but you know...

> Piercy: You don't want me to get excited? [Both Piercy
> and Darlene are talking at once]

> Darlene: [With surety] You don't want to get students
> too upset.

> Piercy: Or be too upset?

> Darlene: [Confusion in her voice] I just don't think, I
> don't know...

> Piercy: You think that is inappropriate for teachers to
> do that?

> Darlene: [With a mixture of resignation and confusion]
> I guess I am more of a mellow person and I don't want
> to get all, all like upset. I don't know...

> Piercy: [With a hint of reproach] And you don't want me
> to be that way?

Darlene: [With a slight edge of timidity] I'm, I'm, I am saying that I would be a little...

Nathan: [Finishing her thought for her] Scared.

Darlene had attempted to say what she would feel if a teacher were "badgering her."  Nathan finished the sentence she was trying to get out, by saying "scared."  This seemed to adequately describe what Darlene was thinking because she seemed thankful for the ending to her sentence, "Yeah. Being the teacher...."

Darlene explained to Piercy that she did think it was badgering and that she felt Piercy could have altered her tone, "and had a conversation with her."  Piercy thought she was having a conversation, yet that was not how Darlene and Nathan read what had occurred.  Perhaps part of why this differing interpretation existed was because of Piercy's and the students' different visions of conflict.  Piercy welcomed challenge and conflict and believed it to be part of good instruction, whereas for Darlene and Nathan this kind of challenge was "badgering."

Darlene raised the issue of Piercy's interaction being inappropriate somehow.  Because she was the teacher she shouldn't have acted in a manner that "got students upset."  Piercy challenged her conception of the teacher's role by questioning her on whether she wanted Piercy to be distant and not get upset.

Piercy then turned to Tricia and spoke directly to her:

Piercy: Do you think I was trying to hurt you Tricia by

pushing?

Tricia: [In a conciliatory tone] I'm sure it was not intentional. I was just getting frustrated because I wanted to get to say all that and you kept saying, I just wasn't communicating it. [She laughs]

Piercy: Okay.

Tricia implied that she had been hurt, but that she knew it was not intentional. She talked about her own frustration at not being able to communicate adequately what she was trying to express. Tricia seemed to be more at ease with the interaction than Darlene or Nathan had been.

At this point Emily began to say something, "It just didn't...." Then Nathan cut in with an arrogant tone and stated:

> I understood what she asked two seconds after she said it the first time. I get frustrated over here, because, well like, I mean I understood what she said right off the bat. And I'm like, "Get it." [He laughs and other students laugh]. That's what I feel sitting over here and [in the background a female said, "Whoa"] It's, it's frustrating 'cause, I mean, I understood what she was trying to ask, and I don't know. I understood what the point she was trying across early, earlier. I guess it's frustrating over here because you don't seem to understand, it seems like that. I mean I don't understand why you haven't figured it out yet and why you keep bothering her to keep trying to see, keep repeating what she has already said. Does that make sense?

When Nathan re-entered the conversation, he seemed to expect Piercy to understand it quicker than she did. He stated, "And I'm like, 'Get it.'" This seemed to be the point at which arrogant presence was at its highest. In the background as he was talking I heard a woman say "Whoa," seemingly shocked at what and how Nathan was saying what he

was saying.

Tricia then tried to explain what happened with Piercy's own explanation of raising defenses:

> Tricia: I think maybe like you are claiming it's like defenses, 'cause we didn't like the film [students laugh] because like people are saying they didn't like it and I wasn't saying that I didn't like it, I just, 'cause they were talking, people like said, there was a lot of dialogue I would have liked to have seen more examples and stuff like that. It's not that I didn't believe it because I believe it. You know they have studied more than I have. I just wanted some examples.

Tricia seemed to tell Piercy that the students perceived Piercy as defensive because the students had not liked the film, and Piercy evidently had. Here some of the students seemed to be judging Piercy as arrogantly present.

> Piercy: Oh but, but I think I was pushing you because you said when you saw it you believed that girls got more attention and more involvement by the teacher. And that's what I was pushing you on. I was saying to you, what I would like you to do is have some evidence to back....

Piercy went on to say that she wanted Tricia to have evidence, but before Piercy could finish Nathan came back and said Piercy still wasn't getting it, "But that's not what she is saying, what she is saying, I mean from the same way I was planning on bringing up, in high school all the girls were in the math classes, all the guys...." Nathan seemed to be protesting and also taking over the dialogue that Piercy and Tricia were engaged in.

At this point class time was up and Piercy said, "I think we got time out here, to come...." Before she finished her sentence, a male student said, "One quick

thing...." Piercy responded, "Okay." He stated that the students don't understand the gender issues because, "We haven't seen that." When he said that other students responded in unison with "Yeah." The same male said, "It doesn't make sense to us. We would like to see an example." At this point lots of people were talking at once. Piercy responded:

> Okay, you are all going to see examples [in your observations] and that is what I would like you to do, I was trying to say is what we need to do is check our assumptions and we may have thought that the girls were more involved, but I would like you to ask that question, rather than say the girls were more involved, the boys were more involved, start to look, to take examples down. I see a lot of disgusted kind of people looking, "Oh my God what is she doing?"

The students laughed. Nathan then said to Piercy that she had missed the whole point of what had just gone on. A female student reinforced Nathan's comment by saying "Yeah." Piercy responded, "Of what Tricia was saying? Okay." Nathan reemphasized that it was hard for the students to believe something just because someone told them it was so. A female student then continued his point by saying, "If you haven't experienced it." Nathan then explained that was what Tricia was trying to get across. He turned to her, "If I am wrong, stop me."

The students were trying to tell Piercy that from their experience they had not seen what the video was telling them was true, and they wanted more evidence. Piercy assured them that they would be seeing examples when they did their

observations.  But she went on to say that they needed to
check their assumptions.

Piercy apologized to Tricia, and seemed to understand
what Tricia had been trying to say, "Oh okay, I am sorry, I
misread you."  Nathan then reemphasized that the whole point
was they wanted to see the evidence instead of just someone
(on the video) saying it was true.  Piercy, seemed to feel
badly, "I apologize I...."  Before she could go on, Emily
interceded, seeming to feel that Piercy needed some rescuing
and explained that she had also not understood what Tricia
had been trying to say.

> I didn't totally hear clearly either though, that's why
> I was waiting to hear her explain more because I didn't
> know what she was saying either though.  I understand
> that you didn't know what she was saying.  I thought
> that maybe if she talked a little, if she realized that
> we needed her to explain more, you know, we would have
> picked it up.

Piercy responded by saying that she had misunderstood the
point they were trying to make but that now she understood.

Piercy went on to talk about how important these issues
were and that what she had done with Tricia could be thought
of as a quality interaction:

> Okay, well then, I think that was what I was trying to
> do 'cause I didn't  understand what she said either.
> But I understand what you are saying now.  [Laughter
> from the students] This is a real important issue.  As
> you see we've got people meeting in Washington saying
> that this is a kernel issue for beginning teachers to
> look at.

Piercy then told them that she would have them read the
Sadker and Sadker (1982) chapter on "The Cost of Sex Bias"

so that they could see what quality interactions between teachers and students are. Piercy went on to explain that what had just occurred between Tricia and herself would have counted, according to Sadker and Sadker, as a quality interaction because "I pushed her and challenged her to explain what she meant so that we all understood [what she meant]. Me in particular, but all of you were very hooked into listening to the point she was making." Piercy went on to say that being hooked in counts as learning. She then stated that often teachers just stand up and tell, rather than "push people on their thinking." From the students' facial expressions, they did not seem convinced that the way Piercy had challenged Tricia was positive.

Piercy then stated that she felt there was a different atmosphere in the room. She asked, "Have you paid more attention? Have you thought more this time than before?" She then stated, "You seem more serious." She asked the students, "Did you learn more last time? Those are genuine questions." She asked, "Did you think you thought more, paid more attention this time because I was pushing you?" Joanne replied to her question:

> I think I've gotten more out of the other classes than today because today I kind of got bored with people arguing back and forth. I wasn't really interested in this as compared to Jigsaw and everything else. This didn't grab my interest. It was just like a fight. [She laughs a little]

Piercy seemed perplexed by this and said, "It was too violent," and then asked, "It felt violent to you?" Joanne

replied, "Yeah." Piercy reflected out loud, with interest and concern, "Challenge feels kind of violent." Then she went on to say," Well that's a question I think we should ask. Is it? Is challenging people on issues is that...." Before she could finish her sentence Joanne stated emphatically, "The atmosphere just felt very hostile." Piercy queried, "Hostile?" Joanne affirmed "Yeah." Piercy then said with conviction, "We got our defenses up."

At that point a few people chuckled. Piercy then asked, "Is that bad? I guess is the question." The students remained silent. It was after 6:00 p.m., the class time was over. Piercy sensing there was no place else to go with the conversation stated, "See you next time." Piercy laughed and others laughed. Their laughter was a mixture of nervous laughter and relief. Students began to leave the classroom. On her way out Darlene looked a little sheepish and perhaps needing to initiate reconciliation, said, "Sorry." Piercy said to students leaving, "Thanks for staying with me. I appreciate that." The class ended.

The conflict had culminated in this phase of the class, but had been churning since the "facts" discussion. When the students critiqued the video, it seemed to me that they were critiquing much more than the video. This was their chance to vent their dissatisfaction with being asked to consider gender issues in Piercy's classroom. They used the video as a vehicle to locate their anger and frustration.

The students had been complaining that there had been too much feminism and emphasis on gender issues in the class. The video they watched reinforced that girls were discriminated against in schools. Even though Piercy did not intend the video as an "I told you so," it may have felt like that to the students.

The students had also been asked to question their own gender segregation and to keep track of when men and women spoke. Looking at specific behavior was threatening; as David relayed, comments about his "support group" threatened him. This was not keeping gender issues at arms' length. This made them feel defensive and threatened. Instead of Piercy soothing their feelings of defensiveness and threat, she wanted them to talk about their feelings and why they might feel that way. Piercy did not let up. This got the students frustrated and angry. Piercy was again bringing up something that in their minds was better left alone.

Piercy tenaciously stuck with the issues when she wanted to challenge the students and when she did not understand something. She did not skirt or avoid an issue. During the misunderstanding students were reacting in a number of ways. Emily was trying to help her understand, Nathan was condemning her for not understanding, and Darlene seemed to plead with her not to engage in challenge.

Piercy was obviously frustrated and mystified by the students' reactions and her students seemed to feel that

Piercy was being defensive, "badgering," and had they had the words, arrogantly present. However, as the observer I did not perceive her as arrogantly present. Although she critiqued her own practice to me later as "oppressive," considering the escalating hostility and arrogance from Nathan in particular, she did not lash out and meet arrogant presence with arrogant presence. She later told me that she was irked with them. That came through, but I never got the sense that she was trying to "get them back" for not engaging with her as she hoped they would.

Perhaps it could be argued that the conflict was a simple case of misunderstandings. Not only misunderstandings (understanding wrongly) of intentions but also the misunderstanding (not understanding) of ideas. Misunderstandings did occur during the class. For example, in phase one, the students did not understand the parallels that Piercy was trying to draw between facts and opinions being complex, and the complexity of teaching, learning, and knowledge; in phase two, Piercy and the students did not understand the complexity of gender issues and the defensiveness these issues cause; and, in phase three Piercy misunderstood Tricia's critique of the video and the students misunderstood Piercy's intentions when challenging Tricia. However, the class signified much more than misunderstandings.

What is also significant is the delicate position

students felt themselves in. We saw this in Darlene's reaction during the conflict: she seemed bold and scared at the same time. She felt moved to speak up and out on Tricia's behalf, and yet the power differential between Piercy and herself seemed to unnerve her. She may have been frightened of the ramifications of speaking up and out in the context of unequal power relations of a teacher educator and a student. Tricia also might not have said all that she felt during the conflict because of the authority that Piercy had over her. Nathan and Matt seemed to say what they felt during the conflict and I wonder how much of their ability to confront Piercy had to do with them being male. What about the other students who were silent? Were they silent because they felt that there could be serious consequences if they said what they felt? In the next chapter I examine further this idea of unequal power relations.

Piercy lifted the lid off the conflict that had been simmering below the surface of the classroom. By releasing the conflict she provided a rich text to examine. We were able to see the ways a teacher educator and her students interpreted knowledge differently. We were able to see how gender affects the lives of students and teachers inside and outside the classroom. We also saw how the power to express oneself as a student and as a teacher affects classroom discourse. And we also saw the ways in which the classroom

reflects the culture at large and also creates the culture at large.

I have presented the case of conflict and detailed how I interpreted what happened during the conflict, wanting to help you "see" how I experienced it. I have examined Piercy's and her students' reactions specifically, but I did not move to larger factors which I believe affected what occurred during the conflict. In the next chapter I will move to analyzing the factors which contributed to the conflict. In this upcoming chapter I fold in Piercy's reaction and analysis of the conflict. I will also examine the ways that this conflict was a turning point for the class as a community.

# CHAPTER X

## THE ISSUES THAT LAY UNDER THE SURFACE OF THE CLASSROOM: UNLEASHING CONFLICT

> The first response of a group in seeking to form a
> community is most often to try and fake it.  The
> members attempt to be an instant community by being
> extremely pleasant with one another and avoiding all
> disagreement.  Their attempt--this pretense of
> community--is what I term "pseudocommunity."  It never
> works. (Peck, 1987, p. 86-87)

> I let my students know they will feel much discomfort,
> doubt and ambiguity; I tell them that to be shaken up
> is evidence of learning, of growth and of shifts in
> thinking. (Henry, 1993-94, p. 3)

In this chapter I will investigate Piercy' reaction to

the conflict and some of the factors which I believe

contributed to the case of conflict.  Piercy and I

considered many issues in trying to figure out what had gone

on.  The interpretations that I will examine arose from my

discussion with Piercy about the case as well as from my own

analysis.

Piercy engaged in the "unleashing of unpopular things"

(Britzman, 1990).  Piercy asked the students to confront

their own assumptions about gender and equity inside and

outside of the classroom.  Her students were not practiced

in challenging their own assumptions of issues like gender,

opening up their own lives for examination, and engaging in

"critical discourse."  Because Piercy unleashed the conflict

we were able to get a glimpse at what lay under the surface

in her classroom.

During each segment of the class different issues were

being enacted.  During the first phase "Facts" signal the
triggering of the conflict, which I label here "the clash of
the paradigms."  In the second phase, "Too much feminism,"
there were many issues being enacted.  The core issues
relate to: gender and the nature of knowledge, smugness and
arrogant presence, the personal is pedagogical, the
complicated nature of sexism, sexual politics, and seeing
man as the norm.  The third phase, "After the Video,"
centers around the students perceiving that Piercy was
"badgering" Tricia.  This, in part, indicates different
visions of conflict and relationships in a classroom.
Embedded within this theme is the nature of women and
conflict.  It also reveals how Piercy may have "overreacted
and underconsidered" (Paley, 1989, p. 106) during this phase
of the conflict.

Close examination of this class reveals a fourth phase,
"Conflict as Turning Point."  The conflict that occurred
during this class seemed to initiate the coalescing of the
community of critical friends.  It is during this phase that
I investigate students' interpretations of the conflict.  It
is in this section that Darlene alerts us most clearly to
the power differential that exists between teachers and
students.  I also include Piercy's reflection two years
after on the case of conflict.

## Piercy's Reaction to the Class Conflict

When Piercy and I talked at Daly's about the class, Piercy said that she was uncomfortable with the hostility that she felt in the room. She went on to say that it had been there before this event, but that it had just been surfaced during this class. She then acknowledged, "Where we go from here with it is what I have got to problem solve about." She mentioned Matt's hostility that had been shown in the past, a "swankering hostility" as she called it. Piercy stated:

> When I have gotten this hostility out directly, it has turned into a better relationship. When I'm thinking back on other kids that I have had that have had these arrogant tones and I have gotten to that, that has been a good move in the forward view. What I'm a little disappointed about is, I think I usually try real hard to respect them even though I don't agree with them. I think part of what moves them from hostility to a disagreement is that I respect them even though I disagree with them. I don't think I was respectfully disagreeing with them tonight. I think I was hostile. I was irked at them because they do irk me, and I let that out. So I think again that is the important part of this whole project is that we don't get oppressive. I do think it was oppressive. I would say the hostility arose because the challenging that I was doing with them was more oppressive than it has been. That was what caught their attention that was what got them defensive.

Piercy seemed to analyze her own reaction and interaction as what I now would call arrogant presence. I am reminded of Paley's (1989) casting of her own response to a parent's criticism of a Black child in her class, "I had overreacted and underconsidered" (p. 106). Piercy seemed to be saying that she similarly overreacted to the students'

responses and underconsidered their thoughts, feelings, and misunderstandings.

Although my tendency is to downplay Piercy's own criticism of her teaching, finding it difficult to cast Piercy as "oppressive" or as having arrogant presence, I need to listen deeply to her own analysis of the conflict. Part of my hesitancy in accepting her own appraisal of being hostile and disrespectful comes from how impressed I was with how little defensiveness and authoritarianism she displayed during a class fraught with tension.

In retrospect, I also see that since I had a deeper relationship with Piercy than I did with her students, my tendency is to privilege her as the hero in the conflict, rather than accepting her own self-criticism. And so conscientiously resisting my tendency to downplay her self-reproaches, I need to try to understand what Piercy concluded about her own participation in the conflict. She indicated that she had overreacted to Tricia, dismissing her based on previous information and making assumptions about what Tricia meant, without "hearing" what Tricia was trying to say:

> I think I did dismiss Tricia very quickly. I did assume because of what she said before. I assumed because Tricia said a lot of things to me before, I was making assumptions about her and look at how frustrated she got. You noticed how hurt she was, that is what happens to kids all the time in school. We are teachers, we have got to take care of that. If Tricia were frustrated all the time like that, she'd give up after a while, wouldn't she? That's what these kids have faced for hundreds of years. You know, really try

to use this example of how unhappy we were with the class, to show them how important this is.

Piercy admitted culpability in Tricia's frustration, and the hostility and oppressiveness that was created during the case of conflict. Piercy felt badly about how she had hurt Tricia by her own assumptions about what she was trying to say.

Piercy seemed to have underconsidered the impact of unlearning about gender in the students' lives and her own life. The dramatic reactions, tensions, and feelings that flowed through the room could not have been anticipated, and yet, as Piercy wrote in her epilogue, her newness at grappling with gender issues led her to mistrust the capacity of her students to grow:

> When I look back I'm reminded what it is like to begin teaching. This research has helped me to take the perspective that Freire suggests, the teacher needs to become the student. As an inexperienced teacher of gender issues, I wasn't sure if my students would grow or that I would help my students grow. After watching their growth, I have more faith in them and me. I have to remember, as I work with beginning teachers, that experience can build trust in your students and yourself and trust builds understanding.

Piercy acknowledged that she might have overreacted to her students because she underconsidered their capacity to learn and grow. The complexity of gender issues was something that Piercy did not have much experience with. Inexperience may have caused some overreactions and assumptions on her part, therefore, making her unable to deal as constructively as she would have liked to with these

issues in times of turmoil, confusion, and misunderstanding.

Despite her self-criticism she remained steadfast in saying honesty being important, "My being honest with them is something I would like to continue with them. I don't want us to hurt each other but the honesty is important." She realized that her assumptions were what hurt Tricia, not her honesty. She also saw what happened as a teaching tool to help her students understand what children in schools go through all the time.

Yet honesty is something that is rare in many classrooms; pseudo-interactions are more the norm. For these students the honesty might also have been jarring. Piercy was committed to honesty and honest interactions, but the students may have been skeptical of this. Students know that teachers have power over them. Teachers can make their lives miserable inside the classroom (and in Piercy's case because she was the director of elementary education, outside the classroom also), and so these students were not sure how honest they could afford to be. We saw a glimpse of this with Reid not telling Piercy the truth at first about what he thought about the emphasis on gender and feminism.

From Piercy's analysis after the class and in her epilogue I see that she vigilantly watched her own tendency toward arrogant presence. She analyzed her own behavior as hostile and not respectfully disagreeing with her students.

She was willing to think about her own role in the conflict
and is quick to see her own responsibility in its unfolding.
Although Piercy said she was "irked," I did not see Piercy
judging the students as "either for me or against me," even
those who were subtly or overtly antagonistic toward her.
Instead, I felt she listened to them. For example, Nathan's
comments, "I understood what she asked two seconds after she
said it the first time.... And I'm like, 'Get it,'" seemed
hostile, condescending, and arrogant. Yet Piercy did not
lash out at him or try to put him in his place. As the
authority figure, she could have used her power over her
students. But that would have been antithetical to her
sense of what it takes to create a genuine community of
critical friends. A real community means that one avoids
potted passions, rejects pseudocommunity and pseudo-
connection, thereby tacitly and overtly encouraging
conflict.

Although she felt that she was being "more oppressive"
than usual and "that was what got them defensive," I did not
sense that she wanted to win out over her students.
However, I did get this sense from some of the students at
certain points during the conversation. There were times
where I felt that certain students were gleefully directing
hostility at an authority figure. When Nathan punctuated
what Darlene said about Piercy "badgering" Tricia with
"Thank you," and then his laugh, I felt that he was getting

in on the action. (Later on Nathan told me in an interview that he enjoyed the conflict and perhaps Piercy was able to pick up on this behind his words in ways that I was not.)

Piercy, however, did not try to prove them wrong. Instead, she seemed to be asking them to help her puzzle through why they read it as "badgering." She also apologized to them for misunderstanding what had gone on. As the students exited Piercy also thanked them for "staying with her."

Arrogant presence, as displayed by some of the students, and in Piercy's eyes displayed by herself, militates against real relationships. "Sharp edges" (Williams, 1922) get in the way. Loving presence on the other hand, helps to develop real relationships. Although Piercy judged herself harshly by saying she had been oppressive and hostile, I thought under the circumstances she was open to them and willing to see the conflict through.

Piercy did not dismiss the students' criticisms and concerns during the class and after the class. Had I not worked with Piercy, I might have done so. With arrogant presence, I might have concluded they "just don't get it." I would never have said they were suffering from "false consciousness," but certainly on some level feeling that they were. I might have used a word like "resistance" to describe what they were doing during the conflict. Piercy,

however, tried to interpret and understand them.

How can we understand the students, Piercy and the
conflict they constructed?  In the next section I begin to
unpack each phase of the conflict in order to deepen our
understanding.

## Phase One: Facts

During the first phase of the class there was one major
underlying factor which seemed to play itself out: competing
knowledge paradigms.  Piercy stated about ten days before
the conflict the students were, "Looking for the truth
rather than seeing these issues challenging the truth."
They felt that if Piercy told them once about gender issues
as well as race and class issues, they could be done with
them.

Many students expressed their need for "facts" on the
midterm feedback forms.  Their comments indicated that they
saw knowledge as compartmentalized into fact and opinion.
Piercy tenaciously attempted to disabuse them of the idea
that "facts" are not as clear as the students assumed they
were.  However, students were not convinced.  This was where
it became evident that communication began breaking down;
they were speaking two different "languages."[86]   It would
be easy to say that this misunderstanding was just about the

---

[86] See Gardner (1991) for his discussion of facts and opinions and the connection to "stereotypes in the social sciences and humanities" pp. 167-181.

soda bottle, or just their desire to have more facts about teaching and learning. I think it was more complex than this. These instances suggest that two paradigms of knowledge were in conflict within the class. This was the beginning of the conflict.

The students could not understand what Piercy was trying to have them comprehend. The difficulty that Piercy experienced was trying to show the fluidity and dynamic nature of knowledge to students who held a paradigm that knowledge is fixed and static.

There was evidence throughout the semester that students had a fixed view of knowledge. Darlene said during a small group discussion earlier in the semester, "facts are facts, facts aren't controversial." These competing paradigms are important to understand not only in terms of this conflict but in the broader sense of what conflicts a teacher educator with feminist imagination may encounter.

In her interview, Emily told me about her own struggles to make sense of the more open-ended and constructivist way Piercy had of conducting her class. Emily talked about initially feeling discomfort with the approach Piercy had to teaching and learning:

> What I was a little uncomfortable about was, you know we would, we discuss the questions that we read at the end of the textbook, and I was a little uncomfortable with, it seemed there was less structure than in other classes where the teacher kind of lectures, you take notes on what she says, and that is how answer the questions on the test. At first I was very uncomfortable about that because it was almost as if we

made the answers.  And since we aren't professionals, I
wasn't sure if they were the best ones to be provided.
Now, I've become more comfortable with the method.
See, in ideology I would have said, "Yes, I think it is
terrific we all get to put input.  Yes, I think that's
important, a wonderful technique to use."  But, when I
was left with only that I felt uncomfortable.  I feel
more comfortable with it [now] because I've learned to
listen to the input and then have a critical analysis
of it and then Dr. Sand does, it is not as blatant, but
she does comment and structure the discussion.  It just
took me a while to get used to.  It just wasn't as
straight forward and as blatant as in other lecture
classes.  I wouldn't consider this a lecture class at
all.  And you know, most college courses are.  Really.
You go in, you listen to the professor chat for 15
minutes and you leave.  So, after you know, I guess,
just after  doing it for a while and becoming
accustomed to it, I feel much more comfortable.  You
know, it is that theory of you want to please the
teacher and how do you please the teacher if you are
not positive about what they want?

I then asked Emily if she felt that she still had to please

the teacher.  She replied:

Yes, I do.  I do think, I can't believe I am saying
that, but it is just one of those, you know.  It's
important to me to do well and I just think,
inherently, obviously, your teacher wants you to do
well.  I would hope.  I've always done fairly well in
school and I guess if you know what the expectations
are, you have an easier time with meeting them.  And
with the structure being less structured, I wasn't sure
what the expectations were.  Now I do, I guess.

Part of why Emily was uncomfortable was that in Piercy's

class she felt "it was almost as if we made the answers."

This was unusual for Emily, yet Emily was able to grapple

with this different kind of pedagogy.  From the other

students' comments it seemed as if they were still yearning

for the "facts" of teaching.  Is this the kind of "allergic

reaction" that Cohen (1988) writes of when students

encounter co-constructed knowledge?

From Emily's responses during the case she seemed to be
trying to figure out the nuances and subtleties of the
gender and feminism; she was not willing to believe that
once a topic is brought up it has been "done." She was the
one who tried to have the students re-see what they were
saying about gender and tracking not being that important,

> I think that we are looking at it wrong. We, that's
> the whole thing about that's just gender issue is a
> symptom just like the tracking is symptom of what some
> of the problems are in the schools system. We *have* to
> look at gender issues. I believe it is a major
> symptom.

Piercy wanted to show the dialectical nature of human
agents within a structure. That is, the oppressive
structure exists yet it is made up of individuals who can
interact with the structure and change it. It was a
difficult task to make this complexity accessible to
students well schooled in dichotomies.

Piercy's students even altered what they heard to fit
their existing knowledge framework. For example, the
students altered words to fit into their scheme of dualism.
To encourage students pushing one another's thinking, Piercy
used the role of "challenger" in groupwork. As a part of my
fieldwork I listened to the small group discussions, and I
heard one group change the word challenger to "opposer." I
wrote this in my fieldnotes and shared them with Piercy.
Piercy responded in her journal:

> I'm interested that in your [field]notes my students
> changed my word "challenger" to the word "opposer."
> They see facts and opposition rather than ideas and

challenges. I wonder? It will be interesting to see if they begin to appreciate complexity and contradictions. (undated, Sunday p.m.)

It seemed that for the students one does not challenge, one opposes. This seemingly inconsequential semantic alteration is an important entryway into how some students saw knowledge--dualistically and dichotomously. Certain words, like opposer, more readily lend themselves to arrogant presence--"you are either for me or against me." This seemed to play itself out in the conflict. Piercy was challenging their conception of "facts" with the soda bottle. The students may have seen it as just her being oppositional for no other reason than to be adversarial.

During the stage of the "facts" piece of the conflict Piercy was trying to help them see how meaning and knowledge are socially constructed. Piercy has had years of grappling with the social construction of knowledge. The students were locked into a way of seeing knowledge that could not comprehend what Piercy was trying to have them understand. She tried to problematize "facts" for them, but they were unable to understand her. Piercy and I talked about students seemingly unable to conceive of knowledge as anything other than a series of facts that can be "deposited" and "banked" (Freire, 1968/1985) about a month and a half before the conflict. Piercy said:

> How do you get across to undergraduates that there may be something problematic in those facts and that they really believe that? I think you are right it takes a lot of thought and a course in phenomenology. It gets

back to their definition of knowledge. It's this structure versus this connecting.

Piercy's students seemed committed to knowledge being a series of facts, for the most part they had not encountered a systematic challenge to facts. On the contrary, much of their education probably reinforced this view of knowledge. It would have been quite a stretch for these students to think that

> "Truth" is a matter of consensus among informed and sophisticated constructors, not of correspondence with an objective reality. "Facts" have no meaning except within some value framework; hence there cannot be an "objective" assessment of any proposition. (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 44)

Their notion of truth and facts had an impact on the ways in which they regarded issues of equity and diversity. Piercy tried to dissuade the students of thinking about facts as immutable *things*, but this did not happen during the conflict. Instead her prompting them to think of facts in this way primed them for the next stages of conflict.

### Phase Two: Too Much Feminism

During the second phase of the class the verbalized conflict centered around there being "too much feminism" and "too much gender." Yet, this section of the class was revolving around more than what was being articulated. It was intimately linked to the previous discussion of the nature of knowledge as well as many other factors.

## Gender and the Nature of Knowledge

Gender issues, and "equity" and "diversity," are seen as part of a body of knowledge that you can "get." It seemed that the students' tendency was to treat oppression and privilege in much the same way they do "facts." If they are told about oppression and privilege then they can "bank" (Freire, 1968/1985) that information and be done with it. Open ended discussions of gender issues made it feel to the students like "too much feminism." Had Piercy presented gender issues in a "factual" positivistic fashion, that is, a series of information pieces to be memorized, I think the students would have felt more comfortable. They may not have perceived it as "too much." In an open ended discussion, there is no single answer to be received. Students must work, weigh information, take positions, and enter into a dialogue which requires risk-taking, and to be actively engaged in sense-making. In a positivistic, "banking" presentation of any subject, including social foundations, students can get away with being passive, taking notes, and receiving knowledge (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986) and "truth."

For example, early in the semester in her interview Ellen stated that "gender...that it's, it's kind of confusing...[because] there's not much lecture, not much of her telling us exactly what we needed to know." Ellen desired a fixed body of knowledge about gender, and

therefore did not know what to make of how Piercy handled discussions of gender. If Piercy could have just told them "exactly what they needed to know" about gender it would have been better as far as Ellen was concerned. But Piercy was trying to help the students see that the sex/gender, class, and race systems are ever-changing, dynamic social constructions.

The students also believed that what they had learned in the past about a topic was enough to explain what was going on in the present or in the future. They did not realize how much more complicated systems can be, they did not realize that gender, class, and race issues are not part of a fixed body of knowledge that once you learn it, you have "got it."

During the second phase of the class students kept telling Piercy that they had heard enough about gender. Jackie also mentioned race along with gender, "Like no matter what we do it is worked into it, and racism." There seemed to be agreement among many of the students that they had heard these issues all too often. Tricia was the only one willing to concede that for some students there may have been too much gender discussion while for others there may not have been enough.

There was evidence other than from the conflict that the ways in which students saw knowledge had an impact on the ways in which they saw issues of equity and diversity.

As one student responded to the question on the midterm
feedback form *What has been the least helpful about this
class?* "Gender issues,- I've learned a lot previously.
However, I believe this is good for class as whole."
Michelle in her interview stated, "I just think that some of
the topics we studied, I mean that I've heard them so many
times already that I don't really think about them anymore."
Piercy wanted students to understand what Frye (1991)
offers: "Every time you begin to feel good about getting
something figured out and making the necessary changes,
something else comes up..." (Introduction to Murphy, 1991,
pp. 14-15). However, for these students, "once was enough."

About a month after the conflict, Piercy talked about
how she was grappling to engage students in these issues:

> We have read the political text together, we surfaced
> it, we examined it, we've talked about teachers and
> classes in the past. We have made it more explicit I
> think. Every time we are working at this political
> reality we are living in it, not letting it be static,
> it has never static in that room. I am reading The
> Fifth Discipline which talks about dynamic complexity.
> I think that is exactly what teaching is all about.
> It's dealing with a dynamic complexity, not dealing
> with complexity period--it's dynamic. That's where the
> political learning comes in. You are helping them to
> learn about you politically-- where you politically
> situate yourself, and you are learning about them and
> where they politically situate themselves. I hate to
> overuse the word "politically correct" but that's why I
> ask them about [what they are thinking] when they are
> using the right words, when they are attempting to be
> politically correct and aligning themselves with
> authority and when they are being politically critical
> and reading a political text. [It's not] a parroting
> of what you want to hear on a surface level, but seeing
> that dynamic complexity. If anything that is what good
> education is all about.

Piercy wanted to help her students see the dynamic complexity of the conflict and also throughout the semester. Yet, the students saw "gender," "race," and "class" as content to be "mastered." They were unable at that point to see issues of gender, race, and class as inseparable from their own lives, vital to their own lives, and relevant to their roles as future teachers.[87] Piercy's students were unable to understand why facts weren't as simple as they seemed, and why gender (and other social constructs) was more complicated than it seemed. Piercy wanted the students to embrace the "dynamic complexity" of oppression and privilege, while the students wanted a series of facts about oppression and privilege that they could master.

## Smugness and Arrogant Presence

A second issue that arose was smugness and arrogant presence. The statements some of the students made during phase two of the class were manifestations of smugness and attitudes that Piercy had noticed in the students earlier in the semester. She talked to me before this class about the smug tone she had perceived in the class. I asked Piercy to tell me more about what she meant by this:

> Well by smugness I mean "I know it all." "We've got this handled." You know a lot of the things that they were saying "We are totally aware of this." "Come on get off of me." "We are with it." "We have it." From

---

[87] My partner Michael Michell and I began an initial conversation about this in 1993. Had we not had this conversation I might not have been able to interpret this conflict in quite this way.

the first day it was "It's your generation's problem."
Tricia, I don't know if she made the comment but she
was talking about that theme and someone chimed in, I
think that it was a male student. It might have been
Keith, I'm not sure. We got at a lot of assumptions
and they basically said what they really thought. But
I think that part of it is, remember we talked about
the whole issue of institutional power and the role of
teacher? [I want] to help them think about the role
different than when they are with their buddies and
teasing each other and that when they are teachers they
have institutional power. I thought about discussing
that, but it was pretty late and I was really tired and
I thought that it wasn't a good time to broach the
subject, save it for a more poignant moment. Well I
guess I would say that I have allowed this smugness to
happen. But I think the smugness was there. It's a
response to the gender requirement, "Oh you guys are
just so worried about it." I think the comfort level
has allowed them the freedom to say that. I think it is
there, I really do. I don't think that that was caused
by the class. They can clearly see that I am serious
about it. In a way they are responding to the
seriousness.

I too had noticed the tone of smugness and arrogance,

which I later came to identify as arrogant presence. Piercy

had created an environment where the students did not have

to hide their dismissal of issues when they did not feel

they were important. The students did not have to pretend

that they felt a commitment to gender issues. For example,

Matt commented, "Well I know that, let's just get on with

the more intricacies of what we need to talk about," and

other students' comments were also dismissive.

It was in their expression of the disregard during this

class that allowed Piercy to address their smugness and

stance toward knowledge in a direct manner. It seemed that

this class was a "more poignant moment" for her to engage

in honest challenge about the smugness and the arrogant

presence she perceived:

> I think you all think you know a lot more than you do.
> Excuse me for telling you but I think that the one
> thing that I would like to work on is sort of your
> attitude toward this, I see a lot of "we got it" and
> "you got the problem, lady." And "we are going be fine
> and the kids out there are doing, are going to be
> fine." And that's what I feel real problematic about.
> Now if you ask me what I want from you, what I would
> like you to stand back from those assumptions that you
> have.

By her doing that, conflict was released instead of going
underground. She chose to confront their disregard and face
the conflict that would ensue because of that.


## Personal is Pedagogical

A third issue which arose was the ways in which the
personal is pedagogical. There were other students who did
not seem to be smugly disregarding Piercy's concerns over
gender issues. For example, Darlene was trying to grapple
with why the topic might be overwhelming for her. Darlene
seemed to be saying that for her she was finding that there
was too much gender and too much feminism, "drilling it in
my head," in part because it was new for her. The choice of
the word "drilling" is an interesting one. She seemed to be
saying that gender issues were boring into her mind and
causing some intellectual and emotional unrest. During the
incident she did not reveal why she might have felt
conflicted about the topic. In her interview, however, she
did. Darlene was particularly helpful in reminding me that
what occurs pedagogically has much to do with the personal.

Darlene made a direct link between what happened in her own family and why she did not want to talk about gender issues in the classroom. Darlene said that talking about gender issues "made me feel tension and that is why I didn't like it." I asked her what she meant by that and she replied, "I hate to talk about it." I then asked, "Okay, you don't like to talk about gender issues because they make you personally uncomfortable or you are uncomfortable with the interaction that goes on when the issues are raised?" Darlene answered:

> Alright, I don't mind telling anybody how I feel. It is just, I guess I am concerned with everybody else's reaction. And a lot of it is how you are brought up, you know, and in my family the male figure is extremely dominant. And my Mom is just the total ideal picture of the mother figure and staying at home and not going back to work ever again after she had started having children, and being very subservient to my father. I started noticing it more and more, you know, when I went home and I actually got into a fight with my Mom about it. It is just a complete dead end street. It's a huge personal family circus. So, it is just an ongoing thing that my Mom and I have never had a personal relationship and so when I do try to bring up things like this, she totally backs off and that makes me feel bad.

Darlene's experience links for us how much personal history affected her openness to issues, information, and ways of teaching that were new and conflicting with personal history. There were some topics, like sexism and male oppression that evoked too much personal conflict for Darlene, therefore she "hate[d] to talk about it." Darlene was concerned with other people's perceptions: "I guess I am concerned with everybody else's reaction." This concern

for everyone else's reaction was clear in her stepping in to halt what she perceived as Piercy's "badgering" of Tricia in the third phase of the class. She focused in on how Tricia appeared to be reacting to Piercy's badgering: "She is flushed, she is, she is like drained." And then when she was afraid of the way Piercy was reacting to her, she backed off and apologized.

## The Complicated Nature of Sexism

A fourth issue which is raised by the conflict is the complicated nature of sexism. Darlene tells us that in her personal life sexism is complicated to talk about, and this seemed true for other students in the class as well. Since an issue like sexism is so difficult to talk about and evokes so much feeling, it seems to make sense that the students would not want it talked about consistently. For if sexism was consistently talked about the feelings these discussions evoked could not be easily avoided. And they certainly would not want to be shown that they may be perpetuating sexism in their own classroom.

Even though the students were hesitant to speak about these issues, and even though they insisted that they already had spoken about them too much, and even though they had been telling Piercy that their generation was not afflicted with inequity in the same way hers had been, and even though they said the issues were not that important,

Piercy would not let up. She persisted in having them look at themselves. She placed a mirror in front of them and no matter how disinclined they were to look at the image reflected back to them, she kept holding the mirror up. Her tenacity was not an attempt to harass them into finally accepting her position, rather it was an attempt to stay with the discourse and the conflict until both she and the students grappled with what was at the heart of their comments, the "defensive chord."

It seemed that the young women were as adamant as the young men in rejecting what Piercy was suggesting about the import of gender relations. For example, Jackie said, "And it's like, it's made too big, it's too big of a deal." Although many feminists find it difficult to understand why women are as vocal as men about rejecting feminism, or not interested in gender issues, one needs to take into account the psychological and sociological press for women to not speak up and out. Miller (1986) states:

> [A] subordinate group has to concentrate on basic
> survival. Accordingly, direct, honest reaction to
> destructive treatment is avoided. Open, self-initiated
> action in its own self-interest must also be avoided.
> Such actions can, and still do, literally result in
> death for some subordinate groups. In our own society,
> a woman's direct action can result in a combination of
> economic hardship, social ostracism, and psychological
> isolation--and even the diagnosis of a personality
> disorder. Any one of these consequences is bad enough.
> (pp.9-10)

During the discussion only Emily seemed to speak up to say that as future teachers it was important to talk about

these issues.  It seemed as if Piercy and Emily were the
lone voices trying to convince the others that they were
important issues.  I believe that Jackie's statement that
"feminism was exaggerated so much" and the other women's
silence around the issue gets at the incredibly complicated
nature of sexism.  These young women were interacting with
men on a daily basis, inside and outside of the classroom.
They had male partners and friends, and they had brothers,
and fathers.  For them to boldly speak about the ways in
which they were oppressed, to agree with Piercy's analysis
that there were gender issues that they needed to carefully
examine, would somehow have been turning on the men in their
lives.  hooks (1989) says it best for me when she writes:

> Sexism is unique.  It is unlike other forms of
> domination--racism or classism--where the exploited and
> oppressed do not live in large numbers intimately with
> their oppressors or develop their primary love
> relationships (familial and/or romantic) with
> individuals who oppress and dominate or share in the
> privileges attained by domination....  The context of
> these intimate relationships is also a site of
> domination and repression. (p. 130)

Piercy was not only challenging her women students to
examine the interactions that went on in the classroom, but
in essence also the other relationships they were involved
in, asking them to "speak to men in a liberated voice"
(hooks, 1989, p. 130).

Darlene already told us that these issues made her
uncomfortable because of the way in which her father and
mother interacted with each other and with her.  Ellen was

asked in the interview if she found herself talking about the issues raised in ED 277. She replied that she got into arguments with her friends "about equality for men and women and equality for races." I asked her about a specific incident that she remembered. She said:

> We had this "Take Back The Night."[88] I had a lot of
> male friends who I've gotten into a lot of arguments
> and one wrote into our school newspaper and said that
> it was a mob of "man-hating" women. And he just, and
> that really burns me. I think that they're just very
> insecure they don't understand at all. I mean, they,
> got upset, because they didn't want um they didn't
> understand why we wouldn't let them march, but I mean,
> there was more to it, just they got very insecure about
> the whole idea.

Piercy asked them to examine these issues in the classroom and their own lives, looking at sex segregation and gender speech patterns, something that could cause conflict and strife within them and for them.

Emily explained in her interview that women are afraid of these issues:

> I was surprised at how strong they [the defenses] were,
> and even for some of the women. It is almost like, I
> think it is almost like the fear of change, defending
> the status quo. And they don't want to be viewed as,
> you know, men haters. I think that is why. It is
> funny because even when I mentioned the paper [I wrote
> about sex bias] to my male friend, the first thing I
> think out of his mouth was, "Oh, it's one of those
> woman libber's papers."

Henry (1993-94) reminds us that not only familial and/or romantic relationships are sites of oppression, but so are classrooms: "The very same societal structures of

---

[88] As mentioned in the "backlash" section, this is a march against rape and violence against women. This march is usually only women and this was the issue that Ellen was saying the men felt insecure about.

racism, classism, and sexism are routinized in everyday
thoughts and actions right in our classroom interactions"
(p.3). I believe this is part of why it was so difficult
for students (or anyone) to examine their own behavior for
it is potentially deeply disruptive to all the relationships
they are involved in.


## Sexual Politics

A fifth issue that arose, that makes the examination of
their own behavior so difficult, was that of sexual
politics. Henry echoes Millett's (1970) concept of "sexual
politics" existing outside and inside the classroom. Jackie
made it clear during this part of the class that there was
no need to exaggerate feminist and gender issues. She was
annoyed at one point in the conversation, suggesting that
even though they teach boys and girls and thus need to look
at gender issues, "we don't have to work it into everything
we talk about though, because it is so much, we don't have
to talk about it forever and ever, and every little subject
and every topic." As she made these statements, many of the
other women were silent. Although we do not know why they
were silent, it may seem odd that the very people who might
have been well served by examining these issues of inequity
rejected the conversation about these issues. I believe
that young women's rejection, disregard, or ambivalence has
to do with the "sexual politics" in a mixed-gender class.

Recall that Millett (1970) chose the phrase "sexual politics" because of the "interior colonization" of women that has been achieved.

Students had spoken before about the "dated" concept of gender inequity and not feeling that these issues were pertinent to their lives. Steinem's article "Why young women are more conservative," though written in 1979, seems relevant today because her explanations get at the heart of continued sexual politics.

Steinem writes about the many factors that contribute to conservatism in young women. As students these young women are probably treated with more equality than they ever will be again in their lives. They are still in the stage most valued by male-dominating cultures, and they have full potential as workers, wives, sex-partners, and childbearers. In many cases their desire for success in school means that there is not much time for activism. And their own faith in education has yet to be shaken. They are also at the stage of worrying about combining marriage, career, and family. There may be a lingering belief in them that women are dependent on men, the feeling they are only half-people. For many of these young heterosexual women being pleasing to a male mate, even if the actual mate is not in the room, compels them to be concerned with how they will be perceived by those that are within the realm of partner.

A related issue that Steinem did not raise but one

which is evident in Darlene's reply to Piercy during the conflict is that young women (and men) have not been exposed to gender issues consistently throughout their education. "But it was just the fact that like I have never had a class where we have ever talked about gender issues so much in my whole entire life." We had students who saw gender and feminism as immaterial, who had been in an educational system that by and large ignored sexism (racism, classism, and homophobia) and who encountered Piercy who wanted her students to see the dynamic complexity of sexism (and other forms of oppression). This was bound to create conflict and tension.

Why had Darlene not had much exposure to gender issues in her classes? Is there an assumption on the part of teachers, teacher educators, and students that it is an irrelevant subject now? Again, as the one student said on the midterm feedback to the question *What issues do you see as less important in this class? Why?* "Gender issues, actually, because I think girls and boys will learn to do what they want regardless of their sex."

There was the sense among students that equality had been achieved and free choice exists for both boys and girls. As McIntosh (1988) reminds us, part of the explanation could be that

> We are taught to think that sexism or heterosexism is carried on only through individual acts of discrimination, meanness, or cruelty toward women, gays, and lesbians, rather than in invisible systems

conferring unsought dominance on certain groups.
Disapproving of the systems won't be enough to change
them...many men think sexism can be ended by individual
changes in daily behavior toward women.  But a man's
sex provides advantage for him whether or not he
approves of the way in which dominance has been
conferred on his group.... To redesign social systems
we need first to acknowledge their colossal unseen
dimensions.  The silences and denials surrounding
privilege are the key political tool here.  They keep
the thinking about equality or equity incomplete,
protecting unearned advantage and conferred dominance
by making these taboo subjects.  (p. 18)

These students have not had the opportunity to see the

"colossal unseen dimensions" of sexism.  Sexual politics

also helps keep them blind to "unearned advantage and

conferred dominance" and they themselves have helped keep

these subjects taboo.  When Piercy raised these issues, the

women wanted them put to rest.  The women were complicit in

the denial and silence that surrounds these issues.  Part of

their complicity has to do with the sexual politics that

were at work during the case of conflict and in their

everyday lives.

Many feminist writers talk about the necessity for a

"safe" classroom and do not talk about how important

conflict is in uncovering sexual politics (or race and class

politics) in the classroom.  Some feminist writers however

do echo Piercy's stance at holding up for students their own

behavior.  For example, Henry (1993-1994) writes about

classrooms as inherently unsafe places when talking about

these issues:

[There is a pervasive]...feminist philosophy of a
"connected classroom" (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, &

Tarule, 1986). Liberal feminist discourse envisions
the classroom as a "safe" place (O'barr and Wyer, 1992)
in which students can express themselves and become
"empowered"--a problematic notion in itself (Gore,
1990). There is nothing "safe" about engaging students
in rigorous and critical ways. It seems to me that to
be able to speak of safety in the "belly of the beast"
reveals class and race privilege.... Sometimes a
discourse of safety and nurturance can blanket
ambiguous politics, doublemindedness or the fear of
jeopardizing one's academic status.... Indeed, it
became clear how racism and misogyny organize the
minutest details of my classroom practice. (Henry,
1993-94, p. 2)

Henry makes a link between conflict and the fact that
she is an African American woman. Piercy was White and
privileged and yet she saw the classroom and "safety" in
similar ways as Henry. Piercy was creating what Henry calls
"dangerous terrain." Piercy called attention to the
microcosm of the classroom; the gendered speech interactions
in their own classroom mirror the ways in which gender
relations are actualized inside and outside of schools.
This was uncomfortable for the students. As David so
honestly told the class, he was uncomfortable when Piercy
pointed out where the men and women were sitting and the
issue of the male's "support group."

Piercy did not ignore the students' enactment of a
sex/gender system. She required that they analyze their own
gender dynamics within the classroom. This evoked feelings
of threat and defensiveness from the students. However, as
Henry explains, these issues which require delving into the
"belly of the beast" will not provide safety and security.
It is clear though that the students would have preferred

silence around issues of their own sex segregation and

speech patterns, telling Piercy she was making a big deal

out of nothing. As Sadker and Sadker (1994) point out "A

racial inequity would be unacceptable, but a gender inequity

is not even noticed.... A separate boy world and a separate

girl world is just education as usual" (p. 59).

hooks (1989) also echoes Piercy's posture toward

conflict. She states a teacher either furthers

mystification of reality or elucidates reality. One way to

elucidate it is to hold up a mirror to the students' own

behavior (as well as to one's own) in order to intervene in

reality:

> If we accept education in this richer and more dynamic
> sense of acquiring a critical capacity and intervention
> in reality, we immediately know there is no such thing
> as neutral education. All education has an intention,
> a goal, which can only be political. Either it
> mystifies reality by rendering it impenetrable and
> obscure--which leads people to a blind march through
> incomprehensible labyrinths or it unmasks the economic
> and social structures which are determining the
> relationships of exploitation and oppressions among
> persons, knocking down labyrinths and allowing people
> to walk their own road. So we find ourselves
> confronted with a clear option: to educate for
> liberation or to educate for domination. (p. 101)

Piercy's philosophy of holding up the students' own

relationships reminds me of Henry's and hooks' (1989).

However, Piercy made it clear that this tackling of

oppression and privilege was a community endeavor. That is,

Piercy was not the one who was "enlightening" the students.

Rather together they were unsheathing the issues of

oppression and privilege, learning with one another. The

tone that seems to be in Henry's and hooks' writings is that
the teacher is the lone arbitrator of the classroom and the
kind of education that occurs. (The community focus of the
teaching and learning endeavor is far more apparent in
hooks' later book, 1994, <u>Teaching to Transgress: Education
as the Practice of Freedom</u>.) Examining their own behavior
was new for the students and made them uncomfortable. This
discomfort seemed to be an underlying factor in the
conflict.


## Man as the Norm

A sixth issue that was raised was that of man as the
norm. Darlene told us that she had not had much of an
opportunity to examine gender issues in her classes before
ED 277. She was probably typical of many of the students in
the class. The students became unwittingly complicit in the
maintaining of androcentrism. They had a legacy of "man as
the norm" and did not have the tools even to uncover the
ways in which that norm governed them. Miller (1986)
clarifies what man as the norm means:

> Since man is the measure of all things--and man,
> literally, rather than human beings--we have all tended
> to measure ourselves by men. Men's interpretations of
> the world defines and directs us all, tells us what is
> the nature of human nature. (p. 70)

Miller tells us that men's interpretations dictate the
nature of human nature. I would add to Miller that men's
interpretations tell us what the nature of curriculum and

pedagogy is as well. During this class Piercy was
challenging the students' androcentrism. This challenge was
bound to cause conflict.

During the conflict, the students were stating that
they wanted a "warning" of the feminist overtone and
undertone that they found in ED 277. As Darlene stated,
"You know it wasn't written in the little green book about
the class" and "It is your foundations education class. You
know, I mean it didn't say, it is going to have a feminist
attitude, or overtone." Part of how to interpret and
understand comments such as these is to see students as
having entered into this conflict with an internalized "man
as the norm" schema. This affected the way that students
responded to Piercy who was trying to uncover the underlying
gender relationships that went unnoticed much of the time,
inside and outside of schools.

When there is a male bias, male overtone and undertone
to a curriculum or a class, the students often do not even
notice. This is perhaps because the ways in which male
norms imbue disciplinary frameworks or epistemology is so
ubiquitous that it is taken-for-granted.

> The denial of men's overprivileged state takes many
> forms in discussions of curriculum change work. Some
> claim that men must be central in the curriculum
> because they have done most of what is important or
> distinctive in life or in civilization. Some recognize
> sexism in the curriculum but deny that it makes male
> students seem unduly important in life. Others agree
> that certain individual thinkers are blindly male-
> oriented but deny that there is any systemic tendency
> in disciplinary frameworks or epistemology to over-

empower men as a group. (McIntosh, 1983, p. 3, emphasis in original)[89]

There is a prevalent assumption that ways in which men and women are treated in curriculum and schools is a given and fitting. The male as norm is not consistently questioned. When the pronouns used are male, or when an androcentric curriculum is the norm (for example, a history class that is all about White privileged males and wars), or when the theories are undergirded with male norms such as Erikson's (1950), Freud's (1961), Perry's (1968), Kohlberg's (1981), and others, there is little outcry similar to that which occurs when the male as norm is challenged.[90] When there is attention to discrimination or sexism, immediately it is "too much."

I am reminded of Kohn's (1986) example of the fish. To use the analogy he cited, but placing the fish in a slightly different "tank," the fish usually swims in androcentric and monocultural environs without ever noticing. When some new water is added, for example, gender sensitivity, the fish is shocked. Students would not ask to be warned of an androcentric perspective or a monocultural perspective. However, they want warning labels when feminism is part of the class.

Piercy said to the students that there wasn't as much

---

[89] Recently I heard the humorous account of the word denial actually being the acronym for "don't even no [know] it's a lie."

[90] By male norms I mean that males have been the subjects of the studies and then by extrapolation women have been included.

talk about gender and feminism as they perceived, certainly
not every day. And as Matt revealed in his interview, he
began to see that perhaps she had been correct:

> A lot of people on their mid-semester forms filled out
> that there was too much feminism and I may have even
> myself, but when she started discussing it and when we
> got discussing it in class, about there being too much,
> I realized that we didn't discuss it that much. It
> wasn't something that we brought up as a topic.

But if gender were discussed often or even every day, why is
this a problem? The problem is with the "natural order of
things." Students are so used to having male norms that
when this is not the case it topples their sense of what is
fitting, and it is seen as extreme.

All of Piercy's challenging of male norms occurred
during what has been called the time of "backlash." The
issues of gender, race, class, culture, and sexual identity
were very important to Piercy. For her to see another as
Other broke down the real ways in which humans could
connect. Yet Piercy was working against the times in regard
to equity issues, especially gender. That is, during this
time of "backlash" there was an antifeminist ethos created
in the larger culture. As David stated, "I think there's
too much of it in society, of trying to point it out, where
you are actually creating problems." And Matt stated:

> I think in everyday life we are bombarded with feminism
> as a major issue, and then it becomes a classroom thing
> that it's based on feminism. I think automatically you
> know, they are putting up a block in any discussion, it
> all becomes too much.

All of these influences affected the tenor of the

second phase of the class. During phase two of the class people were beginning to speak honestly about what they felt and thought. Yet the conflict had not fully revealed itself. It was during the third phase of the class that the conflict was fully actualized, a culmination of all the feelings and emotions from the other two phases.

## Phase Three: After the Video

The students felt threatened and defensive before viewing the video. After the video was over, Piercy asked them what they thought. The students did not seem to value the video. Piercy seemed surprised by their reactions. She kept asking for evidence of why they were dismissing the video and the conflict mounted.

The students talked about the video having too many facts and being a sales pitch. Yet all of these explanations seemed not to get at the real issue. What seemed to be happening was that the video became a symbol for all that they were annoyed with in the class and with Piercy. She seemed relentless and the video seemed relentless. It was in this phase of the class the conflict seemed to be in full force. This phase of the class seemed to best illustrate the different way that Piercy regarded conflict as compared to how many of the students did. For Piercy, conflict helped connect people in their struggles to understand each other and the issues that they were

grappling with. For Piercy, productive conflict was part of loving presence. Conflict means you care enough to be honest and help one another grow and develop. This conflict was an enactment of what Piercy believed in and her vision for connectedness.

Early in the semester, we talked about conflict. I said to her that I was struck by her statements to the class that "conflict is positive." I said how unusual I found that to be. Piercy responded:

> There's different kinds of conflict though, there's some that I'm not comfortable with, but the intellectual kind I am, I'm not uncomfortable [instead] I like it, I crave it I think that's what makes it fun. Conflict that wasn't comfortable was the absences of those exchanges not being able to talk about those exchanges just being categorized. I'd rather get in an argument with somebody than to be categorized, just being dumped, that is bullshit. A heated one, those are fun because people are being open, they are being passionate about their life, that's what it is all about. One of the things my son came home and said, and that I was guarding against tonight and I don't know if it worked or not, "the professor, he has wants us to argue, the point of class is to get us pissed off and argue" that is problematic to me. Why would that be a goal? To keep the focus on this will be interesting, look at opposing points of view is what I was trying to get across. More than other groups they know they are supposed to raise controversial issues.

Piercy did not subscribe to the idea of genteel politeness that so often afflicts discussions in classrooms and thwarts productive conflict. However, Piercy did not want sparring and dueling with words for arguments' sake. Instead, conflict was a deep response in a relationship; it meant that passions were in play. Her students seemed to want people not to get upset. As Darlene said during the

case, "I guess I am more of a mellow person and I don't want to get all, all like upset." She didn't really want Piercy to get upset because having a teacher upset would "scare" her. Darlene at one point told Piercy that she could have "easily just toned it down a little bit and had a conversation with her, instead of [badgering Tricia]." For Darlene this exchange was very uncomfortable. Conflict in this way made her flustered, uncomfortable, and feel the need to come to Tricia's defense. Darlene believed that Piercy as the teacher, should have kept a lid on the emotions.

However, Piercy embraced conflict because to repress or suppress conflict made for pseudo-relationships and pseudocommunity. About a month before the end of the semester Piercy talked about community as opposed to a psuedocommunity:

> It's that pseudocommunity that Peck talks about there is a stage in relationship where it really is pseudo because people are trying to be careful, people are trying to be respectful, people are tripping over their own selves. He calls it a pseudocommunity, what that means to me is a sort of lack of sincerity, being careful that you are being polite rather than being honest, then the next stage he talks about the conflict in that is, sort of directness, disagreeing with people, and being able to be disagreeing and things like that.

Because Piercy used Peck's ideas when she referred to community and pseudocommunity, I turned to Peck, who goes into detail about what a real community requires and what occurs in a pseudocommunity:

Community-making requires the time as well as effort
and sacrifice. It cannot be cheaply bought.... In
pseudocommunity a group attempts to purchase community
cheaply by pretense. It is not an evil, conscious
pretense of deliberate black lies. Rather, it is an
unconscious, gentle process whereby people who want to
be loving attempt to be so by telling little white
lies, by withholding some of the truth about themselves
and their feelings in order to avoid conflict. But it
is still pretense. It is an inviting but illegitimate
shortcut to nowhere.[91]
    The essential dynamic of pseudocommunity is
conflict avoidance. The absence of conflict in a group
is not by itself diagnostic. Genuine communities may
experience lovely and sometimes lengthy periods free
from conflict. But that is because they have learned
how to deal with conflict rather than avoid it.
Pseudocommunity is conflict-avoiding; true community is
conflict-resolving. (Peck, 1987, p. 88)

Reading Peck's notion of community and pseudocommunity
was helpful in understanding how Piercy thought of
community. It seemed as if the students were more inclined
to "withhold some of the truth about themselves and their
feelings" to maintain politeness and gentility. David had
felt "threatened" before this case when Piercy made comments
about his "support group" but had never said anything about
this feeling. Darlene stated, "Since we are being so open
today...." This makes me believe that before this class she
was not completely open. She wanted things to be kept even-
keeled and the way to do this was not to reveal too many of
her own feelings and thoughts.

Conflict for Piercy connected people and promoted
change and growth in those who were involved in it.

---

[91] The list of things to unlearn needs to include the phrases, "black lies" and "white lies."

However, Piercy's students did not necessarily seek the kind of connection and community that she envisioned. For some of the students a pseudocommunity was perhaps just fine because they might merely have wanted their grade, their credential. Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, and Cusick (1986) write about how high school students are primarily interested in attaining a credential. Credential seeking undergraduates are not much different. Perhaps Piercy was seeking a relationship and connection with some students who were not interested in the kind of relationship that she craved. This was also bound to cause conflict.

Although Peck's discussion is extremely helpful in understanding the students' holding back, there is something missing in Peck's analysis. Peck uses constructs that are neutral in respect to race, class, gender, and sexual identity. For example, to understand Darlene a slightly different analysis is needed. Darlene seemed to want to open up and yet close down at the same time. She was apologetic about speaking up and out and seemed fearful when she had done so. I believe that an important piece of Darlene's feelings of turmoil about conflict had to do with her being a woman. It is important to explore what conflict means to women students.

It is necessary to look at feminist theory to make sense of the nature of conflict as illustrated in Piercy, Tricia, and Darlene's interaction. I turn to writings from

Miller (1986) and Gilligan (1990) to fill in the gender

component of conflict.

Miller (1986) develops the notion of conflict in a

gender sensitive way versus a gender neutral way (as Peck

seems to). Miller writes:

> Conflict has been a taboo area for women and for key
> reasons. Women were supposed to be the quintessential
> accommodators, mediators, the adaptors, and soothers.
> Yet conflict is a necessity if women are to build for
> the future.
>     All of us, but women especially, are taught to see
> conflict as something frightening and evil. These
> connotations have been assigned by the dominant group
> and have obscured the necessity for conflict. Even
> more crucially, they obscure the fundamental nature of
> reality--the fact that, in its most basic sense,
> conflict is inevitable, the source of all growth, and
> an absolute necessity if one is to be alive. (Miller,
> 1986, p. 125)

Miller suggests that women reclaim conflict. Piercy

had already rejected the notion that conflict was bad and

had "reclaimed" it, but her students had not. Darlene

stepped in to get Tricia out of what she perceived as a

conflictual situation and wanted to smooth things over,

urging Piercy not to get too upset or upset her students.

In this case Darlene was the caretaker of Tricia.

In schools, especially in the academy, conflict of an

emotional nature (different than conflict in arguments,

which are often detached sparring and dueling with words) is

seen as inappropriate and uncomfortable. As Joanne stated

at the end of the class conflict, "It was just like a fight"

and it felt "violent." Yet some women, for example Piercy,

have managed to internalize that for real connection, not

pseudo-connection, conflict is necessary. For Piercy
conflict was an integral part of a relationship. But many
young women have become accustomed to swallowing the
conflict they feel and actually become agents of suppressing
it in others. For example, conflict "scared" Darlene and so
she would try to suppress it when she could.

Gilligan (1990) explored how girls at a young age know
and "emphasize the need for open conflict and voicing
disagreement" (p. 23). Yet when girls enter adolescence and
young womanhood, they become unwilling to engage in conflict
and view it differently; it becomes something to be avoided.
Conflict is seen as something that threatens connection
rather than strengthens it.

Again, Miller (1986) helps us understand that for women
conflict has been a dangerous feeling to have:

> For a woman, even to *feel* conflict with anyone, and
> particularly but not only with men, has meant that
> something is wrong with her "psychologically" since one
> is supposed to "get along" if one is "all right." The
> initial sensing of conflict then becomes an almost
> immediate proof that she is wrong and moreover
> "abnormal." Some of women's best impulses and sources
> of energy are thus nipped in the bud. The overwhelming
> pressure is for women to believe they must be wrong:
> they are to blame, there must be something very wrong
> with *them*. (p. 131, emphasis in original)

Yet Piercy did not feel this way about conflict. Conflict
for her did not mean that there was something wrong with
her. On the contrary, it meant that she was truly engaged
with others, that she and the others had gone beyond
pretense and had become honest with one another. This was

the point that she wanted to get to with her students. But
her students had years of learning that there must be
something wrong with them to even feel conflict. Therefore,
this unlearning of repressing or suppressing conflict is
difficult for them. The young women had been schooled that
conflict is dangerous at worst, and unsettling at best,
therefore reclaiming conflict was no small feat for them.

For Karen, challenge even felt like conflict. In the
interview when she was asked, "Did you feel that you were
able to challenge the instructor?" She replied, "If I
wanted to, yeah, but it just didn't seem, it didn't seem to
be offensive, not that offensive, so there was no need to go
on a rampage about it, I didn't think." Rampage is an
interesting word choice, for that is what intellectual
challenge must feel like to her, engaging in a conflict,
going on a rampage. She stated that she tried to "stay as
calm as possible," and conflict seemed to be something she
avoided: "I don't think I would do anything to side with it
or side against it." For Karen, it seemed as if conflicts,
internal or external, were to be avoided.

What Miller does not illuminate for us is how conflict
may be different for different groups of women. hooks
(1994) does say that people from upper and middle class
backgrounds are often distressed if conflicts occur in the
classroom. hooks contrasts this with the way that working-
class people might respond, that "discussion is deeper and

richer if it arouses intense responses" (p. 187). ED 277
had primarily upper middle class women (except for Emily)
and this could have been a factor in the way the group
responded to the conflict, making them uncomfortable and
threatened by the strong reactions. It is also important
to remember that Piercy had working-class roots, and she
told me several times that she grew up with heated exchanges
and they were thought to be positive instead of negative, a
value she had held on to. Since ED 277 had all White women
(except for Tasha) and apparently no lesbians, it is
difficult to make any assertions about how conflict might be
different for various groups of women, for women students of
color, working-class women students, or lesbian students.
This might suggest the need for further research.

In the conflict there were times that I felt like
Piercy was being attacked by some of the students. Emily
seemed to concur: "I felt that Dr. Sand had been unjustly
[treated]. The students were really hard on her, I felt."
In the conflict we saw some students reject her ideas and
her at times. Yet with spirited vulnerability she rode out
the conflict to its conclusion. Piercy was open to the risk
of being wounded. She seemed to live what Peck (1987) says
must occur in a genuine community. The participants must be
open, and "Openness requires of us vulnerability--the
ability, even the willingness, to be wounded" (p. 226). I
believe her willingness helped make the conflict a turning

point for the community. As Michelle stated in her second
interview, "Everybody was pretty surprised that it went as
far as it did but they were, they seemed pretty comfortable
and pretty happy that it happened."

During the case of conflict there were many points that
Piercy could have intentionally silenced or shut down
people. She did not do that. Instead, throughout the
conflict she tried to keep dialogue open. She urged the
students to talk to her. After the conflict, Piercy used
the line, "You can be defensive but not live a defended
life." She modeled that during the conflict. There were
times when she felt defensive, and as she said she was
"irked," "hostile," and "oppressive." Yet in the scheme of
things her staying with the conversation modeled her not
living a defended life. That is, even during a time when
the class was at a high tension level, she did not build
walls around herself; she did not use her prerogative as the
teacher to end the dialogue; she stayed open moving with the
conflict.


### Phase Four: Conflict as Turning Point

"Conflict is the midwife of consciousness."
(Freire as cited in Bigelow, 1994, p. 60)

Piercy was unteaching and helping her students unlearn
"the myths that bind them." She was struggling against the
lessons the students had learned for years. She was
challenging the adversarial postures they had learned at

school. Piercy stated at Daly's about the conflict:

> I don't know what their past experience has been but I
> think part of me says that schools are set up to be
> these authoritarian places that there is opposition,
> there are oppositions going on all the time, and that I
> fed into the oppositional thinking but I don't believe
> that that's totally [it]. I think what I got on the
> [midterm] evaluation was opposition, they see it as my
> problem and I think the opposition was there.

Piercy was also challenging the sacred myth of

meritocracy during the classes previous to the conflict and

during the incident of conflict. Unlearning the myth of

meritocracy was uncomfortable for many students. It seems

that the myth of meritocracy is especially sacred in

relation to women and men's ability to achieve anything that

they want to. The students truly believed that "girls and

boys will learn to do what they want regardless of their

sex" (midterm feedback form). Perhaps this made the

students more hostile to the idea that there were any

problematic gender relations inside or outside of schools.

As McIntosh (1988) states:

> [O]bliviousness about male advantage is kept strongly
> inculturated in the United States so as to maintain the
> myth of meritocracy, the myth that democratic choice is
> equally available to all. Keeping most people unaware
> that freedom of confident action is there for just a
> small number of people props up those in power, and
> serves to keep power in the hands of the same groups
> that have most of it already. (pp. 18-19)

When unteaching and unlearning takes place,

"demythify[ing] the cultural roles, values, and icons"

(Acosta-Belén, 1993, p. 121), there may be overt rejection,

hostility, conflict, and anger. It felt to me that during

the conflict that the students were "shooting the messenger" because they did not like the message. For example, Nathan stated "I mean I don't understand why you haven't figured it out yet and why you keep bothering her to keep trying to see, keep repeating what she has already said."

A lot of learning, sometimes the most important learning, is painful. Unteaching can sometimes look as if it is alienating students when in fact defensiveness may be a result of unlearning. Entering the territory of developing double consciousness and double vision is not necessarily polite and "pretty." Instead, sometimes there is a deep inclination to reject the teacher educator who is trying to challenge conventions.

An observer of the conflict might erroneously conclude that community was disintegrating because of the charged feelings of defensiveness, frustration, anger, and hostility. Yet I would argue just the opposite. It was this very interaction that helped create a stronger more connected community for most of the students I interviewed and for Piercy. After the conflict, at Daly's, Piercy made an analogy with what had just happened and what had happened with a class she herself had been in:

> I often think about a class that I was in in graduate school because there probably wasn't a more hostile, more openly [hostile class]. But I probably got more out of that class, and learned more, and enjoyed it more. I think there was a growth in the relationship. There was a turning around point in that class. I think we did confront a lot of this and then all of a sudden we began talk about it. So there was a sort of

turning point that happened [in that class].

About a month after the conflict, Piercy stated, "We
got into some really good discussions, again it [the
conflict] was a turning point for them." She went on to say
that not only was there a turning point for the class, but
"It's funny, it's almost like there's been a turning point
for each one of [the students]." Piercy said she wondered
"would they see it as a real turning point? Maybe they are
as conscious and aware, and they can see themselves. Or do
they just see this as the flow of their thinking?"

Piercy and the students had engaged in a struggle, a
struggle that forged a community of critical friends for
many of the students (I can only make this claim for those I
interviewed). Christensen (1994) in writing about high
school, claimed "Community is forged out of struggle" (p.
14). Although the students she was teaching were poor, she
raises issues that were pertinent to Piercy's classroom.
Christensen tells of raising "uncomfortable truths" as part
of the curriculum,

> Topics like racism and homophobia are avoided in most
> classrooms, but they seethe like open wounds. When
> there is an opening for discussion, years of anger and
> pain surface. But students haven't been taught how to
> talk with each other about these painful matters. (p.
> 14)

There were a number of classroom incidents which seemed
to signal for me a tone change in the community. About a
month after the conflict Piercy was talking with the
students about the names that certain groups want to be

called. They went over the terms (and the political nature
of naming) of African American, Black, White, and Hispanic.
She said that the Census Bureau had coined the term
"Hispanic" and yet Latino is preferred by some groups. At
no point in the conversation did the students seem
exasperated by the language changing and needing to keep up
with it. The reason that this struck me is that I have
often found that groups of White, privileged students do not
want to be bothered with learning what groups themselves
want to be called. In the past, Piercy's students had also
seemed to hold a deep disregard for learning about
oppression, but this did not seem the case anymore. It
seemed as if the students were more open to their own
learning about issues of equity and inequity.

In another instance, also about a month after the
conflict, they were talking about racial issues concerning
Blacks and Whites. She asked the class if there would be a
problem with their families if they brought home a Black
friend. Darlene told the story of when she brought home a
Black man that she had been dating and her family was very
upset. Then Nathan told the story about a Black couple
moving into their neighborhood and his mother said, "There
goes the neighborhood." Both Vannessa and Emily then talked
about friends they had who were dating Black men and the
"grief" they were getting over the interracial dating.
Darlene stated that racism is "not all resolved" and that

"love relationships are different." The students seemed open to examining the discrimination which still existed within their lives and were open about the values that their families and friends were displaying. I wrote in my fieldnotes, "This is a great conversation. The tone in the class seems very different--not defensive. For example, Piercy asked the students to check themselves for their own prejudices." The students seemed open to this, not dismissing prejudice being another generation's problem. Although race and racism are different than gender and sexism (see hooks, 1989), it was the tone that struck me and made me believe that their level of defensiveness around all the issues of equity and diversity had lessened.

During the same class they talked about a tire factory which was burning tires beside the projects in Morrison. Piercy had previously discussed the environmental racism and classism that existed within Morrison, where the poor and/or Black areas to had factories placed right beside them and where activities like tire burning occurred. Darlene then stated, "I've been thinking, I wouldn't want the tire burning in my backyard. I feel hypocritical." The conversation then turned to teaching students to protest actions like this. Piercy stated, "If in schools we are taught to be passive, to not raise questions, then they don't think they can protest." Piercy then asked, "How do we teach middle class kids to be aware of these issues

also?" From Darlene's honesty about her conflictual feelings and the general tone of concern in the students's comments, there seemed to be a more open ethos in the class. It seemed that issues of race and racism were talked about with less tension and less defensiveness than before the conflict.

Another time, about a month before the end of the semester, Darcy came to speak to the class about gay and lesbian issues. I wrote in my field notes "looking around the class it really seems like a community, people talking to one another."

Again, two weeks before the end of the semester, I wrote in my field notes it "feels like a learning community." I had written this down after I watched the interactions of Piercy with the students and the students with one another. At one point in the class students were reporting out on "effective schools" and how race, class, and gender figure into "effective schools." During the discussion, as one of the groups was attempting to get someone to report, Dan stated, "I'll be the reporter, I'm a team player." A little later on it was another group's turn and Karen was to report but she could not find the question that they were to answer. Darlene handed her the paper with the question on it and said, "Here you go hon," in a caring fashion. Karen reported and Piercy asked for clarification. Karen turned to her peers and asked, "Can anyone help me?"

Nathan quickly stated, "I will," and he attempted to explain the interaction of race, class, and gender on effective schools. At one point he seemed to be stumbling; Darlene said, "He is having a hard time. Let me try." She went on to say that what they were getting at was that no generic "effective schools" evaluation is possible given how different contexts are. The collaboration and collegiality present during this and other interactions were striking to me. I interpreted this short interaction of peers helping peers as a group committed to helping one another learn and succeed.

There was other evidence that this conflict was a turning point for some of the students, that communication got better after it ensued. For example, Tasha stated in her final feedback about *Teacher-student relations* "Improved a lot after our 'stress' session. You might want to move this session up a little." In statements made by the students who seemed the most involved in the conflict (Darlene, Nathan, Matt, Emily, and Tricia), reveals that the conflict helped make them feel more connected to one another and Piercy.

For example, Darlene responded to the same question with, "Our class is like a big family.[92] I think that communication was a problem in the middle, but we put

---

[92] It is especially interesting that Darlene would use the metaphor of a family given her particular family patterns that she told us about previously.

everything out on the table and resolved things." Darlene

talked about what it was like after the conflict for her:

> Actually it's been very positive and not only are we
> learning about education but that whole big fight
> thing. Not fight but conversation. Everybody always
> thinks the professors are negative. And, you know, if
> she makes an error she is just horrible, and this is
> not what it is. You know, there is communication and
> it's, the communication, the student's responsibility
> just as much as it is the teacher's. And Dr. Sand did
> have a goal that she wanted to present to us, a lot of
> sex bias information because it is important to her.
> And, yes, it did, it really did bother a lot of people.
> But I think that we really got it out. I think it is
> something that's so foreign but yet so close. And it
> is very difficult for people to deal with stuff like
> that. I don't know if this is a good metaphor or
> whatever, but if someone in your family did something
> bad or something, you'd deny it. And you'd want to
> deny those bad feelings, those ugly feelings. Of race,
> it was the same thing in the 60's with the racial
> issues and such. It was just neat that happened, you
> know, during your first education class, I think. So,
> we started out on the wrong foot, a lot of us with Dr.
> Sand but learned that to respect her more after that.
> Which is good because we are going to have another 20
> million classes with her.

I asked her if she thought the incident helped. She

replied, "A lot, for me." I probed with "Why did it help

you?"

> For me, this is one thing that I wanted to tell you.
> Because I had a meeting with her, kind of academic
> advising, the day after and I was so scared. I was
> just, I was one of the ones that spoke my mind and I
> was just totally afraid that I had thrown my grade out
> the window and I thought she was just going to rip my
> head off and I don't know. I was just really scared.
> So, I came in and she said, "Oh, could we just talk
> some about yesterday's class." And I knew she was
> going to do it and [I thought] "Don't do this to me.
> Why me?" And then we talked about it and I don't know,
> her sincerity really came out and she just really hit
> home a lot more that she really meant it. And it was
> really important to her and that she wasn't trying to
> be mean, hitting us over the head with it. Some
> teachers are mean. And they are definitely trying to

> hit you over the head with it. And it was something
> that she feels strongly about and we are to respect her
> for that. So, and even after the whole class
> discussion, I didn't really, because we didn't really
> resolve it at that class. You know, we just spewed out
> everything in class. And in the next class we talked
> about it more. The next class we kind of reviewed what
> we had talked about in the last class, it was kind of a
> short overview of what she and I had spoken about
> within our little interview. Not interview but, it was
> neat. It was good. I really got to know her better,
> to respect her more, and think she knows me a little
> bit more. Better too. Which is good. I always do a
> lot better when I have a personal relationship with my
> professors. When I know they care, I care twice as
> much about the class.

Darlene stated knowing that Piercy cared made a big

difference to her and made her care more about the class.

She also said that she ended up respecting Piercy more

because of her deeply held commitments.

I asked her if she remembered what they discussed in

the meeting.

> We talked about me specifically and how I spoke up.
> And Tricia, Tricia started crying, she did. And [I
> don't know] whether Dr. Sand recognized that or not.
> She's got 30 people in front of her and Tricia's head
> was down, you know, but I knew she was crying and I
> knew she was very flustered. Her face was bright red
> and just from other times when Tricia wants to speak
> and she gets really, and there is a wall in front of
> her and she can't always say what she wants to say, and
> everybody gets that, but she seems to get just a little
> bit more. And you can see when she gets flustered just
> then. And then when she had to stay with that point
> over and over and over again, Dr. Sand seemed like she
> was hounding her and just little Tricia, she is so tiny
> and she kept on sticking to her guns and, you know, I
> don't know, it was really scary. There was so much
> tension. And so, you know, I kind of lashed out and
> like, I don't really even know what I said. I think
> something to the point that, do you remember what it
> was?

I told her that I thought she used "you keep badgering."

So, yeah, like "why do you keep badgering her" or
something like that. You knew obviously she was upset
and it just made me upset to see a professor making
someone else upset. It wasn't, you know, sometimes my
teachers have gotten me riled up about a subject but it
was an excitement, it was an energy, it wasn't "I'm
feeling bad about myself, I'm about to burst into
tears. If you keep on pushing me, I will." You know,
and that would be very embarrassing in front of the
people in my classroom to see me cry. So, that is just
how I felt. It was just really overwhelming and I
felt, well, Tricia was feeling bad. I don't know.
Going back to my conversation with Dr. Sand she asked
me "How do you feel about yesterday's conversation?" I
said, "Well, I feel that I threw my grade out the
window. That I am dead in the water. I may as well
have a zero point." She said, "Oh, quite the contrary.
You don't have to worry about that. I admire you for
speaking out." She goes, "Yeah, I was pretty stunned
that you confronted the director of elementary
education and your professor on top of it." My
goodness, you know, as if she was saying, "I am in such
a high place, you know, that I can't believe that you
even tried to touch me," kind of thing, you know. And I
was like, more and more, I'm going to pee in my pants
right here in front of you. I was so scared. I was so
frightened after she said that. But it just made me
feel like all the more I've thrown my grade out the
window because she had stated that. Then she said to
me, "I think you are a bright young woman, you are a
hard working student." Just complimentary things and
she really meant it. I mean from the things that she
was saying earlier, I would never have thought that
[those] words would have come out of her mouth. And
really, some teachers just say that, I don't know, and
it is the normal thing they say but I don't really see
Dr. Sand dishing out compliments a lot. And it meant a
lot to me, it really did. And so we were talking about
my exam and how did I do on the exam. And we started
talking about my past educational history, I guess.
Through grade school and stuff. And she was really
cool about that also when I told her about my
elementary years and stuff like that.

Darlene spoke with passion in her voice about how she

had felt she had to step in for Tricia. Even though Tricia

seemed to be "sticking to her guns" she was "so tiny" she

and was unable to handle being "hounded," and although

Darlene was afraid, she had to "lash out." She was fearful that Piercy would broach the subject of the conflict in the advising session; she drew on the metaphor of a family, where something had gone wrong and nobody wanted to talk about it.

After the conversation, however, she felt much better about the relationship and the class in general. She felt that Piercy was sincere and that she deserved respect for feeling strongly about sex bias. Much of the turning point had to do with the conversation she and Piercy were able to have. As she stated, "It was a neat conversation. After that I totally thought of her in a different light and have listened to her more so the second half of the semester than I would have if that hadn't happened."

I asked Nathan if there was any particular class throughout the semester that stood out for him. He replied, "I kind of enjoyed the class where, uh. [laughs]. I think you know which one I'm talking about. Um that was fun." I asked him to clarify which class and he said, "The class where she asked for suggestions." He went on to say:

> I love arguing. So, I guess it was just kinda fun,
> hearing everything go back and forth um it did get a
> little tiresome towards the end, but that's the only--
> that's the one that sticks out in my mind, real well.

I asked him if he thought anything else about it, other than enjoying it. He replied, "I think it was good. I enjoyed the class more since that happened. I can't think of any real specific reason why, but I do."

I asked him if he had been uncomfortable at any point and he said no. At first when I asked him if he had gotten frustrated at any point, he said no but then he said that he had because:

> Tricia was trying to say something and what she was trying to say was clear as day to me. And I understood and Dr. Sand did not get it. And Tricia was getting frustrated and I knew what she was tryin' to say, and then I got y'know, I, I, so I got frustrated and I guess it seemed frustrating. The doctor really didn't understand, but it kinda seemed the way she was just trying to be, um like patronizing. So, that got frustrating...I think I finally just said it, too. [He laughs]

He went on to say:

> I think that people were upset, but as, I mean, just because when issues like that get raised um people's egos tend to get bruised, I guess. But, I, I do think, overall, class has been more enjoyable since then.

I asked him if he could tell me why and he stated:

> I guess the one thing I like is we haven't been dwelling on things as much. And I don't know if that's because it's been changed, or because of that, but it seems that we're moving more quickly through things. Before, it seemed just like everyday, we were talking about the same thing, just a little bit different circumstances.

Nathan stated he had enjoyed the conflict and had explained that it was because he loves to argue. He had not seen the conflict as dramatically as Darlene had, although he felt that both Tricia and Darlene had been upset during the conflict. For him, however, class became more enjoyable after the conflict. Nathan's reason for enjoying that class was the opportunity for him to watch and participate in an argument. This was very different from the kind of reasons

Piercy would have wanted his engagement. She would have wanted him to be engaged in struggling through issues and connecting with her and the other students, rather than argument for argument's sake.

I asked Matt how he felt about the class. (It is important to note that Matt was absent many sessions the second part of the semester.)

> I dunno, I really enjoyed the first part of the class. Um seemed to be going along really well I think the second part of the class really started to fall off. I dunno if I had built expectations up more so, or not. I think the class being very opinionated second semester, very directed in certain areas.

I asked him to tell me about the areas. He talked about Piercy's views on teaching and that "she didn't argue with opposing views, but she fully supported the views that she seemed to believe in."

He said that the "entire feeling" had changed. "After that conflict um the way that she dealt with the conflict kinda changed how the class--how the students viewed how she was teaching." I asked Matt what feelings he had the day of the conflict. He replied, "Shock!" [Laughs]. I asked him about that and he explained, that he was sitting between Piercy and Tricia and that made him uncomfortable. He went on to say that he had been "surprised" by the conflict because there had been such an openness to "everyone's opinions" and so the conflict "seemed out of place." He then went on to say that Piercy had always seemed open to feedback and others' ideas before the class in which the

conflict occurred, but he felt that during the conflict her receptivity changed. He went on to say that it changed his feeling about the class. I asked him if that was why he had been absent. He said no, that he was having other problems."[93] I asked him more about the conflict and he stated,

> I think there was some miscommunication there and I'm not exactly sure where all it came from because it seemed like after it was explained--after everything was explained and out in the air there was a more understanding.

Matt felt that for many of the students it made them "a very cohesive group." However, the conflict had made him less connected to the class. It is hard to know how much of the disconnection had to do with his frequent absences.

Emily actually used the phrase "turning point" to talk about the class of conflict:

> I remember one class in particular that I left feeling, I don't know, a little uncomfortable or not satisfied with the way the conversation had gone. I felt that a lot of the students were very uptight and defensive and although they are negative terms, I think it was a positive thing that happened. I think that the class as a whole was able to overcome that in the long run. I think it was almost like a *turning point* in the class where we even became closer after that. Some of the issues weren't easy to talk about, especially gender issues when there's males in the classroom. I was extremely impressed with how the session on homosexuality went. You know, we talked about, I would have expected more discomfort and defense from the men and some of the women on that issue rather than the gender issue, and it was the opposite.

Emily said that although there were negative feelings at the

---

[93] Piercy reported that Matt had been charged with sexual harassment and was dealing with this issue at the time of ED 277.

time of the class there was a positive outcome, a turning

point, and she felt that the class had become closer after

the conflict.

I had also asked Tricia how she felt after the midterm

feedback.  She answered:

> Well, I thought it was pretty brave of her, to like,
> try to find everybody's honest opinion.  Most people
> just, teachers will like, just really don't care, or,
> they don't wanna know if there's a problem, 'cause it
> means they'll have to deal with it if there is.  So, I
> thought that was really, really brave to go out like
> that and, um I don't know if it, I couldn't tell the
> fact where it helped people think about how they felt
> class and the teaching.

I then asked if it helped her.  She replied:

> Well, I think what was happening is people are like,
> especially had a lot of confusion and a lot complaints
> about the way the gender issue was dealt with.  She
> started to explain to them and I understood what she
> was trying to explain, so I don't really know if it
> made that much of a difference, 'cause I already saw
> that point of view.  But like I said, I dunno, it was
> kinda frustrating for me, because it would be nice if
> everyone could've been on the same, like, wavelength
> and understood.  But, everybody was coming from
> different places, you know, everybody came to the class
> with different perceptions about everything, and so, it
> was hard, when we got together.  'Cause we were all
> different levels.  Since she was trying to teach the
> one thing to us, people were getting confused.

Interestingly, at no point in the interview did Tricia say

that that particular class had been traumatic for her,

although clearly others felt that it had been traumatic for

Tricia.  It might be that Tricia was hesitant to talk about

its traumatic impact, but it did not seem that way in the

interview at all.  She did not seem to see it as a "fight"

in the same way that others in the class did, such as

Joanne. Instead, Tricia seemed to talk more about feeling frustration with the misunderstanding and different perceptions that were occurring surrounding the gender issues.

In some ways it was Piercy's courage that stood out for Tricia and not her own trauma (as others perceived). For Tricia, her feelings of respect increased for Piercy after the class of conflict because she was able to tell Piercy cared.

Although Darlene and others were troubled by the conflict, it seemed to be a turning point for them. As Miller (1986) declares, "Productive conflict can include a feeling of change, expansion, joy. It may at times have to involve anguish and pain, too; but even these are different from the feelings involved in destructive or blocked conflict" (p. 129). It seemed that there was a sense of a real connection for Piercy and the students. The classroom had become a place where people were not merely going through the motions of being in relation, but actually were. That is, all the emotions that are involved in human relations came to the fore, among them: anger, frustration, arrogance, caring, sincerity, honesty, and courage. This is the stuff of genuine connection and not pseudo-connection, and it seemed as if Piercy and the students were moved into a deeper relationship because of the conflict.

## Reflection in Hindsight

Piercy continued to reflect upon the case of conflict and on her practice and wrote in her epilogue almost two years after the conflict,

> It's easy for me to look back and criticize my teaching. I wonder if I used a jackhammer then, and now I use a hoe or pitch fork when I hit hard packed ground.... Were my students' attitudes really hard packed? Maybe I needed to drill holes, or maybe I misjudged the hardness of the soil because the ground under my feet felt like cement....
>
> I see classrooms more relationally now. When you use a jackhammer the vibrations affect the ground around it. Corinna taught me to pay more attention.
>
> I see "the conflict" differently now and I would handle the discussion after the video and Tricia's concerns very differently. I would ask her about her experiences with the biases that the video explicated. I would ask Tricia and her classmates, "Do you think that you haven't seen bias because you weren't looking or because it wasn't there?" I would still openly express my concern if I felt that they had made up their minds. I'd say that I'm hearing dismissal and ask if they think gender bias is "my generation's problem."
>
> I would ask how comfortable they felt examining these issues. I'd point out and check my interpretation of their answers to questions...."I think I heard defensiveness when you said ...(exact student wording repeated)..." or "When you said ...(exact wording again)...you sounded very certain to me. I'm wondering what other possibilities that you have explored?" My goal would be help students to think more about each other and in essence I think we'd talk more about the connections between personal and cultural beliefs. Students may have been trying to move the conversation in that direction. The focus would be more on our thoughts as people and as a group of educators.

Piercy had the opportunity to return to this case of conflict and reconsider her own role during the interaction. Yet, regardless of how she could have handled the conflict differently, Piercy had to act in the "heat of the moment." This is in part why teaching practice, especially practice

that is trying to create a different kind of relationship
between the students and teacher, is an arduous endeavor.

We saw how during each phase of the conflict different
issues arose. For example, "the clash of the paradigms" was
in the first phase. Gender and the nature of knowledge,
arrogant presence, the personal is pedagogical, the
complicated nature of sexism, sexual politics, and man as
the norm were all visible in the second phase. And in the
third phase Piercy and the students had different visions of
conflict and relationships in a classroom. I also proposed
a fourth phase, which was the turning point for the class.

Having analyzed the case of conflict and thinking about
how the students struggled and stretched in ways that were
difficult for them, I recognize how difficult this kind of
ambitious practice is. Part of the difficulty is the
inherent unequal power and authority structure between a
teacher educator and her students.

### Authority and Power in the Teacher Education Classroom

From Darlene's interview we saw how the power
differential between the teacher educator and student scared
her. She was frightened of the ramifications of speaking up
and out in the context of unequal power relations. She
said, "I thought she was going to rip my head off." And
when Piercy complimented her about having the courage to
stand up to her, considering that she was the director of

elementary education, it made Darlene even more terrified. For Darlene this just reasserted Piercy's power over her. She said that she felt like, "I'm going to pee in my pants right here in front of you. I was so scared. I was so frightened after she said that. But it just made me feel like all the more I've thrown my grade out the window." From what I know of Piercy she genuinely thought it was wonderful that Darlene stood up to her like that, but for Darlene her deep fear of the ramifications of speaking up and out alert us that there are factors which hinder open dialogue between a teacher educator and her students. For Darlene, in part it was the fear that by speaking up and out she had jeopardized her grade but even more than that, that Piercy could hurt her future. This implies that real relationships are difficult to develop between students and a teacher educator.

It is so difficult because so many of these students entered the classroom with years of assumptions of what it means to be a student, and years of what it means to be in relation to a teacher and teacher educator. They have had an "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975) that has taught them much about what school "should" be like. It is important for me to never underestimate the legacy of "going to school" that Piercy tried to challenge.

In the next chapter I will explore how the students entered Piercy's classroom afraid to speak up and out in the

context of a classroom. They had had years of progressing through the school system, learning how to be in relation with a teacher. Piercy wanted them to challenge her, and to speak up and out. However, the differential power relation between teacher and student, and the fear of failure, made this goal of Piercy's difficult to attain. However, as evidenced in the case of conflict and other pieces of data, Piercy was remarkably successful in cultivating the students' disposition to speak up and out, given the factors which militate against developing this disposition.

# CHAPTER XI

## SPEAKING UP AND OUT IN THE CONTEXT OF TEACHER EDUCATION: FACTORS WHICH HINDER CRITICAL FRIENDSHIP

### "Unlearning to Not Speak": Speaking Up and Out in the Classroom

[S]ilence is evolved as a signifier, a marker of
exploitation, oppression, dehumanization. Silence is
the condition of one who has been dominated, made an
object; talk is the mark of freeing, of making one
subject. Challenging the oppressed to speak [is] a way
to resist and rebel. (hooks, 1989, p. 129)

"How is it you can all talk so nicely?" Alice said...
"I've been in many gardens before, but none of the
flowers could talk."
"Put your hand down, and feel the ground," said the
Tiger Lily. "Then you'll know why!"
Alice did so. It's very hard," she said, "but I don't
see what that has to do with it."
"In most gardens," the Tiger Lily said, "they make the
beds too soft--so that the flowers are always asleep."
This sounded like a very good reason, and Alice was
quite pleased to know it. "I never thought of that
before!" she said. (Carroll, Alice in Wonderland and
Through the Looking Glass, 1978, p. 166)

This chapter will continue to explore what we can learn

from Piercy and her students about teaching with feminist

imagination, using evidence from the case of conflict as

well as other sources. This chapter will concentrate on how

silence was the norm for some women in Piercy's class and

how schools are traditionally places of silence for women.

This chapter raises questions about how gender, power, and

authority affect learning to teach. This chapter will also

explore how for both women and men students speaking up and

out is perceived as grounds for potential failure. By

speaking up I mean being able to express oneself in a public

space; by speaking out I mean speaking "against the grain,"

or as hooks (1989) calls it, "talking back" against the
prevailing norms inside and outside of the classroom. This
chapter will also explore the significant success Piercy had
in creating an environment where even the most silent of
students, Ellen, felt it was safe to speak if she "chose"
to.

Piercy worked with/in a paradox, that is, she was
trying to push against the "culture of silence" (Freire,
1968/1985) that many of the young women students she was
working with had been used to, yet all the while she tried
to be their critical friend. Trying to do this without
being coercive was an exceedingly hard balance to maintain.
At times it seemed that the students experienced her actions
as coercive, although Piercy had not intended them that way.

Piercy worked against a culture of silence in which
women existed, and the schools' structures worked against
speaking up and out for both women and men. Speaking up and
out was one of Piercy's primary goals. She wanted to help
develop future teachers who could be vocal change agents in
schools, institutions she saw desperately in need of change.

## Understanding Who These Students Are and the "Culture of Silence"

In the case of conflict we saw Tricia struggle to
articulate what she wanted to say. We saw Darlene be bold
and stand up for Tricia against Piercy, yet apologizing for

her actions during the conflict and on the way out of the class. We heard her express the fear and dread of the possible consequences for "talking back" (hooks, 1989). I do not forget her powerful imagery of being so scared that she thought to herself, "I'm going to pee in my pants right here in front of you." Talking to and watching Piercy I had no such image of someone so frightening, so intimidating, that a student would be that scared. Yet for Darlene this kind of fear was evoked. It is hard for me to see Piercy as intimidating, yet Darlene did (and perhaps others did also) because of the power differential. Therefore, I am compelled to ask, What is it about the structure of schooling that sends such trepidation through a young woman just because she spoke out against an authority figure? I am sure there are many other personal history issues playing themselves out here, but as an educator it behooves me to think about the structural factors of education that made Darlene feel the way that she did. To grapple with this I need to look at Piercy's classroom and beyond and think about the ways in which education is structured on many levels.

Piercy tried to create a connected environment. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) write about the need for such a connected classroom environment for women students. However, Piercy also wanted to create an environment where students had to stretch themselves

intellectually, emotionally, and behaviorally. That is, she wanted to push those students who were silenced to speak up and out. This made the classroom unsettling and uncomfortable at times for the students.

Carroll's (1978) image of the flower beds is an apt one to think about what Piercy wanted and what she did in her classroom. Unlike a class where "the bed is too soft and the flowers are asleep," in Piercy's class "the bed was hard" at times, for she wanted her students to be wide awake. As Greene (1978) states, "To be awake is to be alive" (p. 42) and "Lacking wide-awakeness...individuals are likely to drift, to act on impulses of expediency" (p. 43).

Piercy felt that a community made up of critical friends for critical friends cannot be gentle and soothing all the time, otherwise the scholarly intensity, the intellectual vigor, the contribution of multiple voices may lie dormant. If these students lie dormant when they become teachers they may act in ways that are not in the best interests of their own students.

Part of why Piercy made the beds hard was so that students, especially women who have often been silenced and have silenced themselves (see Lewis and Simon, 1986), learned to use their voices. Piercy reflected Rich's (1978) belief that "there is a unique quality of validation, affirmation, challenge, support, that one woman can offer another" (p. 240). Piercy believed it was necessary for

women to become involved in authentic relationships with others in class, in part by entering into the conversation.

Two weeks before the conflict Piercy had gone around the room and pointed out who had spoken and who had not. She asked the students what they could do to get everyone to contribute. She asked if she called on people more, would that help? Vannessa replied, "I'd be pissed off if you called on me and I didn't want to speak." Then Piercy asked, "Does it depend on the intent? If we are serious about needing each other's ideas," doesn't that make a difference? Piercy then asked them, "Is it not important to develop speaking skills in class?" Jackie asked, "Why would you want to make someone talk?" Vannessa seeming to finish Jackie's idea, "And feel like an idiot all day." The conversation continued and Piercy stated, "I just want to help you be prepared to speak to one another about issues. I want you to be prepared, not to walk out of a liberal arts college with no voice. That is an important goal for me. This is critical for me as your teacher."

When Darlene stated that Piercy was "badgering" Tricia during the conflict, this statement was directly related to the actual incident, but it also arose from a long history of discourse patterns. Piercy pushed her students to use their voices. She stated to the students during the third month of class, "Women don't get asked about their ideas in classrooms. I'm trying to change that." Piercy had made

the "bed hard" consistently in the classes before this incident. Piercy took stock of who in her classroom had not entered into the conversation of the community and she tried to pull them in. Piercy stated about two weeks into the semester.

> [I am] getting them ready to get involved in a conversation. I try to target people, get somebody into my head and work on them, sometimes it backfires, I do it ungracefully. At least I try to think about it.

I asked Karen how she felt when Piercy had gone around the room identifying who spoke and who did not and had pointed out that she had become more talkative over time in the class. Karen did not see the interaction as problematic. Instead she felt it showed Piercy was caring. She stated,

> Well, I was glad that she noticed. You know, I didn't think I could talk as much as I did, but it's hard for me to talk as much as some people there because I could never get my point across, and if I do get to a topic I'd probably, it would become like a very long topic and it would be something, I would not want to put any other students [through]. It would be fun to talk to Dr. Sand like one-on-one or something but if I were to talk it would probably be forever and I just wouldn't want to put everyone else through the same boredom that usually happens, well, not usually, sometimes happens in the class. But it was nice to know that she was watching out for all of us.

Karen went on to say that not only did Piercy say she cared about her students, but she had also acted like she did. Karen indicated that Piercy noticing who spoke and who did not was part of the way that she "seems to want to make sure you understand everything, you know, every part of the class. She doesn't want you to go away confused about

something."

However, some students felt that this kind of
interaction was problematic. Piercy worked hard at trying
to get Michelle to speak up and out in class. She probed
Michelle about her ideas, called on her, and made sure she
had the reporter's role in group work. Piercy stated, "I
begged her to talk. I asked her a million times to talk"
(July 24, 1992).[94]

Piercy pushed Michelle in ways that other professors
had not. For example, Piercy spoke to a professor that had
Michelle in his class and they talked about her applying to
a prestigious college to do her student teaching. Piercy
told me with dismay about the male professor's response when
Piercy told him of her concerns about Michelle:

> This professor was really high on Michelle. He said
> she never spoke at all in his class but her papers were
> really written well. He is a nice guy but he is kind
> of the paternal type. He would take care of her. You
> know, he wouldn't help her be more outspoken. He would
> protect her, "you don't have to talk." [I said to him]
> "I'm concerned. I think it is important to speak out
> and make her views known and I'm worried, I'd like her
> to have more presence in the class" and so on. [He
> said] "Oh she'll be fine. She'll be fine when she gets
> out with those kids."

This professor's "taking care" of Michelle was a
paternalistic caring for a student which fits into "the
expectation of female silence" (Steinem, 1981, p. 179).
This professor was complicit, albeit unwittingly, in keeping

---

[94] This was said after the official study was over when we met to discuss the final feedback the students wrote.

women from speaking about their own reality and ideas. As
Rogers (1993) states, "If girls and women were to say in
school what they know to be true, the inequities and the
neglect of girls in our educational system would become much
clearer, and also more poignant and disturbing" (p. 291).

Piercy, unlike the paternalistic professor, wanted
Michelle and her other students to be able to articulate
their ideas and positions. She wanted her women students to
be able to state their thoughts in a public arena with their
peers. This came from a deep desire to connect with them on
an intellectual and emotional level and also to try to
challenge the messages that women usually receive. Piercy
said at the beginning of the study:

> That's where education comes in, you educate women. We
> always got to think about where we are, where we just
> were, that's what I think about these Jackie's
> [referring to student in her class and women similar to
> her] that's where I was 20 years ago, for a long time.
> They still have options but they are still products of
> their contexts and their families. That's where our
> role is critical. I like having you there because they
> are seeing a different role of how women interact
> together, that's going to be important.

Piercy also did not want women to silence themselves.
Piercy was "assaulting" the female expectation of silence
and being silenced. As Steinem (1983) states:

> A feminist assault on the politics of talking, and
> listening, is a radical act.... Unlike the written
> word, or visual imagery, or any form of communication
> divorced from our presence, talking and listening won't
> allow us to hide. (p. 190)

For Piercy it was even more than this, it was the
interaction that was created when a student "called forth a

response from the world" (Gilligan, 1990. p. 26).

> A student first must learn how to call forth a response
> from the world: to ask a question to which people will
> listen, which they will find interesting and respond
> to. Then she must learn the craft of inquiry, so that
> she can tune her questions and develop her ear for
> language and thus speak more clearly and more freely,
> can say more and also hear more fully.... The wind of
> tradition blowing through women is a chill wind,
> because it brings a message of exclusion--stay out;
> because it brings a message of subordination--stay
> under....(Gilligan, 1990, p. 26)

Piercy wanted women to be able to use their voices in a

context that often cultivated their silence. This speaking

would make them "of" their society in ways that remaining

silent would not. It would allow them to learn the "craft

of inquiry" and battle the messages of exclusion and

subordination.

From the students' perspectives speaking up and out in

the classroom was not just a matter of participating in the

community. As far as they were concerned their words were

being evaluated by Piercy and the other students. They may

have felt that they were being judged negatively by the

other people in the classroom. Piercy's power and authority

to "require" that students speak up and out may have made

them feel vulnerable.

When I watched Piercy teach and listened to her talk I

was reminded of what hooks (1989) states in her piece on

feminist pedagogy:

> Unlike the stereotypical feminist model that suggests
> that women best come to voice in an atmosphere of
> safety (one in which we are all going to be kind and
> nurturing), I encourage students to work at coming to

voice in an atmosphere where they may be afraid or see themselves at risk. The goal is to enable all students, not just an assertive few, to feel empowered in a rigorous, critical discussion. Many students find this pedagogy difficult, frightening, and very demanding. They do not usually come away from my class talking about how much they enjoyed the experience.... I began to see that courses that work to shift paradigms, to change consciousness, cannot necessarily be experienced immediately as fun or positive or safe and this was not a worthwhile criteria to use in evaluation. (p. 53)

hooks is accurate in asserting that students do not often find these kinds of classrooms "fun or positive or safe." Michelle talked in her interview about the embarrassment that was created when Piercy pointed out who was silent and who spoke in class. Michelle said that she was surprised that any teacher would do this. Michelle, albeit unaware, was telling us that it is uncommon for teachers to talk about the process of what is actually going on in their own classrooms. That is, in teacher education classes, it is easier to critique outside of one's own class than within it. What Piercy was requiring the students to do was to look at the ways in which they had or had not participated in the classroom community and Piercy's own role in helping her students use their voices. She held up a mirror for them, something they were not used to. Michelle stated:

I feel comfortable speaking in the class but that day that she went around and pointed out people that didn't talk...I have never had a teacher go around the class and say, "Well, you don't talk, why don't you talk?" or "You talk too much." I don't think it was very appropriate for her to go around to everyone and say, "You talk a lot," or "You don't talk so much," or "You

do this or that." You know, I didn't feel comfortable
with it and I know a few of my friends didn't feel
comfortable with it either.

The other issue that Michelle raised, between the lines, was
that Piercy had the power and authority to go around the
classroom and call on people and also point out who was
speaking and who was not, regardless of the comfort level of
the students. Perhaps the issue of power and authority in
classroom discourse was something that both Piercy and I
"underconsidered" (Paley, 1989, p. 106) in our analyses of
the ways in which students had or had not spoken up and out.

Piercy was direct and honest. She saw the ways in
which her students, especially the women, were not
participating in their own education. They were silencing
themselves and Piercy saw this as destructive for women and
harmful for future teachers. The students were
inexperienced with talking about the process of what goes on
in their own university classroom, and this was in part what
contributed to the conflict on February 27, 1992, but it had
a long history of Piercy trying to co-design the classroom
culture. No matter what Piercy did by encouraging or
pushing her students to contribute in class, some of the
women continued to be mute and trapped behind a wall of
silence.

## A Wall of Silence: "The Ones Who Couldn't Explain Themselves"

> I thought talking and not talking made the difference between sanity and insanity. Insane people were the ones who couldn't explain themselves. There were many crazy girls and women. (Kingston, 1989, p. 186)

> I thought every house had to have its crazy woman or crazy girl, every village its idiot. Who would be It at our house? Probably me. (Kingston, 1989, p. 188)

> Either because we had been oppressed into silence or because we had made a conscious decision to refrain from the discussion...we had become exiles within a wall of silence. (Lewis and Simon, 1986, p. 463)

During the one class Michelle alluded to, where Piercy went around the room and named who was talking in class and who was not, Piercy tried to get Ellen to speak up and out. Piercy asked the class, "What should we do about the fact that some students overtalk and others undertalk?" She pointed out that Ellen did not speak and asked her, "Would an invitation help?" Ellen said, "No." Ellen was extremely uncomfortable when Piercy and her classmates told her that they really wanted her to speak. She explained:

> Um, I was, I was a little embarrassed. Because I was pulling it out and then the attention was on me and people were bringing things up like, double, you know, we wanna hear what you have to say and, I dunno, like that. Yeah, I was uncomfortable. I don't like being you know pointed out and, but, I mean after a while, actually, I did. I did. I spoke the most I spoke in class 'cause I did say, "Well, this is how it is." And then, I mean, there are times, this last discussion, um, I mean, I, I actually, I do, I have, I argue it out in my head. And sometimes, you know, I, I get to the point where I do wanna say something, but I don't.

Ellen's interview suggested to me a silent scream of the need to "unlearn to not speak." Her interview was painful

to listen to, for amidst her fear and apprehension she was groping for her own voice.

Ellen was able to speak in the interview and said that she was comfortable, but she seemed not totally at ease. The most poignant lines for me were "It's just I've gotten used to...not talking." And "Sometimes...I get to the point where I do wanna say something, but I don't." What happens to young women who swallow their own voices out of fear? Ellen explains why she doesn't speak:

> I mean, I've, I've always had a problem speaking in front of people. This past semester, I took a speech class and I, I, eventually, I felt more comfortable, but I just, I think it's my self-confidence. Also I'm afraid I'm gonna say something stupid, or she's gonna ask me something that I won't know how to answer--just things like that. And it's also from, um, from the beginning, I've just never really in grade school, and sure, everybody can, you don't really care, but, once you start getting up to those years where your peers are something, part of you and you're in a big thing. You're worried about it and I don't think that's what it is now. It's just I've gotten used to, being used to not talking, just that kinda thing, so. And plus I, I also, I think it's just, it's part of, eh, my personality, that's how, I inherited that from my parents, that's how they are and that's how they brought me up and I'm just basically quiet.

Ellen was trapped behind a wall of silence. Would she ever be able to scale it? It was no accident that Ellen was female and groped, sometimes in vain, for her own voice. When Piercy said, "It's all about gender" I would agree. Ellen needed to "unlearn to not speak."

**Unlearning to not speak**

Blizzards of paper
in slow motion
sift through her.

In nightmares she suddenly recalls
a class she signed up for
but forgot to attend.
Now it is too late.
Now it is time for finals:
losers will be shot.
Phrases of men who lectured her
drift and rustle in piles:
Why don't you speak up?
Why are you shouting?
You have the wrong answer,
wrong line, wrong face.
They tell her she is a womb-man,
babymachine, mirror image, toy,
earth mother and penis-poor,
a dish of synthetic strawberry icecream
rapidly melting.
She grunts to a halt.
She must learn to speak
starting with I
starting with We
starting as the infant does
with her own true hunger
and pleasure
and rage.
(Marge Piercy, 1973, p. 38)

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) created

a paradigm of the ways in which women know. The one

category which comes to mind when I think of Ellen is

"silence." Belenky et al. describe the women in this

category as mindless and voiceless and subject to the whims

of external authority. Ellen was not mindless, yet she was

voiceless. Even when she wanted to speak up, she did not.

Perhaps words had been, and were, used against her. "Words

were perceived as weapons. Words were used to separate and

diminish people, not to connect and empower them. The

silent women worried that they would be punished for using

words--any words" (Belenky et al., 1986, p. 24). Ellen was

afraid and trapped within her own silence.

Piercy did create opportunities that allowed Ellen to speak in a small group setting. Ellen stated, "[In] jigsaw I do, I feel very comfortable speaking. I have talked quite a bit. So it does, um, for me, the size of the group does matter."

Ellen (and other women in the study) compel me to ask about the ways in which gender, power, and authority connect in the teacher education classroom. How does being a woman impact their ability to "talk back" and speak up and out?

## Gender and Power and Authority and Learning to Teach

Two of the women, Ellen and Darlene in particular, signal the need to look deeply at the issues of gender and power and authority in the college classroom, especially in the teacher education classroom. We need to ask questions about the teaching and learning of "talking back" and "speaking out." They probably have had experienced the subtle invisibility, erasure, and tokenism that women encounter in many classrooms from elementary to college (Sadker and Sadker, 1994). They may have endured harassment and demeaning comments in classes, had their experiences trivialized, and faced an ethos that may not have been women-friendly.[95] Although we are not sure of the extent to which they personally had confronted these things, we do

---

[95] See Bravo and Miller (1994) and Stein and Sjostrom (1994) dealing with issues of sexual harassment in schools and what teachers can do.

know that girls and women are ignored, silenced, harassed,

and not mirrored in the curriculum (Sadker and Sadker, 1994;

McIntosh, 1983, 1990). Sadker and Sadker (1994) poignantly

portray the ways in which women who are teachers revert back

to their schoolgirl selves when confronted with sexism in a

role play situation. They also delineate the harassment

that women face at all levels of schooling. College is

often the most flagrant arena, "Intimidating comments and

offensive sexual jokes are even more common in college and

sometimes are even made public as part of the classroom

lecture and discussion" (p. 9).[96] Sadker and Sadker say

that

> Although sexually harassing remarks, stories and jokes
> occur only occasionally in classrooms, female silence
> is the norm. During our two-year study of colleges,
> our raters found that girls grow quieter as they grow
> older. In coeducational classes, college women are
> even less likely to participate in discussions than
> elementary and secondary school girls. In the typical
> college classroom, 45 percent of students do not speak;
> the majority of these voiceless students are women. (p.
> 10)

Girls and women often learn to ignore and swallow their rage

in an attempt to survive hostile environments. If Lortie

(1975) is correct about the apprenticeship of observation,

the women who have learned that they do not have power and

that their voices are not significant will perhaps teach

their future female students the same lessons. Sadker and

Sadker (1994) emphasize "Through this curriculum in sexism

---

[96] I have experienced this first hand. In one of my Counseling and Educational Psychology classes that I took in 1989 the professor said about particular statistics, "These were as flat as Twiggy's chest."

they are turned into educational spectators instead of players; but education is not a spectator sport" (p. 13). So we have young women who are somehow spectators reproducing the spectator stance, albeit unintentionally and unconsciously in their own girl students. We see that even in Piercy's class, where the norm was challenging the lessons that they may have learned, Ellen did not speak up and out, and Darlene was afraid of the power and authority of the teacher, that when she did speak up she was afraid that she would be severely punished. These two young women tell us that we need to explore deeply the ways in which girls and women are treated in schools which fosters and promotes a culture of submission, silence, and fear of authority within the predominantly female teaching culture.

We know a lot about the women who enter teaching in terms of their social constructs and their backgrounds. However, what do we know about their silence and their self-silencing? It strikes me that a large number of young women who enter the teaching profession are probably similar to Ellen. They feel safety in the company of small children, but not with their peers/adults. What does this say about their capacity to speak up and out, to talk back, to be vocal change agents in an institution in dire need of reform? Piercy saw this silence within Ellen and within other young women as deadly. Deadly for their own empowerment, and deadly for them as future teachers.

Piercy's goal was to have her students become participants in the community. However, students in her class had multiple reasons for not participating. For Ellen it was fear. For others there could have been other reasons. Wallace (1993-94) points out:

> Today I see all too well that if the teacher employs a particular model of interaction in the class, there will always be those who do not choose to participate. This may mean that they are "silenced," it may not. They may have no desire to interact with others in this way, in this setting. A teacher cannot demand a commitment from students to share with one another, even in a hierarchical paradigm, to have patience with one another's faults, or to create a unique community of themselves, even though she is convinced that these experiences would be liberating. Some people do not want to be liberated; many do not need to be; others use their empowerment to simply refuse. In any event, all group participation rests upon the individual's choice. (p. 17)

Piercy, however, kept on tilling the soil and tried to create a community where students participated. Sometimes her passion may have made the situation "backfire," as she said. However, she vigilantly attended to the dynamics of the classroom discourse. She wanted to create real opportunities for her students to grow and learn through dialogue.

This goal seemed to strain some of the relationships between Piercy and the students. For example, Michelle in her interview said, "I didn't particularly like the class." She stated:

> I think we have a personality conflict so I am not doing very well in that class. I don't know what started anything but I just, there just always seems to be tension when we are talking and we just seem to be

faking that when we're, you know, being nice to each other.

Gilligan (1990) tells us that paying attention to the education of women may ironically cause tension in the relationship between women:

> At the present moment, the education of women presents genuine dilemmas and real opportunities. Womens' questions--especially questions about relationships and questions about violence--often feel disruptive both in private and public life. And relationships between women are often strained.... The choices that women make in order to survive or to appear good in the eyes of others (and thus sustain their protection) are often at the expense of women's relationships with one another.... (Gilligan, 1990, p. 26)

Piercy believed that one of her primary roles was to help women students develop and use their voices in public spaces. However, as Gilligan informs us, this opportunity that Piercy felt she must take is also a dilemma, for she was working against a culture of silence that some of these young women have learned to live with/in. This is just one of the ways in which the practice of teaching with feminist imagination is very difficult.

### The Fear and Dread Within Educational Institutions

> It was when I found out that I had to talk that school became a misery, that the silence became a misery. I did not speak and felt bad each time that I did not speak. I read aloud in the first grade, though, and heard the barest whisper with little squeaks come out of my throat. "Louder," said the teacher, who scared the voice away again. (Kingston, 1989, p. 166)

The need to have the right answer is another reason for self-silencing in the classroom. As Ellen said, "I'm afraid

I'm gonna say something stupid, or she's gonna ask me something that I won't know how to answer." Jackson (1986) points out, having the right answer is paramount in schools. And Gardner (1991) states, "schools everywhere have embraced 'correct-answer compromises' instead of undertaking 'risks for understanding'" (p. 141). Does this need to be "right" to be "correct" impact young women more severely than young men? From Belenky et al.'s work, this would be indicated. Also, Sadker and Sadker (1994) state that "Women's silence is loudest at college, with twice as many females [as males] voiceless" (p. 170). What seems important to me is not necessarily who is affected *more* but rather that a fear and dread exists within educational institutions and that students' voices are being scared away. Kingston's haunting words remind me of Ellen, "Some of us gave up, shook our heads, and said nothing, not one word. Some of us could not even shake our heads. At times shaking my head no is more self-asserting than I can manage" (1989, p. 172).


## Not For Women Only

Being afraid to speak up is not just relegated to women. There were men also who were frightened to speak. Gary was one. He had a learning disability and this might in part explain his fear. Yet there were a number of other students who felt the same way. There was a recurring theme in the midterm feedback forms that students didn't want to

be called on in case they had the "wrong" answer.  Here were

some of the answers to: *Do you feel comfortable being called*

*on? Why? Why not?*

Student response # 1      Only when asked about an opinion.
                                      If I wrongly state & explain a fact
                                      in class, I'd rather it be on my
                                      own merit.

Student response # 2      No just as long as I know the
                                      answer. Other classes yes. Because
                                      I am not familiar with students or
                                      prof.

Student response # 3      No I don't.  I do not feel
                                      comfortable speaking in front of a
                                      large group.  I am somewhat
                                      insecure, and I've just never felt
                                      comfortable speaking in front of
                                      others. (my peers)

Student response # 4      Sometimes I don't always know what
                                      you are asking in a question.

Student response # 5      Yes. It doesn't bother me at all-
                                      except when I don't know the
                                      answer, but I do understand that it
                                      is uncomfortable for other people.

This pattern of not wanting to risk "failure" and the

idea that all learning is about getting the "right" answers

is frightening.  What does this say about the students'

ability to take intellectual risks?  What does this say

about the teacher's capacity to go beyond the defensive

learning and the protective postures that are deeply

ingrained in classroom cultures?  One student answered the

question *What changes could be made to contribute ideas in*

*class?*  "An anonymous sheet that you can write down your

ideas without having to speak."  It is sad that schooling

has made it so that students would rather remain anonymous than "fail" in public.

Note that one student stated that she (or he) was comfortable, but was aware that others were not. Another student let us know that students worry that they do not know what the teacher is asking for. Piercy was trying to show students that teaching is full of subtleties and nuances, complexities and ambiguities, and that not all things have one answer. How could she accomplish this if the students were so afraid of giving the wrong answer? This returns us to the "clash of the paradigms," students had one vision of knowledge, Piercy another. The students conceived of knowledge as fixed facts, being afraid to give the wrong *one*, and this paradigm added to the challenge facing a teacher with a conflicting paradigm.

Jackson (1986) addresses the issue of students not wanting to be called on. He was not writing about teacher education classes, but I wonder if this fear is exacerbated in teacher education classes where the students are going to be teachers? Jackson contrasts the difference between an ordinary situation like someone being asked directions and not knowing the answer, and not "knowing the answers" in schools. Ignorance in this former case is not dramatic,

> [I]n classrooms, however...faces redden and speech
> falters when a student is forced to admit that he or
> she doesn't know something. The reason for that
> difference, as we all know, is that students are
> *expected* to know the answers to the questions they have
> been asked, for the simple reason that such is what

teaching is all about.... (Jackson, 1986, pp.63-64)

> The student who confesses to not knowing what the
> teacher or the textbook has just finished teaching has
> obviously failed at what is clearly the central mission
> of the teaching enterprise.  The failure may or may not
> be excusable...[T]he perspective taken thus far the
> "knowledge reproduction" point of view.... Essentially
> this view treats knowledge as a commodity of one kind
> or another that is deposited within a student's
> mind.... (Jackson, 1986, pp. 68-69)

An ethos of defensiveness and protectiveness has been

created in educational institutions, and in teacher

education perhaps even more dramatically.  People who have

learned well how to go to school often go into teaching

(Lortie, 1975).  Many of the students in teacher education

have had practice in "going to school"--that is, doing what

it takes to get by without ever being really connected to

other students in the class, let alone the teacher or

teacher educator.  The ways in which Piercy envisioned what

could/should happen in her class was probably something the

students had not seen before.  Their experiences with

university classrooms probably consisted of being rooms with

clusters of other people, separate, disconnected, and

perhaps even competitive.  Lessing (1994) reminds us,

> It starts when the child is as young as five or six,
> when he arrives at school.  It starts with marks,
> rewards...stars....  This horse-race mentality, the
> victor and loser way of thinking...From the very
> beginning the child is trained to think in this way:
> always in terms of comparison, of success and of
> failure.  It is a weeding-out system: the weaker get
> discouraged and fall out; a system designed to produce
> a few winners who are always in competition with each
> other. (p. xxii)

As I explored earlier, getting ahead, and looking out

for number one creates defensive learning and protective postures. Piercy saw evidence of this consistently in the class. For example, she stated, "Nathan seems like he is bracing himself. He seems really defended. He has learned to be defended and put on this defended front."

There is a fear generated in schools: "What such students fear is deeper and more profound than the revelation of ignorance per se" (Jackson, 1986, p.63). This dread permeates the ways in which students and teachers interact. By the time Piercy's students arrived in her class, they may have internalized this way of going to school, and to unlearn it was no small venture. Piercy was battling a legacy of being in schools, a legacy of not being *real* in the sense that she wanted them to be real.

We begin to see how the structure of Piercy's students' school lessons had set them up to be defensive and to protect themselves from what they perceive as potential failure at every turn. If students have been so well versed in the potential to be humiliated for failing at the "right" answer, what does it then mean to ask them to engage in the uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (Cohen, 1988) of genuine human relationships? How can students and teachers be real, authentic, and genuine with one another, given their school lessons and their "de-skilling" (McNeil 1986)?

What Piercy wanted for her students was ambitious to say the least. To ask students to engage in real passions

and not potted passions, to ask them to allow real passions and not potted passions of the teacher educator, was no small request. As Darlene indicated during the conflict, she didn't really want Piercy "to get students too upset" because as she said to Piercy "you are the teacher" and if Piercy herself became too upset it would be scary. But Piercy pursued real passions and real interactions, despite the hesitancy of the students.

Although there is compelling evidence that classrooms generally are not safe places and students fear failing in public, there is also compelling evidence that Piercy's classroom made many people feel as if they had a voice and could participate. Piercy's classroom was a place where despite the fear and dread, students were able to speak up and out.

Many students spoke about the ethos of the class as welcoming. For example, one student wrote, "The atmosphere in the class is positive. I don't feel I would be knocked down for anything I say." Even Gary who was very shy, wrote, "Your class has helped me speak in front of students much more freely." Dan in his interview stated:

> I feel very confident--I can speak up when I got
> something important to say and not--I'm not nervous
> about it and I think I come up with pretty good
> comments and good stories and stuff that are very that
> can be relevant to the class and the class can use.

Nathan stated, "One thing I do enjoy about the class, it's very open, it's very easy to voice your opinion." Karen

stated:

> I think that everyone is interested in what everyone
> else has to say, whether or not it is something very
> vital, and or just being asked my opinion I would think
> they were interested in what I have to say. And if I
> did find something unusual, I am always willing to talk
> about it.

Debra stated that she felt she had a voice in class and it

was

> because she [Piercy] listens to what you have to say
> and, you know, she responds to it and she, I mean, if
> she doesn't call on you, you have the right to speak
> whatever you want. You know, it is just like she
> encourages you to state your opinion.

> Even Ellen, who was so trapped behind the wall of

silence, when asked if she felt she had a voice in the class

answered:

> I feel I could if I wanted to and, I mean, I do, I do
> get my opinion out in Jigsaw. And I think really if
> there was a big argument going on and I really, really
> felt strongly and nobody had brought up something that
> I wanted to say then, I, I would. I mean, I feel I
> could have a voice if I really chose to say something.
> And it really, I mean, it doesn't she's, she is helpful
> in the fact that you know, no matter what, she, no
> matter what someone says, she'll agree, or she'll say.
> "Oh, yeah." She doesn't make you feel stupid.

Ellen saw the atmosphere as being conducive to her talking

if she had "chosen" to do so. Piercy's way of being made it

possible for people to feel they would be safe to use their

voice if they would have wanted to (or in Ellen's case if

she could have summoned the courage).

Piercy was able to create an atmosphere in which many

of the students felt comfortable to use their voices. This

may not seem like an important skill, yet given the fear and

dread that often permeates educational institutions, it really is. It is actually remarkable that students said all they did during the conflict, in the feedback forms, and interviews.

The students felt free to challenge Piercy in multiple contexts, but what seems significant is they were willing to challenge her face-to-face in the classroom during the conflict. With all the feelings that students bring to class, about classes being dangerous places, to stand up to and challenge a professor tells us of the kind of openness Piercy created in her classroom.

When I asked students during the interview whether they felt they could challenge Piercy in class, there seemed to be a resounding yes. Karen answered the question by stating:

> Yeah. But usually I agree with her and, like I said before, there are some points where I haven't even thought of where other students challenge her and I think that's a good point too. But I don't challenge her, not because I don't want to but just because I don't think about it.

Keith answered, "I think I have, actually. I mean, half the time, she says 'If you have any problems with this, let me know.'" Debra replied:

> Yeah. She'll listen to it, then she challenges you too. But you can challenge her and she'll listen to it. I mean, she will listen to what you have to say, and why you think that and why you have come to that conclusion. She's open-minded.

Tasha said yes, she could have challenged Piercy. When I probed why, she stated:

It is just, I don't know, I get that feeling that you
can and she enjoys it. She says a lot, you know, of
voicing your own opinion no matter what it goes
against. And also the way she acts. When she says
something she seems to kind of wait for someone to go
against her if they need to.

From these students' comments it was evident that
Piercy created a kind of community that helped to usurp the
"givens" of discourse in classrooms, that is, as students
they could speak up and out freely. In her statements and
in her way of being she made it clear to the students that
they could challenge her. However, it is important to
remember that Piercy had only been working with these
students for one semester. They had a history of lessons
learned about schooling that they brought into her
classroom. She ambitiously chipped away at the students'
old constructs of what it means to be in relation with a
teacher educator. This was not an easy task.

### Unlearning the Power Differential and Learning How to be a Critical Friend: "Changing the Constructs in People's Heads about Power, that Teachers Aren't There to Get You."

Piercy was working against a legacy of what these
students had learned about the power differential. For
example, Piercy wanted the final feedback form to be an
invitation to collegiality. It was designed so that they
would enter into critical friendship with Piercy and imagine
themselves as her colleagues. She did not want them to rip
and tear on the final evaluation. We designed together the
feedback form as follows:

*Piercy Sand is thinking about redesigning ED 277. You
are a colleague of hers on the planning committee.
Could you please give her advice on the following:*

About a month before distributing it, as we were

constructing the form, Piercy said that she would like to

have an evaluation that

> changes the power dynamic that you put in their head.
> That would be a constructive thing to do with kids,
> changing the constructs in people's heads about power,
> that teachers aren't there to get you. If they don't
> help you then it is your responsibility to be a part of
> that power dynamic and change it, to empower them in
> their evaluations as well as in their conversations.
> To think about an evaluation as part of a relationship
> with a person, we tend to put it out there like it
> isn't. Hey this is a part of the relationship and when
> you take the time to talk to each other, we really
> should do it carefully and thoughtfully.[97]

Piercy's goal was to have students be critical friends

with her. Yet when I read Matt's response I felt it was

imbued with arrogant presence and he was telling Piercy how

it *should* be, not seeing himself as a partner or a critical

friend. His response to *Curriculum* was:

> Jig Saw seems to be a real pain. We hear very little
> except arguments among students. Viewing of movies
> should be more regimented so that there is a single
> viewing and then a second viewing of the KEY aspects.

His response to *Teacher-student relations* was:

> You acted freely with the students, however many of
> your opinions bled through into the classroom. You
> delved into subjects that you disagreed with much more

---

[97] Guba and Lincoln's (1989) Fourth Generation Evaluation state that evaluation needs to be:

  1. A commitment from all parties to work from a position of integrity.
  2. A willingness on the part of all parties to share power.
  3. A willingness on the part of the parties to change if they find the negotiations persuasive.
  4. A willingness on the part of all parties to reconsider their value positions as appropriate.
  5. A willingness on the part of the all parties to make the commitments of time and energy. ( pp. 149-150)

readily than those you agreed with, sometimes to the point of badgering.

Matt's use of the word "badgering," a label directed at Piercy during the lesson of conflict, revealed an allegiance to the adversarial paradigm. He did not use language that was constructive but rather ripped and tore. He may indeed have felt that Piercy was too strong in the way that she challenged students, and was entitled to express this. However, he did not seem to have picked up the invitation to give collegial feedback.

Matt's response reminds us that we need to pay attention to the structure that he and other students have come out of, an educational system that structured most evaluations, especially in the academy, in an adversarial fashion. It sets up arrogant presence and militates against critical friendship. It points out the differential power relationship, where students have limited opportunities to speak up and out, and where evaluations are a time to "get" the instructor. It emphasizes a disparaging and negative kind of criticalness and a "win lest you lose" (McIntosh, 1983, 1990) mentality.

Matt was also coming out of an educational system that promoted a positivistic paradigm of knowledge. He was saying that opinions should be left out of pedagogy and not "bleed" into it. He did not seem to acknowledge that all pedagogy is imbued with opinions and values. Matt still believed in a value neutral pedagogy.

Paulo Freire...felt that American teachers like myself were trying very hard to think of schooling as a neutral process and he felt this a mistake. All education, he said, is either to domesticate or else to liberate the human spirit. (Kozol, 1990, p. 15)

Keith's tone on the final feedback also suggested arrogant presence. His tone seemed demanding and almost insolent. He did not give constructive criticism. Keith wrote about *Curriculum* "LOSE THAT JIGSAW! It's ineffective, and I don't like it!" He wrote about *Teacher-student relations* "Don't be double-standardy. You told us to tell you if you said something sexist, but when I did, you blew me off!" And about *Student-student relations* "This is the student's problem, not yours." And about *In-class activities* "LOSE JIGSAW! 'nuff said."

Keith did not seem to see that student-student relationships are not only the "student's problem" but also the teacher educator's. One of Piercy's fundamental concerns was the way her students interacted with one another.

Another student wrote in the midterm (which was set up to give feedback anonymously) about *What issues do you want to see developed further in this class? Why?* "Applied teaching. Group exercises in student teaching. Why? Because arguing over pointless topics is getting real old, real fast!" The same student responded to *What has been the least helpful about this class?* "Arguing pointless topics!"

Both Keith and this student seemed to be frustrated,

yet their frustration was expressed with an arrogant tone. These students seemed to have one version in their mind of what it meant to be critical. This kind of slashing criticalness has been developed over many years of going to school (and from other sources). Piercy was working against this learning and trying to help students unlearn their internalized version of what being critical means.

However, there were other students who gave feedback in a very different mode. Reid was not demanding and his feedback was not imbued with arrogant presence. He wrote about *Student-student relations* "Maybe change the jig-saw groups mid-way through the year." And about *In-class activities* "Sometimes I find myself day dreaming because certain students are always having conversations, long ones at that." Reid said many of the same things that, for example, Matt and Keith did, but he said them very differently. Why were some students able to be Piercy's critical friend and others not? Why have some students unlearned Piercy as the adversary and others not? Why had some students unlearned the ripping and tearing kind of criticalness and others not? Perhaps some of these students (like Reid) never learned the lessons of adversarial relations in the first place, how did that happen? It is hard to know. The onus cannot reside solely with the individual students, but rather the ways in which they interacted within an educational system and the system with

them, including Piercy. What is important to realize is that although Piercy attempted to construct her classroom as composed of critical friends, some of her students were unable to enter into that kind of friendship within the context of a university classroom. The implication then becomes, what can teacher education classes do to help develop an educational system that fosters a community of critical friends?

In this chapter we explored what kinds of lessons students have had before they entered Piercy's class. One lesson is that speaking up and out in classrooms can mean failure. A fear and dread exists about discourse in schools that for some has to do with being female, but also has to do with the ways in which schools are structured. For some students, like Ellen, this meant they were trapped behind a wall of silence, that they did not seem to be able to free themselves from, even with strong encouragement and a conducive environment.

What this signals to me is that the issue of silence needs to be thought about in more complex ways, connected to the ways in which all levels of schooling are structured. Given what we know about how difficult it is for many students to speak freely, it is phenomenal that so many students felt free to say what they thought and felt in Piercy's class.

It is also important to note that while Piercy did all

that she could to foster a community of critical friends,
some students were able to and some were unable to be
critical friends. This indicates that perhaps the structure
of schooling, with power and authority imbuing every aspect
of the teacher-student relationship, makes it difficult for
some students to enter into a critical friendship with
someone who has power _over_ them. Some of the students were
unable to see that Piercy was inviting them to share some of
the power with her.

In the next chapter we will be exploring, with data not
only from the case of conflict but other sources, the
factors which contribute to the difficulty of teaching with
feminist imagination.

## THE CONTEXTUAL FACTORS WHICH MAKE TEACHING WITH FEMINIST IMAGINATION AN ARDUOUS AND CHALLENGING ENDEAVOR

> With all our institutions, from the police force to academia, from medicine to politics, we give little attention to the people who leave--that process of elimination that goes on all the time and which excludes, very early, those likely to be original and reforming.... A young teacher leaves teaching, her idealism snubbed. This social mechanism goes almost unnoticed--yet it is as powerful as any in keeping our institutions rigid and oppressive. (Lessing, 1994, pp. xxii-xxiii)

In this chapter I will continue to move beyond the case of conflict in an attempt to uncover the contextual factors which had an impact on the case, but also had a bearing on Piercy and her students in a more general way. These factors are the context of teacher education, post-feminist young women, and the sexual dynamics of a mixed-gender class (Lewis, 1989,1990).

### The Context of Teacher Education

It is important to locate this foundations class within the context of teacher education, and how this context affects the difficulty and the possibility in teaching with feminist imagination.

In the past, teacher education has attracted young women because it corresponded to their idea of a "suitable" career for women who want to combine career, marriage, and family. The feminization of teaching has a long history. Women were thought to be "perfect" for teaching because they

were presumably maternal, loving, moral, pious, and they could be paid much less than men. Women were seen as perfect for teaching, and therefore, teaching was seen as perfect for women (see Rury, 1989; Sugg, 1978; Lortie, 1975). Teaching took a shape and character that perpetuated the recruitment of women who saw the profession as "proper" for women and reflexively made teaching "women's work" (Apple, 1985) and a "pink collar" (Howe, 1977) career.

The ways in which teaching emphasized the "appropriate" made the nature of teaching often a conservative enterprise. The educational profession thus housed a feminized teaching force but not a feminist teaching force. As Piercy stated about a month before the end of the semester, "low risk takers tend to go into education. They have for a long time anyway." (There were exceptions and perhaps an important question to ask is how were these teachers enabled to develop feminist imagination?) Teaching is dominated in numbers by women but certainly not dominated by them in terms of power. Currently about "72 percent of all elementary and secondary school teachers are female" (American Association of University Women, 1992, p. 7). Sadker and Sadker (1994) report that women comprise "86 percent of elementary school teachers...and 99 percent of kindergarten and preschool teachers." Many of the same reasons young women went into teaching in the nineteenth century still influence young women in the twentieth

century:

> Many in the nineteenth century believed that
> preparation for teaching and experience in the
> classroom were good for a woman's ultimate career as a
> wife and mother; undoubtly, this belief still
> influences the career decisions of young women.
> (Clifford, 1982, p. 234)

Piercy confirmed this population pattern by stating

"overall my women students are very conservative, it is

partly the person who goes into education." That teacher

education students tend to be conservative young women makes

issues of oppression and privilege especially difficult for

them to grapple with. Zeichner (1993) tells us, this

conservatism is also compounded by their backgrounds:

> Teacher education students are overwhelmingly, white,
> female, monolingual, from a rural (small town) or
> suburban community and [that] they come to their
> teacher education programs with very limited
> interracial and intercultural experience. (p. 4)

This is important in terms of who the students were and the

kind of experiences they brought to issues of race, class,

gender, sexual identity, and culture. Paine (1990) states,

"Prospective teachers enter teacher education with little

personal experience of diversity. Yet they also claim to be

drawing on personal experience as a major influence on their

teaching" (p. 18).

These students were in teacher education to learn about

teaching, which many see as separate from equity issues.

They wanted to know *how* to teach. While they agreed with

the rhetoric of equal opportunity, equity and diversity

issues seemed peripheral to their generation and their

definition of teaching.  That is, the idea of equality was important but the specific attention to diversity, especially gender, was not necessary.  Paine (1990) writes, "Respondents affirmed the importance of equality in education and rejected differences (particularly gender) as important to teachers or as aspects of human diversity that should influence teaching" (p. 5).

Piercy's commitment to uncovering issues of oppression and privilege was done within a context in which students are not necessarily prone to examining these issues. Piercy's students for example seemed committed to the rhetoric and ideals of "equal opportunity" and yet the examination in their own context of gender dynamics, like the sex segregation and speech patterns, made them uncomfortable.  Piercy was working in a context where students' dispositions toward conservativism and their often limited backgrounds with diversity made tackling equity issues an arduous and challenging endeavor.

## Post-feminist Young Women

> To get to the subject of Women's Liberation.... All
> kinds of people previously hostile or indifferent say:
> "I support their aims but I don't like their shrill
> voices and their nasty ill-mannered ways."  This is an
> inevitable and easily recognisable stage in every
> revolutionary movement: reformers must expect to be
> disowned by those who are only too happy to enjoy what
> has been won for them. (Lessing, 1994, pp. xiv-xv)

A second contextual feature which worked against Piercy grappling with issues of gender oppression was the post-

feminist era. Lather (1991) tells us that there is a
"tendency of younger 'post-feminist' women to see feminism
as a dinosaur, no longer necessary, [and it becomes] the
enabling fiction of another generation" (p. 143). Post-
feminist young women such as Tricia tell us "gender problems
aren't really an issue with my generation." During the case
of conflict we saw the young women dismissing feminism and
gender issues. These women claimed gender issues were being
"exaggerated" and were not that important. This perceived
irrelevance of feminism was evident in various data sources.
Karen, for example, stated in her interview that she thought
Piercy was worried about gender because of the era she was
from:

> I think she is a little bit worried about it, about the
> gender thing. I'm not saying she talks about this just
> because she has to, or she feels she's required to,
> because I understand, it seems like she thinks a lot
> about it and she's probably, I think she may have
> encountered it more in her time when she had to learn
> all this stuff than we do because it's become more
> liberated in the gender area.

I asked her if she thought that things have "gotten better"

she replied:

> Yes, because, I mean, because the ideas or things she
> brings up about male and female stuff, I don't, I don't
> know whether it is just me or just the society I live
> in now, I don't find it as clearly as she does. I
> don't know. It could be what she has encountered
> herself. She probably, of course I don't know any of
> this but she seems to talk about gender a lot more.
> Probably she had more experiences in her life that
> dealt with gender than dealt with social, other social
> classes. Or it could be that there is a lot more to
> talk about in the gender area than there is about
> social class.

When I asked Ellen during her interview which issues she felt were unimportant, she said none really were unimportant, but then she went on to say

> probably the gender issues she went over.  I dunno, some of the things that she did, like well she brought up one time 'Well, do you think we need to have it go boy/girl and boy/girl?'  And I think everybody just lost it there.  But, I mean, that's just being ridiculous.

For Ellen Piercy's concern with the sex segregation, especially when she wanted to alter the way the students sat, was ridiculous.  Piercy had tried to make the students aware of the ways in which their own seating pattern might have indicated hidden issues, but some of the students thought that the issue was absurd.  I wonder at a different time in history would the young women think this was as silly as they were deeming it now?

We have young women believing firmly that oppression, especially in regard to women, is a moot issue in the 1990s. What seems to be happening is what Grumet (1988) warns us of, that schooling becomes a process whereby women deliver up girls and boys into the patriarchy.  The sex/gender system perpetuated by

> an elaborate and extended ritual we call schooling...we employ many women...as the very agents who deliver their children to the patriarchy...the feminization of teaching ... has both promoted and sabotaged the interests of women in our culture.  (Grumet, 1988, p. 32)

## Sexual Dynamics of a Mixed-Gender Class

> What women will say to other women...is often the last
> thing they will say aloud--a man may overhear. Women
> are the cowards they are because they have been semi-
> slaves for so long. The number of women prepared to
> stand up for what they really think, feel, experience
> with a man they are in love with is still small. Most
> women will still run like little dogs with stones
> thrown at them when a man says: You are unfeminine,
> aggressive, you are unmanning me. (Lessing, 1994, p.
> xv).

During the analysis of the case of conflict I examined

sexual politics as a factor which lay under the surface of

the classroom. But more generally a third feature was

working in the foundations classroom that I would dub

"sexual dynamics" (see Lewis 1989, 1990). Michelle talked

about the inherent difference between men and women and that

bringing up gender issues and the differences between men

and women was not the way to go about it. She contrasted

herself with other women who are feminists. Michelle

stated:

> I think that they [the feminists] try and push that
> [the differences] too far sometimes. And I think most
> people are intelligent enough that they can see if
> there are differences or not. I think it makes it
> worse if you....

I probed with, "How would it make it worse?" Michelle

responded with:

> I think sometimes people get angry if, because a lot of
> times if they have feminist speakers come or classes
> like that, it is kind of like cut down males. And I
> think a lot of times that makes males very defensive.

I then asked how the women might feel. She replied:

> Me, personally, I don't like that at all. That really
> bothers me because without men there would be no women

and that kind of bothers me. For some, I think it just depends on the person because for some girls they are really into feminist equality and for others I think we are doing all right.

I asked her what she meant by "without men there would be no women."

Well actually without any human beings there wouldn't be any other human beings. But I just think that there are some things that males do do better than women and there are things that women do better than men. I think that we just need to try and work out together just things.

I then asked her, "What sort of things?"

Well as far as, I mean just one thing that comes to the top of my head which I always find kind of amusing is construction workers. Very rarely, I don't think I have ever seen a woman with a jackhammer in her hand, but I mean construction workers, it is a male job. They are stronger than women, they can handle the equipment better. And I think it is kind of funny because I see these....

I then asked her if a woman were just as strong physically and wanted to work that kind of job how she would feel about that. She responded:

I think that is fine if she thinks she can handle it and she wants to do it. That is fine with me. I think she has every right to do it. I just sometimes get frustrated with that.

I then returned to the issue of the men feeling angry and how she felt when the men got angry. Michelle replied:

I guess as I said before, I feel badly for them because some of those speakers get really out of control on the male issue. And I feel badly because they have every right to this college as we do and I think sometimes they take it to extreme. Actually, we just had one that came a few weeks ago. I can't remember her name. [It was called] Speakers for Women in the Work Force and where women are today and she was just getting really out of control.

I then asked, "What sort of things was she saying?"

> She wasn't outwardly saying anything but there were a
> lot of implied things that women still weren't as equal
> and that it took us so long to get this far and how
> long is it going to take before we are truly equal.
> But I don't see that we can ever be truly equal anyway.
> I don't think that one is better than the other but
> that we are different and in that sense we are never
> going to be exactly the same. I tend to not go to
> those so it was a sorority event that we, that the
> sororities put up, had her come and as it was a
> sponsored event I had to go. But I left early.

I then asked Michelle if her friends felt similarly to her.

She replied, "Actually yeah. My really close friends, we

feel pretty much the same."

For Michelle pointing out differences (inequities) made

the problem worse. She was aware that talking about sexism

could make men defensive, something she did not want to do.

For Michelle, as for other young women, the men were

potential mates, or at least ones they wanted approval from.

Sexual dynamics were at play. It was difficult for some of

these young women in mixed-gender classes to talk about

issues of privilege and oppression because they were aware

that the men in the group have some sort of power over them.

It was not necessarily a power over them physically, but

rather a power to reject them sexually and psychologically.

As Lewis (1990) points out,

> the sexual dynamics of mixed-gender classrooms are
> complex and often contradictory. Particularly for
> younger women, at times still caught in the glare of
> sexual exploration and identification, the feminist
> classroom can feel threatening. (p. 479)

> Emily was the only student who supported vocally the

importance of future teachers looking at gender issues. And in an interview she told me that during the discussion she felt that she was being perceived as "blaming men for the problems and injustices, the discrimination." She stated she experienced this pressure although she did not socialize with these men. She also made it clear that she felt the other women must have felt the pressure even more so than she did. Could this have been the reason that the majority of the women remained silent during the discussion?

Michelle and Emily cared about how they *appear* to the men, but this concern was not only in physical terms. Berger's (1972) words echo in my ears, *"Women appear*. Men look at women. Women watch themselves being looked at. This determines not only most relations between men and women but also the relation of women to themselves"( p. 47).

Tatiana, the student from former East Germany, and in many ways an "outsider" to the sexual dynamics of the United States culture, provided insights about Michelle that were intriguing. She identified the ways in which from her perspective Michelle engaged in actions which she labelled as "childish." Tatiana told of observing Michelle interact with Dan, and she believed that Michelle was behaving in a self-denigrating way around Dan by flirting with him:

> I observed her and how she deals with Dan. She likes
> him, he likes her of course. But how she deals with
> him. She presents, she doesn't really deal with him as
> a person. She flirts him but in a so stupid way. It
> is childish. And of course she shocks him, her
> immature behavior, "I thought you liked me." I mean it

is so childish.

It seemed that Tatiana saw Michelle as complicit in infantilizing herself. Michelle took her behavior for granted, Tatiana did not. During her interview Tatiana made it clear that she understood a system of sexism exists within the United Sates. Michelle was part of a system of sexual dynamics that she may have taken-for-granted, but that Tatiana did not.

The sexual dynamics that existed for Michelle affected what she was closed to pedagogically. As Lewis states, "For women who refuse subordination, who refuse to pretend that we don't know, standing against these social forces has not only economic and political consequences but psycho/sexual ones as well" (Lewis, 1990, p. 480). These sexual dynamics were alive and well in Piercy's classroom: "Many young women in the feminist classroom find themselves caught in the double bind of needing to speak and to remain silent at the same time in order to guarantee some measure of survival" (Lewis, 1990, p. 481).

## Caring for the Men

Michelle had also been trained to care for, and to take care of, the men in her life, even if these men were classmates. She did not want them to experience feelings of defensiveness for somehow this would impact her in terms of her own view of herself as a woman:

Within the terms of the patriarchy women have had no choice but to care about the feelings of men. Women know that, historically, not caring has cost us our lives: intellectual, emotional, social, psychological and physical. I see this played out over and over again in my classes and in every case it makes women recoil from saying what they really want to say.... (Lewis, 1989, p. 4)

Even Emily, who was a "nontraditional" student, that is, she was a post-graduate and had worked, explained that after the conflict class she had the perception that the men thought she was blaming them and that she was going to be more cautious about what she said:

I thought it would affect the things that I would say in the future in the classroom. And to some extent I was more careful. The way that the discussion tended to go, for me, the feeling that I got that this was a feminine issue and a woman's thing and all the problems were caused by men and I was fearful that the men in the class perceived me as coming off that way, as blaming men for the problems or the injustices, the discrimination. And so I always felt that if I said, "Oh, the girl children didn't say they wanted to grow up to be policemen and doctors," that caused stress in the class.

I asked Emily if she thought that the men would be concerned about the way in which the women perceived them in the same way the women were. She said she thought not.

Emily is an interesting case, for Emily saw herself differently than her peers because of her history:

Well, I'm probably different from a lot of students here because for one I am a post-graduate. I graduated two years ago and graduated with my BA in communications and social services.... And I work... with homeless children in a live-in position.... I paid my way through school so, in a lot of ways, that's different than the majority of the students here. I feel old. I just turned 25.

Even though she did not socialize with these men, she still

thought about how she was being perceived by them. However, she did contrast her reaction to that of her women classmates in terms of being silenced. She said that she was more cautious but it did not shut her up, as it might have the other women. Emily talked about Piercy urging her as a woman to keep talking:

> I remember that after class, not after class that day
> [of conflict] but at another date, I was discussing it
> with Dr. Sand and I remember she said, I don't remember
> the exact wording, but she said something like that
> could be another mechanism that men use to quiet women,
> so we have to keep talking. And I thought about that a
> lot after I left and I thought she's absolutely right.
> And I don't think it would have shut me up but it did
> make me more cautious. It may keep other women quiet,
> I guess it could. Now, the men in the classroom may
> not have perceived me that way at all. I could never
> be sure unless I were to ask them. It's a feeling, to
> think that I felt the pressure and knowing that I don't
> socialize with those people, the women who do must have
> felt more so than me, I would think. Immediately I
> felt more at ease to say what was on my mind, one,
> because I was older, that doesn't mean I'm one bit more
> intelligent, or make sense, but it did. I felt I
> didn't socialize with those people, they don't know me,
> and I'm more detached. I've had a little bit more
> experience.

Even though Emily had the advantages of being older and a little more detached, she still felt the men saw her as blaming them. Although perhaps not for the same reasons as Michelle, Emily was also concerned that the men might perceive her as a "blamer." I am reminded of Gilligan's statement that women receive "a message of objectification-- become the object of another's worship or desire, see yourself as you have been seen for centuries through a male gaze...the message to women is: keep quiet...say nothing"

(1990, p. 26). This seems to afflict different women in similar ways.

## The Amorphous Generic Male Gaze

Gilligan tells us that women see themselves through a male gaze. I have come to think of this male gaze as an amorphous generic male gaze. That is, even when men were not actually present, or even if some of the male voices may have supported the discussion of equity issues, the women students saw the men seeing them. This gaze caused them to be cautious, to be silent, and to worry about how the men were perceiving them. Emily told us that she had the "feeling" that the men perceived her as blaming them. She was even aware that she could have been perceiving the situation inaccurately, nonetheless, she felt the pressure.

Emily's account suggests even the women who are not attached to the actual men in a classroom try to gauge, to second guess how they might be coming across to the men. They want to please, they want to be accepted, they want male approval, they do not want to be seen as aligning themselves with the "male-bashers," the feminists. They are hearing and seeing themselves through the ears and eyes of an amorphous generic male. Women are limited in their sense of themselves by forever second guessing, even unconsciously, how they *appear* to the amorphous generic male. As Miller (1986) writes, women because of

subordination "become highly attuned to the dominants, able to predict their reactions of pleasure and displeasure" (p. 10).

I believe that many young women, like Michelle, reject what feminism could teach and *unteach* because they know they are being *seen*. That is, they are aware that what they say and do will make them "appear" a certain way so they check themselves. They see themselves being seen--they have internalized being watched by another and they have become the "Other" (see de Beauvoir, 1952/1974).

This in part helps explain why women are not vocal about their own oppression. Not one of the women during the case of conflict talked about the ways in which she experienced oppression either inside or outside of the classroom. They feared being "disowned" somehow. For these young women within the very act of knowing and of gaining knowledge comes inner strife and conflict because, "for women--as for other subordinate groups--to 'know' becomes an act of insubordination and to expose that knowledge, to speak it in the public space" (Lewis, 1989, p.4) is an act of defiance.

Julie wrote on her final feedback form when asked to give advice on *Teacher-student relations*, "They are ok. I think some of the students are afraid to approach you (not me-but the boys might be.) But other than that I think we have a great interaction more than I've seen in my two years

at Atwood." What is interesting is that Julie said that she

was not afraid to approach Piercy and yet "the boys might

be." She could have been describing the male's reactions

and not empathizing or this could be evidence that she was

"looking out" for the males and their feelings in ways that,

as Lewis (1990) points out, boys/men rarely do for

girls/women. Interestingly none of the men themselves said

that they were afraid to approach Piercy.[98] Dan for

example, felt that the males had been treated equitably in

Piercy's class. During the interview he described the

class:

> It's been open. You can speak your mind.... Uh, I think
> the class has been fair to all the students, you know,
> males and females. It's brought up a lot of good, you
> know, topics, topics that we need to be, that need to
> be addressed when we go out there like gender issues,
> race issues, so, it's been very informative.

Although Dan was not "afraid" of Piercy, the women

seemed to worry about how the men regarded them and other

women who talked about gender issues. If we are to help

both women and men unveil oppression and privilege that

affect their lives, we need to examine the sexual dynamics

of mixed-gender classroom. As Lewis (1990) states:

> The pedagogical implications of such gender relations
> in the feminist classroom must be taken seriously if we
> are to understand how and why women students might wish
> to appropriate and yet resist feminist theoretical and
> political positions that aim to uncover the roots of
> our deeply misogynist culture and give legitimacy to
> women's desires and dreams of possibility. As feminist

---

[98] I however did not interview all the men, and some may not have turned in their anonymous feedback forms.

teachers we need to look closely at the psycho/sexual
context within which we propose the feminist
alternative and consider the substance of why women may
genuinely wish to turn away from the possibilities it
offers. (Lewis, 1990, p. 483)

## Variance in the Men's Response

Emily and Michelle were concerned with the way the men

felt about these issues.  Yet only a few of the men were

vocal during the case of conflict.  Nathan and Matt seemed

to reject the ideas and David seemed to want to explain that

they felt threatened and defensive.  From the case we don't

know much about how the men generally felt about these

issues.

From other sources it seems as if some of the men

wanted to be fair and equitable, but they did not want

issues of equity and inequity to be talked about "too much."

As Nathan wrote on his final feedback form when asked

about *Curriculum* "Not so much dwelling on the same stuff:

gender, race, tracking."  When I asked Matt *Which were the*

*most important issues raised for you in the class?*  he

replied, "I think the important issues were the race and

gender issues, but like I say, I think they were covered too

strongly, too much of an emphasis placed on those."

There seemed to be responses from the men that went

from support to rejection, similar to the women's.  There

were men in Piercy's class who did not have trouble with

issues of feminism and gender.  When Gary was asked what he

thought about the "feminist approach" (his words) he
replied, "I like it. It's all right with me. I'm all for
it." On his final feedback form he wrote, "Keep a focus on
gender bias, problems in society, and most important to me
school reform movements. Look for new ways to improve
schools and discuss." Nathan responded to the question of
what he thought about the gender requirement at Atwood with:

> Um, I think it's, um, good [laughs]. Um it's a way of
> bringing out, it's a making people socially aware of
> the problem does exist. The idea of the hidden
> curriculum--just being aware, um, just being aware of
> being unintentionally race or gender biased.

Though, Nathan did go on to say that "gender and race issues
um, not that I don't think they're important, but I think we
just kinda beat them into the ground." Keith responded to
the question, *How do you feel about the way that gender
issues were discussed in the class?* "Fine," and when asked
about he regarded the gender issues he responded with humor:

> The gender issues, I take them seriously, but I don't
> see them being a problem with me, because I like to
> think that I'm not biased! [laughs] I may, may be and
> but, I'm, so I'm not, I'm sure if I was a female then,
> that would probably be more important to me. But I'm a
> white male and so, I don't have to worry about bias--
> ha, ha, ha! No um however, I am left-handed, so
> [laughs] uh, I guess I should take--say I take that
> less seriously than I take the teaching philosophy.

Keith's response allows us to examine another
interesting phenomenon. He did not reject gender issues,
yet in his joking he revealed that they would be more
important to him if he was a woman. McIntosh seems to be
describing Keith when she states:

I have met very few men who are truly distressed about
systemic, unearned male advantage and conferred
dominance.... Many men likewise think that Women's
Studies does not bear on their own existence because
they are not female; they do not see themselves as
having gendered identities. (1988, p. 15)

Dan responded to the question: *If you were to explain
to a friend about what you have learned this semester in ED
277 what would you tell the friend?*

I guess I'd tell 'em that I learned more about being
aware of, like, gender biases in class and like, other
parts of not just class, but kinda like, I think you
can watch, like, a TV show, now and maybe a commercial.
and you can say, "Well, that's really being biased
toward females or biased toward males," so, this class
has probably made me more aware of that the gender
issue.

And later when he was asked *What were the most important
issues what were raised for you in this class?*

[Sighs] Um probably just the gender issues you know,
like, about, you know not treatin', treat how many
cases boys are treated differently from girls, or boys
are treated, more, I dunno, like, for instance like, in
the class I'm in, right now I observe there's this one
boy named Lance every time he walks into the class
teacher always hits him in the gut not hard enough I
mean, just kinda playfully, but you know I would
probably never see her do that to a female and so, you
can just see how some teachers physically handle
students differently.

From the men's written and verbal responses to the class we
see a spectrum of reactions.[99]

In Piercy's class there were a vocal few, such as Matt,

---

[99] It is difficult to know how much, for example, Dan's response was influenced by my presence and the knowledge of what
my dissertation was on. He wrote on his final feedback "I really enjoyed having Corinna in the room. I really thought
being recorded was neat. It was neat to see how people's attitude changed, once they knew they were being recorded."
Could it be that the men (and women) were putting on a face that they thought I might approve of? After looking over all
their comments (see appendix H) it is apparent that although they say that my presence does not influence, it does on some
level. This seems to be a eternal dilemma that a researcher grapples with. I have explored this issue somewhat more in my
epilogue, in the section entitled "Learning Through Relationships and My Position Vis A Vis Students" and the rest of the
responses are in Appendix H.

stating "to me it is tiresome hearing about it every time I come in here," that confirmed the young women's fears. However, there were others who could have been seen as signalling the opportunity for real discussion around issues of oppression and privilege. Keith, for example, who even though he often treated issues in a joking manner, seemed to be open and willing to discuss these issues. And Gary seemed very supportive and open to the issues. But some of the women in the class, like Michelle and Emily, seemed to "see" an amorphous generic male who supposedly felt maligned by feminism and gender issues.

Despite what the women thought, there was a variance in the men's responses. Perhaps the silent women were silencing themselves because of a generic male that resided within their heads versus out in the classroom. This is not to diminish the fact that many men do put down, ridicule, ostracize women who are vocal feminists. Even Keith, who was open to many of the issues, calls certain feminists "rabid."

However, perhaps "talking back" (hooks, 1989) was not as detrimental as some of these young women felt it was. For example, there were also men such as David, who said that he felt threatened during the gender discussions, but who felt by the end of the semester his eyes had been opened. When asked to comment on *Curriculum* he wrote:

> I was really satisfied with the information I received
> during this course. I learned about things I had

previously never thought about (such as gender bias and tracking). I feel this course really taught me a lot about the basics of teaching as well as about communicating with others.

When asked if he wanted to make *Any additional comments* he wrote, "I loved this class and I learned a lot. Thanks. It opened my eyes to problems such as Gender Bias & Tracking."

Why did the women seem to regard all the potential responses to be of an amorphous generic male? Why did these young women students worry so much about the men's reactions and feelings? Why did they not seem to support Piercy's attempts to uncover oppression and privilege? I believe there were many reasons for their actions. One such reason Chesler (1989) provides. She delineated how "colonized" people might behave:

> The image of women as colonized is a useful one. It explains why some women cling to their colonizers the way a child or hostage cling to an abusive parent or captor; why many women blame themselves (or other women) when they are captured (she really "wanted" it; she freely "chose" it); and why most women defend their colonizers' right to possess them (God or Nature has "ordained" it).
> Like others who are colonized, women are harder on themselves. Women expect a lot from each other—but rarely forgive another woman when she fails, even slightly. Women are emotionally intimate with each other but tend to take their intimacy for granted. Almost unilaterally, women do the work of creating similar intimacy with men—and prize male reciprocity very highly.
> Despite women's real ability to connect with others, they tend to disassociate themselves from both female victims and female rebels. We are often the first to denounce or ostracize other women who step out of line, even slightly. (p. xix)

Chesler's discussion on the actions and postures of colonized people seems pertinent in terms of these young

women's reactions.[100]  For example, Michelle vividly showed

us in her interview that she was unsupportive of feminist

issues and denounced those who stepped out of line.

Chesler writes about how women cling to their

colonizers even when the relationship is abusive.  A

concrete example of this was when Jackie two weeks into the

semester came to class with a black eye.  She walked in with

her head tilted downward.  She avoided the video camera,

Piercy's gaze and my gaze.  After class, when Piercy asked

her about it, Jackie explained that she had fallen down the

stairs.  But after another class, almost casually and

jokingly she told Piercy this happened to her every year.

Jackie had been attacked on campus the year before.  The

students in Piercy's class, like Jackie, alert us to the

political reality of their lives.  The personal is

political.  At Daly's Piercy and I discussed how Jackie was

a walking personal/political text who seemed to embody

Piercy's statement, "It's all about gender."  We also

talked about how seductive "blaming the victim" (Ryan

1966/1976; Jones, 1993) was.[101]  And we talked about how

---

[100]  Freire's theory (1968/1985) that those who are oppressed internalize their oppressors is similar to Chesler's.

[101]  20% of college students are beaten by their partners. (As reported on July 30, 1994, "Domestic Violence," Week in Rock, MTV News, MTV). The issue of partner/spousal abuse is often a blatant example of the seductive syndrome of "blaming the victim." Ryan (1966/1976) and Jones (1993) flesh this concept out:

> The generic process of Blaming the Victim is applied to almost every American problem.... Every important social problem...has been analyzed within the framework of the victim-blaming ideology.... That process if often very subtle.... In the process of Blaming the Victim, one tends to be confused and disoriented because those who practice this art display a deep concern for the victims that is quite genuine. In this way, the new ideology is very different form the open prejudice and reactionary tactics of the old days. (Ryan, 1966/1976, pp. 5-7)

important it was not to get trapped into that way of

thinking and to help our students unlearn "blaming the

victim." The knowledge of issues of oppression, including

abuse, are very real in students' lives. The teacher

education classroom is a microcosm of the larger society,

and when looking carefully and listening intently to our

students, they tell us about the larger issues that exist

beyond the walls of the classroom. Henry (1993-1994)

reminds us:

> The classroom is not a safe place. Teaching and
> learning about race/ethnicity, culture, religion,
> language background, gender, sexuality, and able-
> bodiedness are difficult. Learning about these issues
> by examining our own lives, by tracing and exposing our
> personal and social histories is dangerous. (p. 2)

This is how the personal is pedagogical.

Chesler tells us that women are often especially hard

on other women who are trying to raise issues of oppression.

Remember Michelle, who stated, "I think that they

[feminists] try and push that too far sometimes."

Given what we know about young women's responses to

---

Ryan was certainly not thinking of battered women. It was still possible in 1966 to write about targets of discrimination in America without thinking of women at all.... Blaming the victim allows everyone in the system to pass the buck; the buck-passing conveniently enables individuals within the system to acknowledge a problem without doing anything about it. They'd like to help, but, hey, what can they do? Besides, when you come right down to it, isn't it really up to a woman to follow through? Why doesn't she just leave? (Jones, 1993, pp. 178-179)...[K]now that the next time a woman is battered in the United States (which is to say within the next twelve seconds) few people will ask: What's wrong with that man? What makes him think he can get ways with that? Is he crazy? Did the cops arrest him? Is he in jail? When will he be prosecuted? Is he likely to get a serious sentence? Is she getting adequate police protection? Are the children provided for? Did the court evict him from her house? Does she need any other help? Medical help maybe, or legal aid? New housing? Temporary financial aid? Child support? No, the first question, which we can't seem to stop asking, is not a *real* question. It doesn't call for an answer; it makes a judgement. It mystifies. It transforms an immense social problem into a personal transaction, and at the same time pins responsibility squarely on the victim. It obliterates both the terrible magnitude of violence against women and the great achievements of the movement against it. It simultaneously suggests two ideas, both of them false: that help is readily available to all *worthy* victims (which is to say, victims who leave), and that *this* victim is not one of them. (p. 176)

feminism and gender issues, in part because of

"colonization" and the dangerous quality if liberatory

education, questions arise.

> [H]ow might I create a feminist pedagogy that supports
> women's desire to wish well for ourselves when for many
> women the "good news" of transformative powers of
> feminist consciousness turns into the "bad news" of
> social inequality and, therefore, a perspective and
> politics they want to resist? (Lewis, 1990, p. 468)

In studying Piercy in relation to her students we need

to recall many contextual factors.  The context of teacher

education draws to it conservative young women.  Many of

these young women are post-feminist and see sexism as

irrelevant in their lives.  Added to this is a mixed-gender

class filled with sexual dynamics.  Taking just these

influences into account one begins to see the enormous wall

of defensiveness that Piercy met surrounding issues of

equity and diversity in her classroom, and how much effort

it takes to till the soil to develop a community of critical

friends at this point in history.  Piercy was attempting

practice that was very ambitious.  It is clear to me how

many norms about schooling and relationships she was

actually challenging.  It is almost unimaginable to me that

Piercy continued to pursue real and authentic relationships

within a structure that is in some ways antithetical to

doing so.  But that is the promise of teacher education with

feminist imagination--to imagine the unimaginable--to

conceive of the inconceivable.

I have examined the contextual factors that influenced

Piercy's practice. I have been able to learn a lot about the possibilities and the dilemmas of teaching with feminist imagination. In the next chapter I will examine the possibilities that teaching with feminist imagination holds, despite all the difficulties, and the potential that feminist imagination has to reform teacher education.

# CHAPTER XIII

## FEMINIST IMAGINATION AND TEACHER EDUCATION

## What One "Mellow Little Education Class" Can (and Cannot) Do

> "I'm not sure the women you met are working for
> anything," Beth said. "Talking is more their line--and
> mine too, I'm afraid. Real change might terrify us."
> "And it might not," Hijohn said. "Every revolution
> starts with talk. Sometimes talk breeds action."
> (Starhawk, The Fifth Sacred Thing, 1993, p. 318)

In this chapter I explore how much can happen in a
teacher education class taught with feminist imagination.
Feminist imagination offers a new true reform which calls
for loving presence and passion, creating a new role for the
teacher educator as critical friend, unlearning, and
teaching, living, and loving against the grain.

I learned so much in working and learning with Piercy
and her students. There were times when it was hard not to
get disillusioned when hearing young women and men say that
it is all "your generation's problem." Yet realizing the
number of years that the myths have been spun for these
young people about meritocracy and fairness, it was logical
that they didn't problematize "the natural order of things."
The role of the teacher educator with feminist imagination
seems to be to help "unlearn the myths that bind" all of us.

Piercy created intellectual unrest in her students,
compelling them to see the world, themselves, teaching and
learning in different ways. She helped some students form a
critical consciousness, unearthing the various ways in which
privilege and oppression are created and maintained. She

helped them think about the ways they can become active agents in analyzing and reflecting upon education.

Although some of the students staunchly held on to the belief that "everything is equal now," there was significant change in many of the students. When I asked Darlene what advice she would give to a student in a future ED 277 class taught by Piercy Sand, she replied:

> Be prepared to deal with things that you don't really feel all that comfortable with. You are going to have to be prepared. I mean it is, you would think it is going to be such a mellow little class, a little education class [with] the little kids in the room, and you've got to put some great colored stuff on the walls. I don't know why I [thought that] but it was nothing, nothing that I got. I'm really excited about the gender issue, the gender requirements, at the very least it will raise their awareness. Even though this is a liberal arts school, they might not ever have had to be faced with stuff like this. And I think it is an advantage.

And she went on to say:

> I guess I just realized there is a different side of respect that guys can show for women and I never had a class like this before where we just talked about interaction. Before this class I wouldn't have said anything [if men spoke down to women] but I don't know, I feel like I am more educated and I feel like I have more of a right to say something. Because before I was not.

This study became a way for me not to despair, but instead to see that these future teachers could grow and learn even when they seemed to have a disposition toward flippancy. I was privy to the growth that some students experienced even in the course of one semester. Piercy had faith in their potential for growth and development and many confirmed her faith. Tasha was one such student. She was

one of the students who felt that the video "Shortchanging
Girls" was "stupid." Tasha explained in her final interview
how much she had grown and learned:

> One of the things I never realized was the biases
> between men, women, and curriculum. And a lot of
> things that she [Piercy] brought up, it kind of reminds
> me that I didn't realize it, that has to do with me.
> Because I never thought of myself as a minority but I
> guess I'm part minority/Caucasian and my ex-boy friend,
> they were talking about interracial relationships, and
> he was kind of surprised because someone said, "Isn't
> your girl friend Asian?" And he said, "Yeah," which
> was weird because I never thought of myself in that
> way. It did open my eyes and it taught me some things
> that I tend to do that, you know, I always thought that
> I didn't do but I do. I guess, with this class and a
> combination of my developmental psychology class, it's
> made me more aware of, I guess you could say, of who I
> am and how important my culture is. And like before
> this semester I'd never viewed myself as someone from
> another culture. But now, because of the combination
> of the two classes, I realize now that I'm not, you
> know, I'm not a Caucasian. I'm not the standard White
> person that I'd always viewed myself as. And it has
> made me real aware of my Filipino heritage and my
> Canadian heritage and how important it really is.
> Before, when people made those [racist] comments, I
> didn't see myself as part of that culture so in my mind
> it was okay because I wasn't connected. So, in a way,
> I was being biased towards my own race. And now I
> realize that was a mistake I was making. That by doing
> that I was just adding to racial problems.... I was
> just blind to my own culture. I would say it has
> opened my eyes on a lot of different issues that I'd
> never paid any attention to, just about sexism that
> exists in the classrooms. And now that I actually sit
> down and think about my own school years, I can see the
> sexism where I never noticed it before. I grew up in a
> small rural, a small community where we didn't have, I
> don't know if there was racism involved but we lived in
> such a small community where there wasn't a bunch of
> racists. So that kind of opened my eyes too....
> Racism and sexism is so much a part of our society and
> it does cause a lot of problems that I am sure that
> most of the teachers that I had didn't realize they
> were doing these things, because it has been a part of
> our culture for so long. It is something that does
> need to be changed, and if you are not aware of it and
> are subconsciously doing it, how can you change it?

Tasha's tone and seeming commitment sound very different in this interview compared to her response after the video. Piercy stated that she wanted her students to develop "a consciousness of seeing" that allowed them to see who they are and how this might impact them personally, politically, and pedagogically. From listening to Tasha, saying how her eyes had been opened, it sounds like she was able to make those links. When I asked her *What advice would you give to a student in a future ED 277 class taught by Piercy Sand*, she replied: "The main advice I would say is always keep an open mind. And don't be afraid to speak what you feel."

Tricia in the final interview, when asked whether she saw equity issues in her personal life any differently after ED 277, replied:

> I don't know if this is good or bad, but I really get a lot more uptight about um, things, like, when I see, in inequality or something like that--or someone being treated differently because of the culture, or especially because of gender. It really bothers me more. I think it's just because I'm noticing things more and it's like I was telling somebody the other day, like, it's pretty sad once you get to college and you get an education and you learn about these things, you just learn about all the problems there are, and it's depressing.

Piercy wanted to create certain dispositions in her students and to help them become significant members of the classroom community and the wider professional community. She tilled the soil in certain ways and with loving presence attempted to develop a community of critical friends. In

some cases the students seemed to reflect the dispositions that she intended, in some cases they did not. It is important to remember that the ambiguity, uncertainty (Lortie, 1975; Cohen, 1988), and disorder (Finley, 1988) of teacher education never lets us become complacent about the transformations and outcomes we envision for our students.

As teacher educators we cannot predict the impact that a learning environment has on students. Recall that Piercy told us that her Catholic schooling helped her develop a critical eye. And Tatiana revealed that her seemingly oppressive East German system created unintended outcomes. In her country she was forced to help out other countries, such as Poland and South Africa. They had "huge organizations" for helping out other countries that "had troubles." Tatiana said that she was "forced to help and now it is more inside of me." But she went on to say, "They also supported behind our backs terrorists. They had two tongues." Tatiana said that she and others "had to read to get the truth behind the lines. So we learned how to get all the information we wanted to have. We wanted the truth." She then contrasted what she learned with the United States of America's system:

> Our government said, our party said, if you don't teach ideology, you teach ideology because you like them stupid. If you teach them Marxism and they know what they can change. So, if you don't teach them ideology, then you teach them ideology because they don't know what's going on. I think probably they don't have ideology here [United States] and I don't know why. I don't know the problems here but therefore I think they

are probably more naive.

Tatiana stated that she was able to develop her own critical thinking; she was taught to critique capitalism and she was able to turn the critical lens on the political belief system that she was supposed to adopt. Tatiana reminds us that whatever an institution intends, there are always unintended outcomes and transformations. Teacher education is no different. There is no one-to-one correspondence with what a teacher educator intends and what students actually take away from the encounter.

Miller (1986) writes of the dialectical and reflexive nature of interaction:

> As a result of the interaction, both parties will change, but each in different ways and at a different rate...each person develops new conceptions of what she/he is. This continually new conception in turn forms a subsequent new desire; new action will flow from the new desire.... Both parties approach the interaction with different intents and goals, and each will be forced to change his/her intent and goals as a result of the interaction. (p. 129)

I need to remember that whatever a teacher educator intends, whatever she plans, whatever she desires is not guaranteed to come to fruition. Instead, what occurs is the interaction of the teacher educator, her students, the content they cover and uncover, and the knowledge they create together.

There are no guarantees for liberatory education, and Dickens' paradoxes do seem to exist: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom,

it was the age of foolishness...it was the season of Light,

it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it

was the winter of despair" (Dickens, 1859/1980, p. 13). Yet

it is my belief that feminist imagination in teacher

education moves toward the light, the wisdom, the hope, and

the best of times. This hope exists because individuals

create systems, and individuals and systems can reinvent

themselves. The words of Margaret Mead seem to ring out:

> Never underestimate the ability
> of a small, dedicated group of
> people to change the world; indeed
> it's the only thing that ever
> has changed the world.
> (as cited in Jackson, 1992, p. iv)

### A True Reform: Invoking Loving Presence and Passion

> Until we see the authoritative forms as forms, we will
> continue to deny those parts of ourselves that have no
> words, that don't come in paragraphs and chapters and
> footnotes; we will be forced to deny the woolgatherer,
> the conversationalists, the imaginer, the lover of
> women and lower caste men, the one who likes people and
> joins with them without necessarily "achieving"
> anything. The world of neighborhoods and of human
> communities is the world of survival. If the public
> world becomes more honest, it may help us invent a form
> of podium behind which honest people don't have to
> apologize for their connectedness to others. (McIntosh,
> 1985, p. 12)

Piercy challenged norms by being a teacher educator

with feminist imagination. In her way of being she revealed

dispositions of love and passion. Yet love and passion are

not necessarily the norm in teacher education. Teacher

education may be more of a place where potted passions,

pseudoconnections, and pseudocommunities are enacted. Any

discussion of teaching with feminist imagination implies caring for and connecting to students intellectually and emotionally. Feminist imagination makes possible caring for and with students, connecting with students, developing a learning community with students, all with and through loving presence.

It is uncommon to talk about passion and love in teacher education. This kind of talk creates discomfiture. Is the discomfort about passion because there is a link to sexuality in this society? Or is it that love is something only poets, authors, and artists struggle to make sense of? Or is it that in the academy reason and objectivity have the revered tradition? Feminist imagination makes possible the head and heart, the mind and soul merging in teacher education.

Some educational theorists have broached the passion domain. Years ago I read Schwab's (1978) discussion of eros and education and asked the question then, Why do we not see passion as fundamental to and in teacher education? Schwab states:

> Education cannot...separate off the intellectual from feeling and action...Eros, the energy of wanting, is as much the energy source in the pursuit of truth as it is in the motion toward pleasure, friendship, fame or power...means or method of education taps this energy source to the extent that the method is at all effective, and the best means of education will be the one which taps it most effectively. (p. 108-109)

Schwab states that education cannot allow the dichotomy between the intellectual and the emotional. Instead, for

him, the educated person enjoys an intellectual life melded
with an active, zestful life.  The two ways of being work in
harmony and give the other strength and direction.

hooks (1994) has recently connected eros and pedagogy,
entitling one of her essays "Eros, Eroticism, and the
Pedagogical Process."  She broaches eros and eroticism in
ways that few professors seem to dare.  hooks writes:

> Professors rarely speak of the place of eros in the
> erotic in our classrooms.  Trained in the philosophical
> context of Western metaphysical dualism, many of us
> have accepted the notion that there is a split between
> the body and the mind.  Believing this, individuals
> enter the classroom to teach as though only the mind is
> present, and not the body.  To call attention to the
> body is to betray the legacy of repression and denial
> that has been handed down to us by our professorial
> elders, who have usually been white and male. (p. 191)

Why are passion and love not common dispositions talked
about in teacher education?  Is it that an honored tradition
of the mind/body split is obstructing this kind of talk?
But Piercy reminds us that irreverence can be part of
feminist imagination and just as she rejected the
traditional mind/body split, teacher education with feminist
imagination can do the same.

"Eros, the energy of wanting" is what she alluded to
when she referred to the driving force within her, the
"ganas," the desire for a better world for women and men and
children.  She talked with passion when she told me that she
wanted different kinds of relations between men and women,
and between her and her students.  She used the word love
noticeably and with ease.  She had an effervescence when she

talked about issues, stating that ideas and issues were fun.
Her language and her voice exuded laughter, love, and
playfulness, all the while taking relationships very
seriously. That relational quality was of utmost importance
to Piercy, a passionate relationality. She helps us realize
that teacher education can be relational and invoke loving
presence and passion.

I have always said that passion and intellect need to
meld and mesh, but Piercy put a new edge on it. For it was
a playful passion and a playful intellect, and a passionate
playfulness and intellectual playfulness that met and merged
in her pedagogy. This was in part how her feminist
imagination manifested itself in teacher education.

Piercy was a teacher educator who lived out this
connection in her own practice. The words she used to
describe her teaching and what she envisioned the profession
becoming, implicitly tells the story of a woman who felt
passionately about her vocation and believed that the ideal
could be attained. She prompts us to envisage a teacher
education that aspires to the same ideals.

Thinking, acting, and teaching differently often
creates fear of reprisals. Zinn, interviewed by Miner
(1994) recently addressed the question of "How can a
progressive teacher promote a radical perspective within a
bureaucratic, conservative institution?"

> The problem certainly exists on the college and
> university level--people want to get tenure, they want

to keep teaching, they want to get promoted, they want to get salary raises, and so there are all these economic punishments if they do something that looks outlandish and radical and different. But I've always believed that the main problem with college and university teachers has been self-censorship. (p. 155)

Piercy, despite fears of being denied tenure, did not censor herself. Piercy had tenacity, a willingness to confront, to engage in conflict, and not to let her spirit become domesticated. Although, Piercy had a spirit that was unwilling to be domesticated, she was open to new and challenging ideas.[102] Her spirit and actions remind us that teacher educators can "teach against the grain" and love against the grain.

Many structural factors foster domestication. It is often uncomfortable to engage in conflict and confront issues and people. One route is to choose not to engage in practices that would evoke conflict and confrontation. "You want to get along, you go along" (Brown, 1993, 13). But Piercy did not choose to go along to get along. Piercy was "gritty." The tilling metaphor and grittiness work in tandem. When you till the land, you get dirty. Conflict and confrontation may be messy, full of human emotions and feelings.

Teaching for liberation is not neat and clean and antiseptic. Piercy's teaching, like that of many teachers

---

[102] This quality of Piercy's reminds me of that, "All education is either to domesticate or else to liberate the human spirit" (Freire as cited by Kozol, 1990, p. 15). Although I do not believe that anything about education can be as clear-cut or dichotomous as this, the point is well taken. So often education which could be about liberating the human spirit turns out to be a powerful mode of domestication.

who are committed to liberation, was a quest for a new way

for women and men and children, for people of all colors,

for people of all classes, and for teachers and students to

interact in meaningful and authentic ways.  Messy stuff...

> the messy process of helping students come to
> understand their lives as complexly embroiled in larger
> social relations.  My hope is that as teacher
> educators, we can help students understand that
> pedagogies deemed "liberatory" or "emancipatory" set us
> on dangerous terrain. (Henry 1993-94, p. 1)

There was a joy in Piercy's teaching and learning and I

believe hers was a pedagogy of joy.  Joyful, invigorating,

exhilarating, that was what teaching and learning was for

Piercy, for it connected her to her own soul.  Toward the

end of the third month of the semester Piercy said:

> [I want the students to] value making connections.
> They need to see the difference between making
> statements and making statements that are self-
> reflective.  They still don't value their own
> reflections like they do content that they memorize in
> a book.  I am always working against that conception.
> If we are not talking about content that's in the book
> then it's not really valuable. I think what is
> important, inviting the student to be an interpreter.
> Empowering the student to make sense of the world is a
> very different definition of teaching.  I want to set a
> forward motion. I don't want to set the agenda.  I
> don't think it is something that you do in one class,
> it is something that is part of the class.  I think all
> of the way I have asked for their input, invited them
> to be a part of it, *like a mirror, throwing light on
> it.* I want student involvement and it is important to
> me.  Part of what is fun is delving into yourself,
> uncovering things that you feel stupid and uncomfort-
> able about.  This work is really empowering when I
> think about my own wants and goals and using books and
> text and figuring [out everything], it changes
> schooling into something that you really enjoy as a
> teacher.  Something you really want to get into.  What
> can be more satisfying?  It's just such an exhilarating
> thing.  *It connects you to your soul*, or something.  It
> just makes your whole life just so much different when

you live this way, when you look at teaching and learning this way. It is really invigorating.

She saw challenges to ideas and conflict as connectors to others, and connectors to her own soul. Teaching was invigorating and exhilarating for Piercy because she was creating a community, a real community not a pseudocommunity (Peck, 1987), full of challenge and conflict. She shows us what a community in teacher education forged out of loving presence could be like.

Remember the house that feminist imagination builds, the mirror in the room? Part of what Piercy wanted to do was hold up mirrors for her students to look deeply at themselves. We had been talking about forcing our truth onto others three months into the course. Piercy talked about the teacher's role:

> What kind of long term effect [do you want to have on students]? Holding up the mirror rather than you being the one to point it out. Maybe that's the important thing. Maybe that's the way to think about it. Your stance is to help put up a mirror, so they are looking for mirrors, rather than you are the one describing what is in the mirror. And if we can help them put up mirrors for themselves, then we have really given them a lifelong way of thinking. That is very powerful and very long lasting. But some people they just don't want to put mirrors up. What is that saying, "Truth is the greatest form of love." I can't even remember the saying but it is something about being direct and truthful with somebody is really the most sincere form of caring about them. There's a tension, can you have a vision of the world of what should be without, without seeing truth with a capital "T"? And that is the tricky part, there is a passion about people who have a vision who can lead others to that vision, that's powerful. This gets back to the notion of stance and relation with people. I don't want to be the only one to create the vision for everybody else. Yet I do think when you have one vision and people are

united on the one vision that is when change happens.
Mark [Piercy's spouse] often says someone who is
community minded can see the common visions in people's
minds and help them focus, look at that common vision
and that is how they lead, not by imposing their
vision, but seeing this common vision. I like that.
Again I don't know if it is really true because I think
anything we see in other people is always our own
(laughs). The bottom line is I think I will always be
the kind of person that's putting my vision on other
people. I think I care enough, so I will always do
that regardless of how condemning I am of my own
visions. I think to be direct about one's political
agenda, when that becomes explicit, I think that is
important point to get to. It's pretty important to get
to that political conversation. It will be interesting
to see where we all end up in this class.

Piercy had a vision of teaching and learning that connected

heart and soul, intellect and passion.

We have met one woman teacher educator who helped us

see the possibilities of teacher education with feminist

imagination. She opened her classroom's door and helped us

see the ways in which, despite constraints and risks, one

woman with feminist imagination was with loving presence

developing a community of critical friends.


## The Challenge For True Reform

How does the approach Piercy embodied connect and

reflect on dominant reform trends in teacher education in

the 1990s? By studying Piercy I am compelled to notice

what is absent in the current reforms. There is a drive, a

push toward deep subject matter knowledge for pre-service

teachers. Yet I now see dispositions that have been

bypassed in this flurry of reform. There is something I

have not read about in the reformational literature, the
call to love. When Lessing (1975) wrote, "I was looking for
the warmth, the compassion, the humanity, the love of
people..." (p. 6), she was referring to literature. I
write, "I am looking for the warmth, the compassion, the
humanity, the love of people, and the love of justice and
peace" in the reforms of teacher education at the end of the
twentieth century. I want the reforms to speak of social
justice and equity not only because of changing
demographics, that is, people of color are becoming the
majority in many areas (see Banks, 1991-1992; Thomas, 1992)
and therefore we must think about equity. I want it to be
more than that. As educators shouldn't we yearn to provide
preservice teachers with a vision that schools would mirror
all students' realities, not out of fear (that the
"minority" will become a majority soon), but because we feel
it is the right thing to do, it is *just*? It seems to me
that a fair and equitable educational system should be
constructed out of a good heart, out of care, out of
compassion and the desire to heal the world, and not only
out of pragmatism and fear.

After seeing the possibilities one teacher education
class taught with feminist imagination holds, I ask what can
feminist imagination offer the current reforms? I believe
it offers the heart and soul of what it means to be
connected to other human beings. Accountability of teachers

and students is often reduced to paper and pencil indicators

of achievement and success; nowhere is there an indicator of

whether these students have the ability to interact with

people in a compassionate and connected way.[103]  Social

justice for its own sake, for the love of a humane humanity

seems to often be lost in the zeal to create competitive

citizens, able to enter into the competitive marketplace,

and make the United States NUMBER ONE.  The push for

preservice teachers to understand subject matter deeply is

necessary, but not sufficient.  We may be missing too much

in our press for the "rigorous" content knowledge.  Giroux

(1992) states:

> Accountability in current mainstream discourse offers
> no insights into how schools should prepare students to
> push against the oppressive boundaries of gender,
> class, race, and age domination.  Nor does such a
> language provide the conditions for students to
> interrogate the curriculum as a text deeply implicated
> in issues and struggles concerning self-identity,
> culture, power, and history. (p. 7)

I agree with Giroux, but add that nowhere in the current

mainstream discourse is there mention of love.  Love is not

prominent in the text of educational reform.

Feminist writers, however, do speak of love and call

out for it.  Perhaps those of us who are teacher educators

---

[103]  I find this a very powerful statement about the need for compassion and humaneness to be one of the fundamental goals of education:

> I am a survivor of a concentration camp.  My eyes saw what no person should witness.  Gas chambers built by learned engineers.  Children poisoned by educated physicians.  Infants killed by trained nurses.  Women and babies shot and killed by high school and college graduates.  So I'm suspicious of education.  My request is: *help your students to be human*.  Your efforts must never produce learned monsters, skilled psychopaths, or educated Eichmanns.  Reading and writing and spelling and history and arithmetic are only important if they serve to make our students human. (Unnamed school principal, cited in Buscaglia, 1982, p. 130, emphasis added)

with feminist imaginations could call for a discourse that suggests loving presence as an ideal we could be working toward. Our collective imaginations could push toward loving presence for the twenty-first century which could prepare students to push against oppressive boundaries.

From studying Piercy and her students I am acutely aware that I have engaged in my own teaching and learning in what Daly (1984) would call potted passions, those facsimiles of passion and love and all the other compelling emotions. How many others in teacher education are like myself? In teacher education there seems to be little talk of the compelling emotions. How much courage would we need to invoke real passions rather than potted passions?

Why is it that it sounds odd to speak of love in relation to adult learners? We often do hear preservice and experienced teachers say they "love children" but I often do not hear this feeling directed at adult human beings in educational settings. How often do academicians use love when they speak about their students? I know I have not spoken of love in relation to my own students. Perhaps the kind of reform that I am speaking of in the academy requires a "true I," as Rogers (1993) talks about:

> I have begun to articulate a concept of self that is inseparable from courage, the determination to speak truthfully, with integrity, to tell a story that has not been welcomed in the world. What I mean by the "true I" is the self who describes her experience courageously, rendering a story in detailed transparency, voicing a full range of feelings. (Rogers, 1993, p. 273)

Loving presence in teacher education would be the
recognition that it is not an "us against them" way of
being, but rather that through each encounter we all can
learn and expand our imagination.  Hendrix (1990) reminds
us:

> If...you would look at everything in the same open-
> minded way, you would realize two things: first, that
> [the other] has a valid point of view; second, that
> reality is larger and more complex than...you will ever
> know.  All you can do is form impressions of the world-
> -take more and more snapshots, each time aiming for a
> closer approximation of the truth.  But one thing's for
> certain.  If you respect [the] other's point of view
> and see it as a way to enrich your own, you will be
> able to take clearer and clearer pictures.... All of a
> sudden [there is] binocular, not monocular, vision. (p.
> 136)

I believe that moving toward loving presence allows a
community of critical friends to develop whereby all
learners move toward their potential and become part of much
more than themselves.  Both Tasha and Darlene grew in ways
they had not anticipated.  This was, I believe, because
Piercy created the kind of environment where students could
interact with each other and with Piercy as critical friends
in ways that enriched their lives.  Concomitantly, Piercy
and I grew in ways we had not anticipated.  Our lives were
enriched.

I envision that loving presence in teacher education
classrooms means that they are dwelling places.  I use
dwelling in the older sense of what dwelling mean:

> Dwelling is not primarily inhabiting but taking care of
> and creating that space that within which something
> comes into its own and flourishes.  Dwelling is

> primarily saving, in the older sense of setting
> something free to become itself, what it essentially is
> ...Dwelling is that which cares for things so that they
> essentially presence and come into their own....
> (Vycinas translation of Heidegger's meaning of
> dwelling, as cited in Devall, B. & Sessions, G., 1985,
> pp. 98-99)

In this kind of dwelling place each person takes care of the other and has compassion for another's struggles. The teacher educator is the facilitator of this dwelling place, but all the participants are responsible for the upkeep of the classroom community.

A teacher educator with loving presence would not be patronizing or condescending, for those are part of arrogant presence. Words and knowledge would not be used as power over, but rather to construct meaning and knowledge together. It would not be vanquishers and the vanquished, sparring and dueling with words, with arrogant presence using knowledge as a weapon for power's sake.

Teaching teachers can be guided by loving versus arrogant presence. The legacy of intellectual combat does not need to be revelled in; arrogant presence can be overturned. After studying Piercy and her students I ask, Of all the fields of study, does it not make sense that for future teachers we model loving presence instead of arrogant presence? Teacher educators teach future teachers who then go and teach students. All along the way there is the potential for arrogant presence or loving presence. We _can_ cultivate loving presence in ourselves and in our students.

Freire unabashedly speaks of love in education and we have not *heard* him:

> Because love is an act of courage, not of fear, love is commitment to other men. No matter where the oppressed are found, the act of love is commitment to their cause--the cause of liberation. And this commitment, because it is loving, is dialogical. As an act of bravery, love cannot be sentimental; as an act of freedom, it must not serve as a pretext for manipulation. It must generate other acts of freedom; otherwise, it is not love. Only by abolishing the situation of oppression is it possible to restore love to the world--if I do not love life --if I do not love men--I cannot enter into dialogue. (Freire, 1968/1985, p. 78)

How is Freire able to speak in such language and have so many admirers, yet his bold language of love is rare in the reform talk? Yet it is passion like Freire's, not potted passion, that moves others to listen, to learn, and to grow.

I see the challenge to love as difficult in the academy. Like Matt's critical feedback of Piercy's "badgering," "Why is their [the academy's] interpretation of the word *critic* always to find fault?" (Lessing, 1994, p. xxv, emphasis in original). There is ripping and tearing, an arrogant presence that is often at the center of what the academy teaches about becoming critical. I ask, Is this what teacher education also teaches?

It is important that when one discerns that a person is arrogantly present, such as Matt seems to be, that one does not dismiss the person or what the person is saying. Arrogant presence as a concept should not be used in the service of dismissal. Instead, the task is to find out how

to move arrogant presence to loving presence and critical friendship.

The question becomes how we help our students and ourselves move away from arrogant presence and toward loving presence and critical friendship. We need to not only have a pedagogy that implicitly and explicitly teaches loving presence and critical friendship, but also a content that fosters these ways of being. Would this not be true reform?

### Content That Unteaches, Teaches Compassion, Caring, and Anti-bias Strategies

"In school you learn to discuss 'issues,'" she wrote, "to interpret 'objectively,' to avoid dirty economic interpretations and asking who owns things and what makes them richer. You learn to 'discuss the text' and raise no extraneous issues. You make one Great Decision after another, fill out you multiple-choice questionnaire and depart, having sharpened your decision-making skills--presumably to make a wiser choice between toothpastes and candidates and whether you will build your facts from _Time_ or _Newsweek_ ... [The] 'responsible leaders'... are responsible for the plastic bread you eat and the filthy air you breathe; they own the buildings that line your streets and the means of production and the means of distribution; they rot your mind with wanting what they have to sell. They own your bodies to fight their wars. They sell you their brand of _Playboy_ sex and their religion of greed and their science in the service of power and their sterile and alienated art. They are responsible, and you should be articulate...." (Marge Piercy, 1979, p. 140)

To have true reform the role of teacher educator needs to be that of unteacher, helping her students unlearn the myths that bind all of us. This implies choosing content that challenges the myths that students enter the classroom with.

Although I have not dealt in-depth with the content of Piercy's class in terms of subject matter, focusing more of the relationships that were established, the "content" we use in our classrooms can have a powerful impact on our students. We saw the powerful reactions that "Shortchanging Girls: Shortchanging America" had on her students, and the vigorous dialogue that made possible. Our choice of reading materials, activities, strategies, and techniques are pivotal in helping our students re-vision teaching and learning for equity, social justice, and peace. We need to select these carefully and thoughtfully.

Content that helps students come to grips with "otherness" can do much to teach about oppression and privilege. There are provocative and helpful pieces of text written by "Others" who talk about their life experiences which allow students into their worlds.

However, our work as teacher educators has to go beyond helping our students be sensitive and aware of "Others." We need to help pre-service teachers (and experienced teachers) develop strategies and practices that promote, equity, social justice, and peace. So often pre-service teachers' awareness is heightened but a general malaise sets in, or as Giroux and Freire (1988) call it, an "Orwellian despair" (p. x). We need to help future teachers realize and utilize the numerous resources that exist to help them implement a community of critical friends working for equity and justice

inside and outside of the classroom.

Piercy used texts such as "What Should I Tell My Children Who Are Black" to evoke "social imagination" (Johnson as cited in Bigelow and Christensen, 1994, pp. 110). Teacher education would do well to call on feminist and critical texts in order to help future teachers connect to others/Others in ways that are not common in everyday life.

> One of the most important aims of teaching is to prompt students to empathize with other human beings. This is no easy accomplishment in a society that pits people against each other, offers vastly greater or lesser amounts of privileges based on accidents of birth, and rewards exploitation with wealth and power. Empathy, or "social imagination," as Peter Johnson calls it... allows students to connect to "the other" with whom, on the surface, they may have appear to have little in common. A social imagination encourages students to construct a more profound "we" than daily life ordinarily permits. (Bigelow & Christensen, 1994, pp. 110)

This "social imagination" seems to me to be a large part of what thinkers and theorists with feminist imagination have attempted to do. They stretch and struggle to understand and work against oppression and exploitation; they stretch and struggle to understand and work against their own privileges in order not to oppress the Other.

Since so many of the students who enter the teaching profession are privileged and often have not been asked to stretch their imaginations to include the other/Other, it seems that teacher education needs to work hard at incorporating thinkers and theorists whose life work it is

to challenge the systems of oppression and domination. It is not enough to teach future teachers "how to" teach, when how they are teaching perpetuates the systems of domination and subjugation. Education with "social imagination" requires that the imagination of all our future teachers be stretched in ways that are not common and go against the grain.

We need content that powerfully speaks to issues of equity and justice. However, there are cautions. For example, Wong (1993) spotlights some of the "pitfalls" of "curricular diversification." She states:

> A great deal depends on how the classroom teacher implements the revision. A reading list or a syllabus is an inanimate document; as such, it satisfies institutional demands for explicitness and stability of form, for citations and dissemination. But as such, too, it needs activation by a teacher and can therefore be subverted by insensitive handling. Thus how chosen works are actually taught is as important as, sometimes even more important than, which works are listed. (p. 111)

I emphasize that the content and the pedagogy needs to meld in ways that unteaches, teaches anti-bias strategies, and teaches compassion and care. Piercy through her curriculum was able to teach about "otherness," for example, by bringing Darcy in to speak to the students. And she was able to with loving presence create a community where these issues were handled with sensitivity and compassion.

A second caution Wong points out is that teachers need to be conscious of the power that inevitably goes into

making any curricular or pedagogical determination.[104]  She notes the complexity of the concept of *inclusiveness*.  The etymology of the term, *include*, is made up of the prefix *in* and the Latin root of shut or close.  She explicates the intricacy by stating that

> since a curriculum is not just a theoretical construct but a framework for practical action, it is not infinitely expandable; at some point inclusiveness has got to stop.  Such acts of boundary-drawing requires an arbiter and presupposes a position of power.  (p. 111)

A third caution is the danger that can occur when we use texts about "Otherness."  Wong states that a pitfall called "culturalism" can occur.  "The tendency to exaggerate exoticism and the determining role of culture" (p. 177) in a group who is deemed Other,[105] "allowing a facile concept of cultural difference to arrest inquiry into the complexities of the Other, and thus inadvertently perpetuating Otherness" (p.117).  When Piercy presented "otherness" she never seemed to fall into the trap of "culturalism" that Wong warns us of.

In all of these cautions the implication is that not only the pedagogy and the content need to move toward loving presence, but the role of the teacher needs to change.  In order to develop a community of critical friends the teacher has to become a critical friend.

---

[104] See Wong's (1993) discussion of the complexity and power inherent in the concepts of marginality and multicultural literature in analyzing power and authority in the selection of text.

[105] Wong focuses on the Asian American experience. I have borrowed her concept and ideas because I think that she speaks to other groups who face similar "culturalism."

## The Role of Teacher Educator: Moving Toward Critical Friend

> The role of the teacher changes. From the often
> negative function of judge and jury, the teacher can
> rise to the far more useful and satisfying position of
> friend. Strangers hide feelings and pretend to be what
> they are not. Friends want to know and talk about
> everything. It is a good environment in which to
> learn. (Paley, 1989, p. xv)

Perry and Fraser (1993) remind us that it is important

to "acknowledge that conceptions of teachers are neither

given nor universal, but social and cultural constructions"

(p. 19). And, so too, the role of teacher educator is not a

given or a universal, but a social and cultural

construction. We need to think in creative and innovative

ways about what it means to be a teacher educator with

feminist imagination in order to create a "community of the

future" (Perry and Fraser, 1993, p. 20). Could what Piercy

enacted in her classroom suggest to us a new role for the

teacher educator, that of critical friend?

In her own words two years after the class she taught,

Piercy wrote about implications for the role of teacher

educator.

> I recognize the voices of Jackie, Tricia, Tasha,
> Darlene, and Emily. They are all elementary education
> students who I worked with for the three years after
> this class. I learned so much about their lives
> because of this class. Darlene confided in me that the
> AAUW videotape that we saw in class was about her. She
> gained weight as a depressed teen and she couldn't
> tell her mother how she felt because she "...didn't
> want her mother to think she wasn't a perfect mom."
> Jackie wrote to me about in her journals in a
> subsequent class about her struggles with her father, a
> recovering alcoholic. Emily and I discussed a troubling
> personal relationship that affected her teaching
> throughout her student teaching experience. Tasha and

Tricia went on to incorporate their own lives and
ethnicity into school-wide projects during their
student teaching. Each one went on to be strong
teachers and outspoken child advocates as they
confronted difficulties and challenges in their own
lives. I believe that the resistance and the struggles
and the class gave each of us more "ordinary courage"
as we continued to work with each other.

When I look back I'm reminded what it is like to
begin teaching. This research has helped me to take
the perspective that Freire (1970) suggests, the
teacher needs to become the student. As an
inexperienced teacher of gender issues, I wasn't sure
if my students would grow or that I would help my
students grow. After watching their growth, I have
more faith in them and me. I have to remember, as I
work with beginning teachers, that experience can build
trust in your students and yourself and trust builds
understanding. Building is an interesting verb, but
it's the building that we need to think about. I'm
still struggling with metaphors like building, houses,
rooms and tilling the soil.

I remember, but I have difficult distinguishing,
the two students who were most problematic to me,
arrogant in their presence. Both of them dropped out
of Education, one because he didn't meet GPA
requirements. These two young men both sat across the
room from "maletown." I think they were as separate
from maletown as the women in the class, although I
don't believe they felt marginalized in the same way.
Interestingly, all of the men from "maletown" went on
in Secondary and Elementary Education. Three of these
young men later asked me to be their academic advisor.
The young man who stopped coming to class because of
personal problems came to me when he was having
difficulty with an old girl friend who threatened
sexual harassment charges. I was skeptical at first
about the socially acceptable conversations during the
interviews with Corinna. But I think we were right
when we talked about the unpredictability of change.

My teaching has changed a great deal as a result
of changes in my position. I no longer teach ED 227
because I took on the responsibility of chairing the
Education Department. I have moved the discussion of
gender issues into my literacy pedagogy class. The
approach is very different. Students examine their own
teaching for bias. I continue to self-evaluate bias in
my own class as an example. However, students are
teaching at the same time and the immediacy of their
teaching makes a difference. They teach all semester
in elementary classrooms so that we read together and
self-evaluate our own work for bias from the very

beginning of the semester. Maybe the organization and
structure is more egalitarian, I'm not really sure.
There was something very democratic about our arguments
in that class. I'm reminded of one of my colleagues
who argues with teachers like colleagues rather than
trying to stay above the argument.

What hasn't changed for me is the importance of
loosening and tilling the soil. It's easy for me to
look back and criticize my teaching. I wonder if I used
a jackhammer then, and now I use a hoe or pitch fork
when I hit hard packed ground. Maybe it was necessary
at that time in Atwood's history and I have changed
because Atwood has changed. Were my student's
attitudes really hard packed? Maybe I needed to drill
holes, or maybe I misjudged the hardness of the soil
because the ground under my feet felt like cement.
Maybe the students that come to me now are different;
reputations travel fast on small campuses.

I see classrooms more relationally now. When you
use a jackhammer the vibrations affect the ground
around it. Corinna taught me to pay more attention.

I see "the conflict" differently now and I would
handle the discussion after the video and Tricia's
concerns very differently. I would ask her about her
experiences with the biases that the video explicated.
I would ask Tricia and her classmates, "Do you think
that you haven't seen bias because you weren't looking
or because it wasn't there?" I would still openly
express my concern if I felt that they had made up
their minds. I'd say that I'm hearing dismissal and ask
if they think gender bias is "my generation's problem."
 I would ask how comfortable they felt examining
these issues. I'd point out and check my
interpretation of their answers to questions...."I
think I heard defensiveness when you said ...(exact
student wording repeated)..." or "When you said
...(exact wording again)...you sounded very certain to
me. I'm wondering what other possibilities that you
have explored?" My goal would be help students to
think more about each other and in essence I think we'd
talk more about the connections between personal and
cultural beliefs. Students may have been trying to
move the conversation in that direction. The focus
would be more on our thoughts as people and as a group
of educators.

When I listen in on our class conversations, I
think that I saw success as building community by
changing students thinking and eventually the group
would change. Successful teaching was when I tilled the
soil. The words "change agent" sound wrong-headed to
me now. I think success is when students loosen the
soil for each other. The delicate job of carefully

protecting the fine root hairs is critical for all of us. If I were to do it all over again I'd talk more about loosening the soil and about arrogance, patronizing comments, and condescension as hard packed dirt that needed to be loosened. I'd ask students, as I did during this class, to name hard packed ground in me, but I'd also ask them to name it in each other.

I think I work now at helping my students to know how to talk about assumptions in ways that allow others to examine their own assumptions rather than setting up oppositional assumptions. We still go on to find evidence around us, but that evidence is surrounded with more situational and relational explanations. We see our selves as connected to these situations. We talk more now about success as figuring out when we can loosen the soil for each other so that we share the difficulty of the task. I think because of this work, I ask students to try to explain if the soil wasn't loosened for them. I challenge them more to have the courage to ask for support and name the pounding and the oppression that we find in each other.

Corinna, I'd like to raise another challenge for both of us. We still sound like we are entrenched in what Nel Noddings calls an ideology of control. We aren't really ready to give up on trying to arrange our curriculum and our responses to work toward creating equity as the most critical educational outcome. We know we can't control, but we want to. It's most sustaining and meaningful to me to have colleagues like you that care about the same issues. The concept of "critical friend" lacked rigor for me at the beginning. It seemed too protective when I first started to read this dissertation. I've grown to think more about how important critical friends are to rigor, growth and learning.

Piercy continued to reflect upon her pedagogy and her role as a teacher educator. She pushed herself and those around her to think deeper and harder about what it means to be a teacher educator and to help develop a community of critical friends with loving presence. Her reflection, self-challenge and challenge of peers are essential aspects of the evolving role of teacher educator as critical friend.

## The Need For Unlearning in Teacher Education: Teaching, Living, and Loving Against the Grain

Through this study, I have come to believe that one of the necessary steps in creating a community of critical friends in teacher education is that we need to begin with our own unlearning of the lessons that bind us. As teacher educators we have internalized the lessons of domination and oppression in unconscious, yet insidious ways. Can we really expect to help our students come to a "consciousness of seeing" if we ourselves are not seeing clearly? The need to reeducate ourselves and to combat the lessons that in many cases our own defective educations have taught us about the way of the world is necessary in reforming teacher education.

Piercy believed that education is all about relationships. She compels us to question how we approach those relationships. Is it with loving presence in an attempt to develop a community of critical friends, or with arrogant presence and the kind of criticalness that reinforces hierarchy and competition? Piercy showed that feminist imagination can mean trying to imagine a different tomorrow where teachers and students learn to "be" together in new ways.

In my conception, teacher education with feminist imagination is moved by a loving presence. It means being open and willing to learn and grow, change and evolve. It means patiently developing a community of critical friends.

Yet because of the oppression and privilege that exists,

this is a unique kind of patience, it is an urgent patience.

There is a need for urgency in education, and yet

ironically, those with the most privilege do not recognize

the urgency and can "afford" to wait to be patient.  In the

context of teacher education what can we do?

> As a Black woman and feminist, I must look about me,
> with trembling and with shocked anger, at the endless
> waste, the endless suffocation of my sister; the bitter
> sufferings of hundreds of thousands of women who are
> the sole parents of hundreds of thousands of children,
> the desolation of women tapped by futile, demeaning,
> low-paying occupations, the unemployed, the bullied,
> the beaten, the battered, the ridiculed, the slandered,
> the trivialized, the raped and the sterilized: the lost
> millions of beautiful, creative and momentous lives
> turned to ashes on the pyre of gender identity.  I must
> look around me and, as a Black feminist, I must ask
> myself: *Where is the love?*  How is my own life work
> serving to end these tyrannies, these corrosions of
> sacred possibility?  How am I earning membership in our
> world-wide movement for self-determination and self-
> respect?... It is against such sorrow, such spiritual
> death, such deliberate strangulation of the loves of
> women, my sisters, and of powerless peoples--men and
> women--everywhere, that I work and live, now, as a
> feminist, trusting that I will learn to love myself
> well enough to love you (whoever you are), well enough
> so that you will love me well enough so that we know,
> exactly, where is the love: that it is here, between
> us, and growing stronger and growing stronger. (Jordan,
> 1990, pp. 175-176)

Jordan reminds me of that which I see lacking in the

reforms of teacher education at the end of the twentieth

century.  It was when I stopped putting the answers before

the questions that I came up with new questions.  Where is

the love?  Where is the loving presence?  How many of us

have our passions so well potted that we do not even speak

of love in teacher education?  In all that I read and all

that I hear in teacher education, nowhere but nowhere do I hear of love of humanity, love of justice, love of peace. Where is the love? It is not the sentimental and naive feeling that I am speaking of, but the kind of love that Jordan (1990), Freire (1968/1985), and hooks (1989, 1994) speak of. It takes a tenacity of the human spirit, against many odds, to connect to others/Others and to make a better world for *all* living beings. The implications for teacher education are as Cochran-Smith (1991) suggests, "teaching against the grain," as hooks (1994) suggests "living against the grain," (p. 26) and as I am suggesting, loving against the grain.

In this chapter I examined what was possible in a teacher education class taught with feminist imagination. I believe feminist imagination offers a new true reform for teacher education, a reform that is about loving presence and passion, creating the role of teacher educator as critical friend, unlearning, and teaching, living, and loving against the grain.

I have learned much about Piercy, her students, and myself. Yet, I have only revealed my own learning slightly in previous chapters. I experienced deep learning about the nature of feminism and my stance toward feminism during this study. In the next chapter, the epilogue, I tell how by studying Piercy I was able to look deeply into a mirror, a mirror that had shattered in some ways and has been

reforged, seeing the ways in which I had brought with me a
positivistic notion of feminism. I was able to re-vision
the feminism I had learned to embrace and move toward a more
fluid and dynamic feminist imagination. I uncover my own
learning as an integral part of learning about feminist
imagination in teacher education.

# CHAPTER XIV

## EPILOGUE: RE-VISIONING A FEMINISM AND MOVING TOWARD FEMINIST IMAGINATION

## Gaining Access to Difference and Commonality: Stretching the Personal, the Political, and the Pedagogical

> Say there's a mirror you have trusted to give you a
> solid unblemished surface reflecting the world then
> suddenly it breaks and shatters revealing a thousand
> new surfaces, miniature angles of seeing that must have
> been there all along hidden in the mirror's bland face
> *but you hadn't known.*
> Who *is*, who *was.*
> ...does it matter that our old selves are lost to us as
> surely as the past is lost, or is it enough to know yes
> we lived then, and we're living now, and the connection
> must be there?--like a river hundreds of miles long
> exists both at its source and at its mouth,
> simultaneously. (Oates, 1994, p. 179, emphasis in
> original)

> I did manage to understand something about my own
> assumptions, about feminism, and about the practice of
> conflict.... I was forced ... to think beyond easy
> polarities and to question the boundaries of identity
> politics.... In that context, conflict openly
> confronted, voiced directly and clearly on all sides,
> in good faith--was utterly and searingly illuminating,
> even, in retrospect, a source of pleasure.... But
> learning, through conflict, that my feminist experience
> is in so many respects different from others has
> cleared the ways for me to become part of the
> theoretical work which seems to me truer, more honest,
> less idealistic--if more difficult to formulate and
> agree on... Placing differences among women so
> centrally in the project of theorizing has its risks
> (obscuring commonalities, losing the power of
> consensus.)  Feminist movement is currently in a phase
> of reflectiveness.... (Hirsch, in Hirsch and Keller,
> 1990, pp. 384-385)

I learned much about Piercy, much about her students,

but just as important, I learned much about myself.  This is

just as much a story of my coming to re-vision what had been

a feminism to what is moving toward feminist imagination.

540

My gaining access to studying Piercy is an important piece of this story for it reveals who we were and the assumptions that we brought to feminism. When I first decided that I wanted to study "feminist pedagogy" I had a vision in my head of what a feminist teacher would be like. I knew I had preconceptions. That was self-evident. Any feminist scholar would admit to having biases and presentiments about what it means to be a feminist teacher.

Who was this person that I had in my head? She was an amalgam of all that I had read and what I had seen, a composite of the *ultimate* feminist, an expectation of a quintessential feminist teacher, one who would transform students' lives into understanding their oppression and their privilege. It would be a teacher who would *guarantee* that students would have continual epiphanies about the world and themselves. Although I would not have seriously considered the notion of "false consciousness," the notion of raising consciousness was part of my schema of a *good* feminist teacher. Early in my doctoral studies when I first thought of my dissertation, the title I chose was "Feminist Pedagogy as a Counter-hegemonic Strategy." This title reveals that I was thinking of a feminism and not about feminist imagination.

When I drafted my proposal I had the idea that the feminist teacher was the one who planted the seeds which would germinate successfully when the students were

receptive enough. When I thought about who this feminist
teacher was I thought of the people I had read or met, for
example, Kathleen Weiler's high school teachers (1988),
Magda Lewis (1990, 1989), Marilyn Frye (1883), bell hooks
(1989), Charlotte Bunch (1983), Barbara Hillyer Davis
(1983), and Adrienne Rich (1978). Now the trick was to find
someone like that to do my study with.

As my proposal unfolded into a second draft entitled
"The Journey of a Teacher Educator With a Feminist
Perspective," (1991) so did my notion of what could "count"
as feminist teaching, and therefore who could "count." I
injected the notion of a teacher educator with an "evolving"
feminist perspective. This "evolvement" meant that the
person could be grappling with issues. This broadened the
scope of possibilities. I laid out my research questions
neatly and then wrote:

> The above research questions will let me access the
> possibilities that a teacher education course with an
> emerging feminist perspective holds. Yet, I believe
> that teachers and students coming to a feminist
> perspective move along a continuum, not in a smooth and
> facile manner, but with starts and stops, and forward
> and backward movements. This perspective evolves over
> time for both the teacher and the students. Therefore
> concomitantly, the recognition needs to be made that a
> feminist perspective in a teacher education classroom
> will in all likelihood be accommodated, mediated,
> opposed, challenged, and/or rejected by the teacher and
> the students....(Hasbach, 1991)

Piercy came to mind when I thought of a teacher with an
"emerging" feminist perspective. As I spoke with Piercy
about my revised proposal, she also felt that she could be

the one I studied.  Earlier she had felt that she couldn't "count" as a feminist teacher, but as someone grappling with feminist issues she could.  Even though I had moved from a rigid conception of a feminist teacher who transformed others, I realize how I had created an image of the ideal feminist teacher that had little to do with the complexity and uniqueness of an individual woman.

Wallace's (1993-1994) report is important for it shows that of the 50 self-declared feminist teachers who were surveyed there wasn't a single method they all subscribed to.  "Julie Brown (1992) surveyed 50 respondents to a questionnaire to find out what common methods of feminist pedagogy were employed by self-proclaimed feminist professors and could find none" (p. 19).  This hints at the diversity within a group with feminist commitments.

In my proposal I was looking for the quintessential feminist teacher.  The whole point however, as I came to really understand it, is that there is not one.  This search for quintessentialism was also a search for positivistic models of feminism.

I would have argued against the sense of a monolithic feminism--yet my language was imbued with this notion: "I believe that teachers...coming to a *feminist perspective move along a continuum*, not in a smooth and facile manner, but with starts and stops, and forward and backward movements.  This perspective evolves over time for...the

teacher..." (emphasis added). I would have denied that I had a paragon of the perfect feminist in my head, yet my language revealed this.

It was also no accident that my proposal was entitled "The Journey of a Teacher Educator with a Feminist perspective." Journeys have destinations, and I felt there was a feminism to "get to." None of these assumptions I would have admitted to, for I knew better than to have assumptions like this. Yet, my own words tell of the assumptions about feminism that I was not even aware I had. They were so deep as to be almost invisible. My own arrogant presence was propelling me into a positivistic "arrival" mentality.

Piercy agreeing to work with me was fortunate, for the differences between us and who she was made me reconceptualize what feminism might mean in teacher education in general. We were kindred spirits in many ways, but we were different in others. Piercy's ways of being were also different from my unconscious vision of the ideal, that she compelled me to look at my unconscious vision. She held up a mirror for me and I looked in and saw that I had previously not honored each woman's unique historicity, identity, and context.

Brunner (1994) writes about examining the tain or underside of the mirror:

> We may examine the mirror reflection...without
> examining its underside or backside. Put another way,

we may not see through the looking glass, and even if
we do, who we see changes continually...feminist
inquiry seeks to reveal the political order within
relationships that perpetuate oppression. [Barbara
Eckstein]...sees the process more in terms of examining
the "tain of the mirror, the underside, the inside of
political structures housed in private homes and public
buildings." (Brunner, 1994, pp. 19-21)

Through my relationship with Piercy I was able to look at my
own ways of perpetuating oppression in the relationships I
had with other women in regard to feminism. The mirror was
not enough, for the reflection was not enough. I had to go
to the tain of the mirror that Piercy held up, and look at
the relationship that was reflected back, the relationship
that I was co-creating with my own arrogant presence.

However, through this research I have begun reinventing
myself and moved toward feminist imagination. Old images
have shattered and new ones have appeared through going to
the "tain of the mirror." I think the phrase "reinventing
oneself," even though it has become part of popular culture
it is still a worthy concept. Shouldn't a "true learner"
yearn for reinvention of the self?

My feminism has altered dramatically and moved toward
feminist imagination. This dissertation is not an expansion
of my proposal. On the contrary. It has, I believe, a
different tone, one that grew out of the data that I
collected. My dissertation in content and form seeks to
reject my own arrogant presence and move closer to loving
presence (in places I am sure I have not succeeded for
positivism still drives me in unanticipated ways). I hope

it will become part of the discourse in a community of
critical friends.  The concepts that I have conceived of in
this dissertation emerged from our search to learn about
feminist imagination.  I have truly learned what it means to
search with another and learn from a "we-search" and
therefore re-vision a theory.  What is delightful for me to
consider is that scholarship has the potential to confront
an assumptive life.

Piercy stated, "You can be defensive but not live a
defended life."  I think this is a powerful statement and I
have thought about it in terms of assumptions.  That is, you
can have assumptions but not lead an assumptive life.

Scholarship, learning, research, all have the
capacity to challenge those assumptions and help one to not
lead an assumptive life.  Echoes again of Daly's (1978)
"declaration to stop putting the answers before the
Questions" (p.xv) comes to mind.  This commitment helps stop
the assumptive life.  An assumptive life is a consumptive
life--that is, it consumes you.  When you aren't open, when
you close down, assumptions steal little parts of you--steal
little part of your openness.  An assumptive life is a life
full of walls not scaled.  Confronting one's own assumptions
is paramount.

Piercy always spoke about not reducing the complexities
to slogans or to essentialist arguments.  In retrospect, I
learned much from her struggling not to reduce the

complexities; I began to see the complexities within
feminisms that I had not before sincerely considered. I was
able to examine my own deep assumptions of what a teacher
educator who was a feminist "should" be like, and my own
deep assumption of there being an "ultimate" feminism to
achieve.

## Access to Difference: No Laughing Matter

> I had been unable then to speak of color and so I could
> not be a friend. Friendship and love grow out of
> recognizing and respecting differences. Strangers
> cover up. Color had been, for me, a sign of a
> stranger. I did not look in the eyes of strangers or
> dare to find out about their feelings. (Paley, 1989, p.
> 138)

Paley (1989) speaks about color being the basis for
creating a stranger. Yet in various contexts there are
assorted differences that we do not speak of, that can keep
us from looking into the eyes of a stranger and seeking to
find out about their feelings. From my experience and
readings academia is an institution which values certain
qualities, dispositions, abilities, and demeanor. This
demeanor is implicitly masculinist. Masculine ways of being
are seen as professional, scholarly, and professorial (Rich
1973-1974, 1977, 1984; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and
Tarule, 1986; Gearhart, 1983; Bunch, 1983, Torton Beck,
1983; Minnich, 1983). What is fascinating is the way in
which I had internalized these ways of being, although I
"knew better." I am reminded of Hollingsworth's (1990)

statement "We may think we know before we really know" (p. 16). That is, I knew that masculinist ways of being were equated with "high ability" (see Rosenbaum, 1986) in many different contexts, including academia. However, it was not until I worked with Piercy that I was able to confront my own assumptions of what is professional, scholarly, and professorial.

Rosenbaum says that we do not really know what ability is, therefore we look at signals of ability. These signals are created by those in power, and those definitions become how we define ability within a profession, within a career. Professions are full of "definitions belonging to the definers--not the defined" (Morrison, 1987, p. 190). Many professions have a male model of what is considered "professional" and who is considered able. Teaching, although dominated in numbers by women, still is seen through a male representation of what counts as a career. Strober and Tyack (1980) and Biklin (1985) confront some of the issues surrounding the male model of the profession of teaching. Being an academic in teacher education is not exempt from the male construction of what counts as "being able."

> It has been widely argued that schooling supports the
> dominance of men in society first by exaggerating
> those characteristics that distinguish male from female
> gender and then by gradually establishing success norms
> that favor males, linking their achievements and world
> view to ideologies that dominate both the economy and
> the state. (Grumet, 1988, p. 45)

For many people "honorary males" (Frye, 1990, private communication) are still seen as the best kind of female in academia, not letting those "feminine" qualities get in the way," and "thinking like a man" (Steinem, 1992). Even though the pressure to be an honorary male is not as strong as it was in the past, the remnants of what counts as scholarly and professorial remain to a large degree based on male prototypes.

As a teacher educator who considers herself a feminist, I should have exorcised these assumptions of what counts as professorial to begin with; however, I had not. It was when I saw Piercy deal with issues that I considered *dead* serious--issues of power and oppression--in a playful, humorous, and lighthearted way, nonetheless taking them seriously. I was forced to confront some of the assumptions I carried around about what counts as an academician teaching about equity and diversity.

In my own learning, grappling with constructs like equity and oppression had to begin with grappling with what gets defined as professional within a profession, and who does the defining. The assumption of who has created the university and who it is for is important to unearth. Universities were built for elite white men (see Veblen 1899/1994). Women were not welcome. Many reasons were cited in the nineteenth century for the opposition, including that women's ovaries would be in jeopardy with too

much education, and also that they would marry late or not at all (Sadker and Sadker, 1994). But as Sadker and Sadker (1994) go on to claim, "the real reason behind such strong opposition was that education was devalued as women were included. If a woman could do college-level work, then the whole system of higher learning became less prestigious and less exclusive" (p. 23). When they entered into the university it meant that they had to become masculinist in their perceptions and their imaginations in order to survive. Those that refused to, and there are always "outlaws" (Frye, 1990, private communication), those who chose to dwell on the fringes, were often ridiculed, ostracized, and seen as "difficult."[106] Although the ridicule, ostracism, and patronization are not as overt in the 1990s, the remnants of this hostile environment last, and just as importantly what counts as appropriate is internalized. We perpetuate "the appropriate" in unanticipated ways (see Gearhart, 1983). Freire's profound and poignant warning rings in my ears: the oppressed internalize their oppressors (1968/1985).

I needed to develop (and continue to develop) my own double vision and double consciousness for these help me to tackle my own deep assumptions, so deep that they seemed not like assumptions at all, rather they seemed like what is

---

[106] See Watson (1968) pp. 105-107 for his depiction of "Rosy," and Bleier's (1986, pp. 55-66) critique of his rendition of Rosalind Franklin.

"best," most "able," and most "appropriate." The problem
was not in admitting that I had a preconceived image. The
problem was I did not even know I had one. And later on in
the process, I knew I had one, but not just exactly what it
was. I was comparing what I saw, albeit often
unconsciously, to the ultimate feminist teacher educator.
Although Piercy's students were not grappling with the same
deep assumptions that I was, I was similar to them in that I
did not even know I had them.

What was it about Piercy that allowed me to dig deep at
my own assumptions? I am a serious person. I take things
seriously, *dead* seriously at times. I worked intimately
with a woman, learned with a woman, listened to and *heard* a
woman who was intrepid in confronting issues, even if they
were uncomfortable. She was a firebrand, yet with a
demeanor and carriage that was spritely, and when she was
not laughing outright her voice was imbued with laughter.
Laughter imbued voice and serious issues? The juxtaposition
set me aback.

Piercy liked to tease, tease her students, her
colleagues, and the people that she was close to. She loved
humor. She made jokes, and did not get personally affronted
by humor. For Piercy teasing was a form of connection to
her family and to her students. Piercy accepted her
students joking around and teasing each other for this meant
they were, as Piercy stated, "trying to make a connection,

letting themselves be there in a different kind of way."
Piercy also believed that jokes have the power to expose
issues for people to reconsider in light of the humor.

Although I love to laugh and, I think, I have a sense
of humor, I think there is very little "no harm humor"
(Michael Michell, 1993, private communication). I find
humor is often cruel and jokes are usually told at someone's
expense. They are also often exclusionary, those who don't
get it are out of the community. Piercy and I went round
and round on humor. I think in the end we tacitly agreed to
disagree. However, we listened to one another and I think
learned from one another.

Piercy's humor was an important facet of her
personality. It kept her from despairing, it kept her
laughing at the world and at herself. Humor was part of her
array of emotions that she experienced, part of her
passionate way of being. I need to remember that laughter
is a wonderful feminist tool. A bumper sticker comes to
mind, "She who laughs, lasts."

Why was Piercy's demeanor not somber and heavy and
serious? Because Piercy was delighted by life and teaching
and learning and students. She found gender issues
fascinating, she found complexity intriguing, not daunting.
It was the inherent ironies in life and learning that amused
Piercy to her core, ergo a laughter saturated voice and a
lighthearted being.

Piercy wrote to me in her journal of our differences. She began by addressing the concerns I had about what I read as the students having displayed "frivolity" and a "lack of seriousness" regarding issues of race, class, and gender:

> I keep hearing your concern about having "fun." I'm bothered by the judgement about frivolity and lack of seriousness. I think good classrooms and excellent teachers have a range of emotions--allow their students and themselves a range of emotions. I've cried in my classes in front of my students. I wonder if your concern comes from a concern for self-disclosure? Losing something?
>     I think some of the saddest issues are funny. It isn't wrong or diminishing to laugh or to cry for me. My Irish side likes to laugh and Italian side likes to cry. Responsiveness is important in my classroom and my life and my growth. (Inattentiveness is important too-part of attentiveness.)
>     Flat affect and monotones are deadly to me.
>     Do we value conflict, passion and argument over laughter, lightheartedness and calm in classrooms?
>     I enjoy the genuiness of my students--if they are feminist flip I try to understand their attitudes and challenge them--but it's important to know them for who they are and help them to want to grow. Valuing their own growth and understand the conditions of their growth so they can understand their own growth are important to me.
>     I think we value basically very different things in people, students, men. Maybe this is a basic difference. Maybe related to ethnic difference?
>     I feel different than most Anglo Saxon Protestants when it comes to emotional expression. I think I've accepted being ethnically different and value my ethnic difference and accepted my spiritedness the older I get. I think that men and women are denied their emotional expressions and that we don't always know how we deny this part of ourselves. Schools seem to be places where this happens--I guess I really believe that learning that is meaningful is "_fun_" and full of laughter.
>     Kohl uses a term called "guicio." I nearly fell flat when I read that it was an Italian word. The concept immediately made sense to me. He talks about the artificial divisions we make in schools--work and fun.... I think I grew up having fun with my mother. Did I ever tell you about her? She is brilliant-- graduated at 14, valedictorian of her class with full

scholarship to college. She had 5 kids instead. More later. (undated, Thursday, 10:00 p.m.)

I had had an image in my head about what a feminist professor was "supposed" to be like. What her classroom was "supposed" to be like. I had had an ideal in my mind. I went out in the field and I saw a different conception than matched my ideal. And so I had choices. I could judge what I saw as "not feminist enough," "not the right kind of feminism," "not the feminism that counts." Or I could take one important step in another direction and look in the tain of the mirror that was so fortunately held up for me. I asked myself, What lurks within me that wants to see a quintessential feminist? The answer, I think, is a positivistic arrogant presence. I had a fixed way of thinking about a feminist teacher educator and that there were dispositions that counted and ones that didn't. Humor was suspect; teasing was suspect; being able to take glee in gender, race, and class issues was suspect. In essence what counted was my own idealized version of what was feminist. This vision also got mixed in with what I had internalized as professorial and academic.

The way teacher educators are "supposed" to be is a myth that was created by a male centered academe (see Gearhart, 1983, Rich, 1973-1974). Teacher educators who are feminists are changing that. Yet that does not mean that I had left behind all my androcentric constructs. I am reminded of a description by Hill (1990) of morning doves

and mourning doves:

> For years I thought mourning doves were morning doves,
> and when I learned their song was supposed to be about
> endings rather than beginnings, it seemed haunting in a
> new way. I've kept the "morning" in my mind though,
> too, and I listen now with a different sort of
> alertness...being able to let old understandings double
> over new ones, the doubling giving us a richer sense of
> how things can begin and end...But there is also
> talk...about the mental and emotional turbulence that
> often comes when one meets foreign feeling others, when
> some other person, idea, or culture bumps into one's
> own habits of understanding in a life world. Central
> belief systems--more tenacious than beliefs about
> doves--can get shaken, moats get build around them, and
> a dead space so easily set in place...a decision to
> bring one's mind out of that dead space, to the margin
> between self and other, old ideas and new. There one
> can...create different kinds of spaces, live at the
> risky critical edges between one's own values and those
> of [the] other.... (Hill, 1990, p. vii)

In my feminist imagination there are old understandings
and new ones coexisting. I could not just discard what I
had understood previously (for many years I might add), for
it remained steadfast in complicated ways. For Hill, this
sense of doubling over helps her understand more. Yet, I
wonder for how many of us this new knowledge meshes easily
with the previous knowledge? Or are there remnants of the
old ways nestled in our minds? Hill does caution us that
central belief systems are tenacious, and so I am left
asking, What happens to the remnants of those old belief
systems? Do we all have our morning/mourning doves, old
androcentric constructs that can bind us if we do not push
ourselves out of the dead space?

Pushing my mind out of dead spaces was (is) not an easy
task. These constructs were (are) so deeply imprinted in my

mind that even when I knew (know) something different, the old knowledge seeped (seeps) back in. For me it was (is) not as positive as "the doubling giving us a richer sense of how things can begin and end." Instead, it locked (locks) me in rooms that I didn't (don't) want to be in. I want/ed to see women differently, I want/ed to regard them differently, I want/ed to see academicians who are women differently, and yet I have my "morning/mourning doves" coexisting and clashing at times. As a teacher educator who has feminist imagination I try to discard "the myths that bind me." I know that it will be a continual struggle to battle the myths that I still unconsciously buy into.

Piercy allowed me to think about one woman teacher educator with a particular kind of feminist imagination. However, by being who she was, she asked me to rethink the ways in which I think of myself, my students, and the knowledge which we construct together.

When I studied Piercy I had already changed dramatically my assumption that gender, race, class, or sexuality guaranteed politics. For example, I no longer had the romantic and sentimental notion that just because someone was a woman they wanted what was best for women. However, what Piercy helped me to understand more fully is that someone's history and situatedness impacts the way they interact. There is so much that contributes to the way that someone sees the world. Piercy found this all fascinating.

Piercy explained the complexity as she saw it in relation to
women and men working together on issues:

> If we are judging all men as discounting, then we are
> discounting them as we are accusing them of
> discounting.  To read individual men for their
> intentions and what they do to women rather than to see
> them all as oppressors I guess is the issue I think is
> really important, because I really do hope at least at
> this time that there are some men that really don't buy
> into this, and that are beginning to see, let's put it
> that way, just as we are, and that they need to be our
> allies in changing things.  And there are a lot of
> women that don't see it and buy into it.  There are
> some women that buy into it and go along with it and
> they are not our allies, they are not our enemies
> either.  I think that is very individual and that as
> long we are realizing what is happening and we are
> changing and we are real aware, I like your term of
> "appeasing the oppressor," if we are conscious this is
> where I really think is the solution, words to [help
> us] understand the realities that could be happening
> and that go unnoticed.  And that if we are always
> monitoring when that is happening, standing up when we
> think it is, then it doesn't have to happen at the
> minute.  It can be part of an ongoing kind of
> relationship.  I do think some men do deserve some
> slack because they are attempting to grow and they are
> conscious when they slip, rather than trying to be all
> knowing, and to be perceptive and if they don't
> understand what they said, to tell them, not to back
> off from that.  And when they do understand it, I do
> think you can go overboard.  I think that is what you
> do when you have been oppressed, that you can over
> respond and you can do things that are destructive,
> rather than helpful.

Piercy taught me to see the complexity of the
individual with/in the social constructions.  In her unique
and individual way of being, she asked me to confront my own
mourning/morning doves.  I wonder if they will fly the coop,
or are they trapped within the recesses of my mind so deeply
that I don't even know which dove is which?  I think I have
let some free.  Others however remain.

Piercy was intrigued with people, fascinated by them, even when they did not share her own political outlooks. This allowed her to be open to learning from people in ways others who are closed could not. She taught me to battle against my own arrogant presence, dismissing those who do not share my personal, pedagogical, or political beliefs.

For Piercy teaching and learning was fun. It was all like a puzzle for her. She kept trying to figure people out, with wonder, a wonder that accepted "the complexity of the other as something which will forever present new things to be known" (Frye, 1983, p. 76). She taught me to dig deeper and deeper into the endless complexity that exists within one life and bespeaks the endless complexity of teaching and learning.

Piercy had qualities that seemed contradictory. That is, she was self-effacing, and projected a tentativeness and hesitancy in her stance. Yet, she had intrepid self-confidence and "spirited vulnerability." She also had a clear vision for the future. Piercy and I spoke about this self-effacement after the first class session. I told her that I was struck by her openness and being up front about who she was and what she believed in. She asked:

Piercy: Did you sense the self-effacing?

Corinna: Humorously yeah, humorously I did. I wrote "theme of humor." You call it self-effacing but there's that undertone of you don't really believe it. Do you know what I mean? It's not like you really denigrate yourself. It's an interesting mixture. I saw it as humor.

Piercy: I don't think I disrespect myself.

Corinna: No not at all.

Piercy: I tease myself, make fun of myself.

These seemingly competing dispositions arose from her
paradigm of knowledge. Reality and truth cannot be
completely known, therefore she would not take an
authoritarian stance in her classroom. Knowledge was
offered up in dialogue, and she was willing to acknowledge
her own fallibility, yet not in a self-denigrating manner.

I am reminded of Peggy McIntosh's essays (1985, 1989)
"Feeling Like a Fraud" and "Feeling Like a Fraud: Part Two."
McIntosh (1985) talks about women and the ways in which they
interact in institutions:

> Many people--especially women--experience feelings of
> fraudulence ... these ... feelings also may indicate a
> wise reluctance to believe in the accuracy of absolute
> ranking, and may point the way to a valid critique of
> hierarchical structures. Apology and self-
> disparagement may indicate an honest refusal to
> internalize the idea that having power or public
> exposure proves one's merit and/or authority.
> Apologetic or hedging speech may indicate an uneasiness
> with rhetorical or coercive forms of speech and
> behavior, and may signal a desire to find more
> collaborative forms. (McIntosh, 1985, abstract)

Piercy was well aware of how power is not meted out in
a meritocratic fashion. Since Piercy believed in a
constructivist theory of knowledge, her speech patterns
undermined the often expected role of teacher as deliverer
of TRUTH. By studying her I was able to work on rejecting
my own tendency to KNOW TRUTH with a certitude that
undermines my own constructivist and feminist knowledge

paradigms.

We thought differently about many issues, such as humor, yet we continued to push each other's thinking. We listened to one another and as critical friends we unlearned some of the ways of thinking that we had internalized and moved to richer and deeper learnings. We did so by weaving in and out of the political, the personal, and the pedagogical. Our particular ways of responding to something as "simple" as humor was important to our pedagogy for it affected the ways we saw ourselves in the world. In our conversations we insisted on inserting ourselves, our personal and pedagogical lives, each informing and undergirding the other (see Grumet, 1988 for her discussion of the personal and the curricular). When we discussed the personal or the political the link always returned to the pedagogical.

Piercy was aware of her own situatedness and privilege and I had been aware of my own. However, she helped me understand that even beyond the social constructions of gender, race, class, and sexual identity, a person's identity is a relational one and it is negotiated and renegotiated and reinvented within relationships.

Piercy was different in tone and action from many other teacher educators with feminist imaginations, including myself. This is not good, bad, or indifferent. Yet, had I studied someone very much like myself, I would have learned

about feminism, but I do not believe I would necessarily
have been challenged to the point of having to confront my
deepest assumptions. Our differences probably more than our
commonalities allowed me to re-vision feminism. Feminism is
no longer an "IT" for me. Rather feminism means different
things to different people depending on contextual,
personal, political, and pedagogical realities. It is ever-
changing and dynamic. I can no longer think of a feminist
teacher educator, rather I think of a woman teacher educator
with feminist imagination. A simple semantic difference
that individualizes and acknowledges the uniqueness of the
woman behind the teaching, the ideas, and the life. This
does not suggest that there are not threads that connect
women who consider themselves feminists, but it is as
important to tease out the differences as it is to unite on
the commonalities.

### "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall, Who is the Fairest (Best, Most Liberated....) Feminist of All?": Will the *Real* Feminist Please Stand Up?

Piercy defined herself and her feminism relationally.
Piercy valued, loved, enjoyed feminist work and feminist
writing. She was a self-declared feminist but never
categorized herself as a particular brand of feminist. From
listening to her and watching her, feminism for Piercy was a
stance, a way of being in the world a connectedness to
others, being a critical friend, and being lovingly present.
Yet it was not a naive or sentimental way of being; rather,

she was willing to pierce through the rhetoric, willing to

be the kind of person who fostered growth in her students

and pushed their thinking. Piercy stated one month before

the end of the semester:

> I think you can understand it all only when you begin
> to share it, then you really do have this dual
> ownership of a classroom. You cannot do it by yourself.
> I think that is the beauty of the feminist perspective,
> you can talk about this gender bias till you are
> purple, but until you hold that [feminist] perspective,
> it doesn't happen, I don't think. It really is a way
> of thinking about yourself and your existence and you
> can't distance yourself and make a difference.

Yet it seemed that some of the feminists at Atwood have

fallen through the trap door of judging her "not feminist

enough." Near the end of the semester Piercy reported:

> I am seen as conservative. I am married and my husband
> is a department chairperson, but they also see me as a
> bridge, but educators are suspect. You know I told you
> about the feminist group and I feel excluded from them
> quite a bit and I don't always feel valued and yet feel
> valued on some level, that I don't quite understand.

The women that Piercy collaborated with seemed to have

also bought into the hierarchical system. This hierarchy

affects how they judged education ("education is suspect")

and they judged other feminists. In this pyramid some

people get to count as real feminists, strong enough

feminists, and others do not. As McIntosh (1983, 1990)

reminds us in any hierarchy/pyramid there is a lot less room

at the top. These feminists were Piercy's intellectual

community and yet there was this sense that she was "not

feminist enough" for them. They saw her as being

conservative, in part because of her identities and

relationships (i.e., married). This is important, for they seem to have fallen through the same trap door as I had, labeling another as deficient in the feminist department misses potential learning. It is important for them and for me to remember that many feminists are working for similar things in different ways.

It is all too easy to judge the other/Other as wanting. So much stretching of our own imagination is missed when we arrogantly present ourselves and dismiss others. Arrogant presence is alive within the feminist community. How deep does this arrogant presence reside? I did not even recognize it because it was lodged deep within me and came out in subtle and not so subtle ways. I dismissed those that I did not think were *real* enough feminists. This suggests to me that embracing what McIntosh (1985) suggests would come closer to loving presence and learning from others/Others, "We <u>need</u> the tentativeness in high places.... We need that conversation, that ability to listen, to have a nonrhetorical, a relational self" (p. 9).

Ironically, feminism holds explicitly the tenet that a woman should be able to come to a sense of her self and seek and write her own truths. As Laird (1988) writes, "'Democratic' and 'passionate' qualities are often cited as characteristic of feminist pedagogy, which aims for a woman's 'sense of her self,' for women's learning to 'seek and write their own truths'" (p. 451). Yet within me there

was a definitive and ultimate feminism that we should all be
aspiring to.  And herein lies arrogant presence.

What has evolved as a new dilemma for me is how do
teacher educators with feminist imaginations develop a
coherent vision for teacher education given the differences
among us?  This was not a dilemma I entered the study with.
I had believed (albeit unconsciously) that there was a
feminism that we should all be aspiring to, the differences
between us would not obstruct the goal of a coherent vision.
Part of what I learned about Piercy and myself is that who
we were and what we did were so intertwined.  We did things
differently in part because of who we were and how we saw
the world; we saw things radically different because of our
psychological, philosophical, spiritual, and intellectual
predilections.

Yet, there were commonalities between us; we wanted
social justice for all.  We wanted an educational
environment that was anti-sexist, anti-racist, anti-
classist, and anti-heterosexist.  We wanted a classroom
where students could stretch beyond their own experiences
and develop care and compassion for those who are oppressed.
We wanted a classroom where those with privilege come to
understand their privilege and work against oppressing
others.  We wanted a classroom where those who were
oppressed came to understand the ways in which oppression is
not only about individual acts of discrimination or

brutality, but is also about invisible systems that create subordination for some and domination for others. We wanted students to unlearn the myths that bound them and obscured their visions. We wanted a classroom where as future teachers these students would, with all their hearts and minds, embrace knowledge about equity and inequity so that they would not be part of the perpetuation of institutional sexism, racism, classism, or homophobia. We wanted the students to see themselves as advocates for the students they would be teaching. We wanted a safe enough place where students were able to talk about their passions and indifference, and to help all understand where these came from. We wanted a place where students could learn to speak up and out so that they could be vocal change agents. We wanted the students to be able to grapple and struggle with the complexities of teaching and learning, yet not be paralyzed into inaction. We wanted a community of critical friends to be developed where women and men feel as if their lives were honored, yet were pushed to stretch beyond themselves to imagine a world in which inequity and equity are seriously and consistently addressed in all realms, especially in education.

Given differences and commonalities, the quest then becomes to discover if there could be enough commonalities, similar to the ones Piercy and I had, that a cohering vision for teacher education with feminist imagination could be

developed?  What this suggests to me is that we need to
study many people who are struggling with these issues in
teacher education in multiple contexts.  I believe this
could add much to teacher education.

I learned through my relationships with all the
participants in the study.  However, the relationship that I
had with Piercy was very different than the one I had with
the students I studied.  In part, because of my own
positionality in the study.

### Learning Through Relationships and My Position Vis a Vis Students

As I reflect on my relationships with the students in
Piercy's class, I realize that it was of a completely
different nature than I had with Piercy.  I was more distant
and detached from them, not allowing them to understand me
and my beliefs more fully, or I theirs.  Because I had a
deeper more connected relationship with Piercy there was an
inevitable privileging of her thoughts, perspectives, and
reflections.  I tried harder to see things from her
position.  This in part grew out of the length of time we
spent together, but also because of the way in which I
situated myself in relation to her as compared to the
students.  There were times where when I read over my
analyses and it felt like I was doing research *on* and *about*
the students, rather than how, even in hindsight, I feel as
if I did research *with* and *for* Piercy.  If I knew then what

I know now, I think I would have attempted to fashion a different kind of connection with the students. Yet I am not completely convinced of this, for as I read over the transcripts of what the students responded to the question of how my presence affected the class, they responded with comments that seemed to suggest that "my lack of presence" made me less distracting and intrusive (see more details in Appendix H). As Ellen explained when I asked her why my presence did not seem to affect the class, "Um I dunno, I just I, maybe it's your personality, maybe it's, I think everybody just feels really comfortable." And Tasha explained when I asked whether my presence affected the class:

> I don't think it does because I really don't notice you
> there. Because it is not like you make a lot of
> commotion or anything. You are there but you are not
> there. And plus, you were introduced like everybody
> else. So, it was like you were made a part of the
> class. You are not like somebody doing a research
> [project], just there to eavesdrop on us or anything.

When I asked Michelle the same question she stated no also. When I asked her to explain she stated: "Because I think everybody is very used to you being there and I think they feel comfortable with you. And once one got used to the camera and tape recorders it's not really noticed anymore. It's just become part of the class."

In some ways I think that by not revealing myself fully for what I thought and felt the students experienced me more as a friendly "outsider" whom they could tell things to,

without feeling that they needed to censor themselves as much as they might have had to if they had known my political, pedagogical, ethical, and philosophical stances. It would have ended up being a very different dissertation if I had connected with them on a different level than I did. Not necessarily better or worse, just different.

Piercy had encouraged me early on to co-teach with her. But I was uncomfortable with that, feeling that there might have been too much of an overlap in my role as a teacher and my role as a researcher. Yet perhaps the educative role that I would have played may have changed the classroom dynamics in a positive way. It is hard to speculate what would have been gained and what would have been lost. But one thing is for sure there would have been gains and losses, as there are in any methodological decision.

I gained so much from the search I did into feminist imagination in teacher education. I entered into Piercy's classroom and learned about her, her students, and myself. I also learned about what it means to try to paint a room in the house that feminist imagination builds.

## Imagining New Rooms in the House Where Feminists Reside

Virginia Woolf (1929) declared that a woman needs a room of her own. Many theories have built a women's room off to the side (see Firestone, 1972). The taking into account of women's experience and knowledge is an add-on.

What I am suggesting is that the house that feminist imaginations build is a house in which feminists and profeminists wander around, paintbrushes in hand and paint those spots which have been and will be left unpainted.

This is a house painted by a community of critical friends; some of the people we share this house with we have not even encountered yet. We may share rooms or have a room of our own, but the rooms form a new kind of house, a new kind of structure that has open doors, open windows, and keys of many shapes, sizes, and configurations.

However, the upkeep is never ending, the rooms keep changing size and shape, and people enter and exit (but with a paintbrush in hand). The task is to build a house that is inviting and lets all sorts of critical friends into it where friends warn each other of the trap doors and help shatter the glass ceilings.

Arrogant presence will keep us from allowing new rooms to be constructed, rooms that may seem odd in shape, size, or utility. Arrogant presence will keep us imprisoned, afraid to venture outside this particular house, agoraphobic. Afraid to be out in open spaces--learning in and from new contexts, afraid to show spirited vulnerability, afraid to become critical friends.

Lorde (1983) warns us that "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (p. 99). Is arrogant presence part of the master's tools that could dismantle the

house that feminist imagination builds?  I believe it is.
And so those with feminist imaginations need to resist their
own tendency toward arrogant presence.  And also to resist
the tendency to use the concept of arrogant presence in the
service of dismissal.  That is, dismissing others/Others who
are deemed to be arrogantly present.  The task, instead,
needs to be to move all of us toward loving presence and
critical friendship.

Issues of oppression and privilege evoke fear and
loathing in some.  The walls surrounding the garden need to
be scaled.  As Piercy reminded us, it is alright to have
barriers, defenses, but it is not alright to live a defended
life or to keep a defensive theory.  As human beings having
defenses is natural, a coping mechanism.  Yet it is when
those defenses keep us from learning and growing that it
becomes grievous.  By living a defended life, keeping a
defensive theory, I mean tenaciously keeping out new
knowledge that might challenge existing knowledge, or as
Hill (1990) might analogize, never acknowledging the
mourning doves.  I add it is all right to have assumptions
but not all right to live an assumptive life and maintain an
assumptive theory.

I imagine a new kind of criticalness, a criticalness
that is borne of a community of critical friends.  As
scholars we can be a community of critical friends, each
with our own paintbrush helping one another paint in those

spots. As teacher educators we can develop communities of critical friends where arrogant presence is replaced by loving presence. As teachers we can help our students seek out loving presence so that they can help develop a community of critical friends in teacher education. This is what I imagine, this is the house that feminist imagination builds. One that is developed by loving presence.

The room that I invited you into still has unpainted spots. Will you berate me for the missing spots? Will you tell me I missed the spots, pointing them out? I hope instead you will help me paint the room. Please pick up the paint brush and help me paint this room, those missed spots may be the ones _you_ are most capable of painting in, with _your_ knowledge, wisdom, and insight. I imagine that the painting will never end, for that room will never be quite the right color, or not color-full enough, it will never be quite the right texture and will never have all the spots painted in. There are spots we have not even yet noticed, for we are products of our culture, our history and our paradigms. But as long as we all hold paintbrushes and are motivated by loving presence--no matter how many rooms need to be painted it will be painted together, by a community of critical _friends_.

# APPENDICES

Syllabus for Educational Foundations
Winter 1992

Piercy Sand, Ph.D.
Schaeffer Education Center
Office Phone:
Office hours: Mon.-Fri. 11-12:00 and by appointment

Program Description

The Atwood College Teacher Education Program prepares
teachers competent in subject matter disciplines and in
their ability to help their students in the pursuit of
personal, intellectual and social growth and responsibility.
Given this goal, the purpose of the foundations course is to
sensitize students to critical issues in the field of
education from a broad interdisciplinary viewpoint. The
scope of topics is organized to give a preservice teacher
and understanding of important ideas and issues that the
community of scholars in education have identified as
important for improving schools and society. As a beginning
course students will observe and discuss impacts of social
context on students within schools as a springboard for
proceeding courses. Assignments will become a part of an
on-going professional portfolio that enable students to
assess strengths and continued growth as a prospective
teacher.

Course Descriptions

This course builds a foundation for students in the
Atwood College Teacher Education Program by emphasizing
social, political, ethical, philosophical and personal
issues in education. As such, recommended readings will
emphasize breadth by exposing students to many current
issues.
In addition to breadth, course lectures and small group
discussions will emphasize in depth an examination of the
relationship between school and society. Issues such as
social justice, social class, gender, ethnicity and equity
will be the focus of our discussions, paper assignments and
students' fieldwork on an on-going basis as we observe and
reflect on situations in the classroom

Course Goals

This course will expose students to a variety of issues
in order to help them to articulate stances and know how to

critically analyze issues in education. As such the following objectives address content, process and attitudes.

Content objectives:
1. Students will synthesize and evaluate current issues described in Part I, II, III. (See section labeled Critical Issues.)
2. Students will apply specific concepts and identify equitable social relationships, interaction patterns and assumptions within field sites.

Process objectives:
1. Students will understand how to analyze concepts such as non sex-biased teaching and apply these concepts to experiences in the field.
2. Students will understand how to critically analyze both written and spoken texts.
3. Students will learn how to articulate positions orally and in written texts through collaborative group work.

Attitude objectives:
1. Students will explain their thinking about the purposes of schooling by writing a philosophy statement.
2. Students will self-assess their interest and awareness of critical issues by observing and reflecting on the required text and field experiences. (p. 2).

**Required texts**

> **Foundations of Education** by Ornstein/Levine
> **Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality** by Jeannie Oakes
> **School and Society** by Feinberg and Soltis

**Requirements**
1. 25% Class Participation and Collaboration
2. 25% Three papers
3. 25% Professional Reflections
4. 25% Midterm and Final Exams
(See Evaluation Criteria Sheet at the end of this syllabus and Assignment Description Sheets to be handed out in class for further detail.)

**Critical Issues-Course Schedule**

Part I  Unlocking the Tradition
        You will identity issues that you see as critically important and then we will begin our discussions by examining current issues that scholars have identified as critical for improving education in the 1990s. Jeannie Oakes is one example of many scholars who identify tracking as the

root of many problems in education today. We will begin by
defining tracking and examining the gulf between the intent
and the effects of tracking in classrooms today. Finally,
the status of the teaching profession, conditions in the
classroom and teacher autonomy today will be explored in
light of this problem.

Jan. 14 Introduction "Your concerns and Burning Issues"
    16 Hasbach paper- (handed out in class)
Authors: Ornstein/Levine               Jeannie Oakes
Jan. 21 & 23 Chapter 1 Professionalism   Ch. 1 Tracking

*Jan. 28 & 30 Chapter 6 Philosophies       2. Unlocking
                                              Tradition
                                           3. 25 Schools
                                           (skim ch. 3)


Part II Taking a Closer Look
    The inequities that are uncovered in the historical
analysis of tracking are further exposed in a study of 25
schools where Jeannie Oakes compares contemporary high track
and low track classes. Differences in distribution of
knowledge, opportunities to learn and classroom atmosphere
are described as embodying a hidden curriculum. The hidden
curriculum is based on different purposes for schooling,
i.e., low track students are trained for low track jobs
while high track students are educated for high track jobs.
As such, differences in classroom culture socialization for
students of different social classes, races and gender are
questioned. The principle of equal opportunity as it plays
an important role in functionalist theories is questioned
and social reproduction is described as a result of unequal
opportunities.

Feb.  4&6  Chapter 10, Culture, Socialization  4
Distribution
*Feb. 11&13 Chapter 11 Social Class, Race        5 Opportunity
Feb. 18& 20 Chapter 12 Equal Opportunity         6 Climate
* Feb. 25 Midterm
Feb. 27 Hasbach (paper handed out in class)
* Mar. 3&6 Cost of Sex Bias in Schools           7 Attitudes

Part III Where do we go from here?
    Current thinking about educational reforms are
examined. We begin by questioning the legality of treating
some students so much better than others. We revisit the
hidden curriculum and the costs of sex biases in schools as
a springboard to explore reforms in education. Nonsexist
teaching and reinterpretations of the meaning and messages
communicated to students is examined. Adequate
understanding of the student's total environment is

advocated rather than an examination of the isolated
features such as social class, homelife, race, gender or
ethnicity. Finally, we question our own perspectives on
what we believe are the aims of schooling in order to
understand out own biases and standards of judgment for
improving schools.

Mar. 17&18 Nonsexist teaching            8&9 Voc. Ed.
                                         Constitutional
                                         Questions

                                         Feinberg/Soltis:
*Mar. 31 & April 2
    Ch. 14 Curriculum & Instruction      Ch. 1-3 Perspectives

*Apr. 7&9 Ch. 15 School Effectiveness and Reform  4-5
Cultural
Reproduction

Part IV Articulating your philosophy
    The acceptance of inequity in education can be
explained through an examination of the common practice of
elitist grouping throughout the origins of our educational
heritage. The roots of tracking are traced to practices in
ancient Greek and Roman civilizations, medieval times,
Renaissance, and the reformation period. We examine the
role of women during these periods and during the historical
development of American education. We will examine the
arguments that describe the purpose of schooling as
massification rather than education during the colonial
period and describe women's roles as teachers in
acculturating the large influx of immigrants into the
country during this period. By examining values of
educators in the past we can better articulate our own
philosophies of education.

*April 14&16 Chapter 3&4                 6-7 Functions of
Schools

April 21 (Editing session--bring first draft of your
philosophy of Education paper to class)
!!!!!! No journal, rewrites or late papers will be accepted
after 4:00 pm on April 21

April 23 no class

April 28&30 Review for final--Jigsaw  (Paper III due.)

May 5 Final Exam

        Course Daily Schedule:
Tuesday

1. Your questions and discussion (15 min.)
2. Lecture/discussion (30 min.)
3. Jigsaw (45 min.)

Thursday
1. Journal reading and peer feedback on field observations (30 min.)
2. Videotape observation and analyses (45 min.)
3. Small group discussion (15 min.)
4. Field observations for next week (15 min.)

## Educational Foundation
## Evaluation Criteria

Name_____

Class Participation    25%

1. Content
2. Consistency

Total_____

_____

Papers  25%
1. Gender within Disciplinary major
2. Purposes of Schooling
3. Philosophy paper
(Each paper will be evaluated for content and mechanics
using the Diedrich system handed out in class.)

Total_____

_____

Professional Reflections    25%
1. Clarity of descriptions of classroom observations
2. Clear statements of opinions and judgements
3. Explanation of reasons for statements and opinions
4. Assumptions undergirding opinions
        References or connections to course readings

Total_____

_____

Exams  25%
1. Midterm 10%
2. Final 15%

Total_____

_____

Aggregate Total_____
Course Grade_____

All assignments must be handed in on time to receive full
credit.  One grade point per day will be subtracted for each
day that a paper is handed in late.

## Professional Reflections

The purpose of writing your reflections is to give you and me a clearer idea of how and what you are thinking about the teaching profession. Thoughts about students and learning, reflections of your opinions and judgments, critical questions,a nd an understanding of why you think and believe as you do are critical for your success as a teacher.

In your written reflections you may keep and on-going record of what you see and do in your classroom and notes about a particular student that you and your teacher select--a child who is culturally different from you. Part of your journal will be samples of dialogue in the classroom with your analysis of the messages that are communicated to students about the purposes of school. teacher and student roles, value of learning, reading and writing etc. Professional reflections will be graded as follows:

1.0 Clear description of teacher and student interactions.

2.0 What do I value and/or devalue that I have seen? What kinds of things will I do as a teacher that are alike or different than what I have seen?

3.0 Why do I think this (the above) is important? What effect    does what you have described have on students and their growth? Explain your reasoning in depth.

4.0 What belief about schools, learning and teaching is this opinion based on? Clearly explain the concepts and the connection of these concepts to your classroom observations.

This format is just a guide, it is not meant as template that you have to fill out each week. We will be observing a videotape in class and practicing how to observe and reflect about teaching in class. Your journal will be your on-going record of your observations in the field, value statements and reflections on why you think as you do about issues that we cover each week.

You reflections should be written at least once a week immediately after field observations and readings on looseleaf paper and handed in during the weeks designated on the course schedule. I have indicated dates on your schedule with and asterisk (*). A total of ten entries are required for the semester. You may hand in no more than two journal entries on the dates indicated. reflections are meant to be informal so that mechanics do not count, however the quality and quantity of the contents of the journal is critical.

## FIELD ASSIGNMENT: GENDER

This assignment requires at least two observation
periods. Its purpose is to see if an patterns of
gender bias exist in the classrooms and schools where
you observe. it consists of several activities.

### 1. Classroom
#### a. Seating
Draw a seating chart of the classroom. Are
students sex segregated, sex clustered, or integrated
so their is no discernable pattern?

Ask the teacher about his or her policy for
seating (e.g., sit where they want, move the trouble
makers, by reading groups, etc.).

Watch to see what patterns of student-student
interactions occur because of the seating arrangements
(e.g., boys may talk or work with boys, etc.).

Draw out seating charts for smaller activities
like reading groups or times when students come up and
sit one the floor next to the teacher. Are these
patterns similar or different from the ones above? Are
the student-student interactions similar or different?

#### b. Displays
Carefully examine the displays on the bulletin
boards. How are males and females portrayed? Is there
an alphabet in the room? Does it have pictorial
symbols for various letters? Is student work
displayed? What about sentences the teacher writes on
the board? What messages are sent about roles? Are
there any affirmative displays?

#### c. Language
Is the generic "he" or "man" used by the teacher
or students? What language forms appear in the posters
or displays?

#### d. Task Allocation
Who gets to carry out various classroom jobs
(e.g., washing the chalkboard, passing out books,
taking lunch money or attendance down tot he office,
etc.)? Consider both the formal allocation of tasks
(e.g., by a chart usually rotated weekly) and the
informal allocation of tasks (e.g., when a table has to
be moved, who does the teacher call on? When a word
has to be read out of the dictionary, who gets to do
it?, etc.).

### e. Teacher-Student Interaction

Watch a range of settings (teacher-whole class; teacher circulating to help individual students; teacher working with a small group, perhaps a reading group) to see how she or he interacts with and what the quality of those interactions are. You should start by counting the interactions between the teacher sand boys and the teacher and girls. Then try to get more fine grained by noting the types of questions or responses (e.g., open-ended for males, information for females) and the type of evaluative feedback were given.

Remember to watch for different questioning strategies. Does the teacher let students call out answers? Volunteer by raising their hands? Or does she or eh call on students? What are the patterns that emerge from different strategies?

Does the teacher organize activities around gender? If so, in what areas and how do students respond (e.g., boys against the girls in a spelling bee, math contest, etc.)?

### f. Discipline

Who gets disciplined more , males or females? Are there examples of differential treatment (e.g., males told to be quiet but females allowed to talk to each other)? Does the teacher keep and eye on certain students and move around quickly to a management strategy with them than for others?

### g. Quality of Content

Sometimes discipline becomes a problem in a classroom at a time when little or no content is being taught. How does that work in you classroom? Content may be taught beautifully but only to some children. What is your perception of the content being taught and who gets most of it, boys or girls?

### 2. Hallways

Follow your class down the hall as they go to another activity (e.g., lunch or recess). How do they line up? What are the interactions in the line?

Walk around the building and look at displays. What messages are being sent about gender roles and opportunities?

### 3. Cafeteria

If possible, observe your class at lunch. Where do they sit? What are the patterns of interaction? How do these compare with what you saw in the classroom? (If you can't observe your classroom, watch other classes and address these first two questions.)

## 4. Playground

Watch your class on the playground. Who occupies what space? What games are played? What skills do these games teach for later life? Under what conditions do the genders interact? What is the quality of those interactions?

## 5. Library

Go to the biography and sports sections and randomly sample to see how many books are about males and females. When were some of them published? Is this librarian aware of any imbalances? What is he or she doing about them?

## 6. Personnel

Is the principal of your school a male or female? How many male or female teachers are on the staff? How about the custodians and cafeteria workers? What messages might students get from the patterns you have observed?

"What Should I Tell My Children Who Are Black" by Margaret
Burroughs

What should I tell my children who are black
Of what it means to be a captive of this dark skin?
What shall I tell my dear one, fruit of womb,
Of how beautiful they are when everywhere they turn
they
Are faced with the abhorrence of everything that is
black.
The night is black and so is the bogeyman.
Villains are black with black hearts.
A black cow gives no milk.
A black hen lays no eggs.
Bad news comes bordered in black, mourning clothes are
black.
Storm clouds are black, and devil's food is black.
What shall I tell my dear ones raised in a white world.
A place where white has been made to represent
all that is good and pure and fine and decent.
Where clouds are white and dolls, and heaven
surely is a white, white place with angels
robed in white, and cotton candy and ice cream
and mild and ruffled Sunday dresses
and dream houses and long sleek Cadillacs
and angel's food is white...all...all...white.

What can I say therefore, when my child comes home in
tears because a playmate has called him black, big-
lipped, flat-nosed, and nappy headed?  What will he
think when I dry his tears and whisper "Yes, that's
true but no less beautiful and dear."

How shall I lift up his head, get him to square his
shoulders, look his adversaries in the eye, confident
in the knowledge of his worth, serene under his sable
skin and proud of his own beauty.

What can I do to give him strength that he may come
through life's adversities as a whole human being
unwrapped and human in a world of biased laws and
inhuman practices, that he might survive.  And survive
he must! For who knows?  Perhaps this black child here
bears the genius to discover the cure for..... cancer
or to chart the course for exploration of the universe.
So, he must survive for the good of all humanity.  He
must and will survive.

I have drunk deeply of late from the fountain of my black culture, sat at the knee and learned from Mother Africa, discovered the truth of my heritage. The truth, so often obscured and omitted and I find I have much to say to my black children.

I will lift up their heads in proud blackness with the story of their fathers and their fathers' fathers. And I shall take them way back into the time of Kings and Queens who ruled the Nile, and measured the stars and discovered the law of mathematics. Upon whose backs have been build the wealth of continents.

I will tell him this and more, and his heritage shall be his weapon and his armor will make him strong enough to win any battle he may face. And since this story is often obscured I must find the truth of heritage for myself and pass it on to them. In years to come, I believe because I have armed them with the truth, my children and their childrens' children will venerate me. For it's truth that will make us free!

## Midterm Feedback Form

This was constructed by Kathy after we talked about what kind of questions could be on it. All were anonymous. Only 15 students filled out these midterm feedback forms (out of 22 students) These were done on the day of the midterm exam.

*Midterm*

*1) Do you feel you have a voice in this class?*

  *What changes could be made to contribute ideas in class?*

*2) Do you feel comfortable being called on? Why? Why not?*

*3) Are you frustrated by the focus on multiple answers rather than   specific answers to questions?*

  *What changes would you like to see in the 2nd half of the course?*

*4) What issues do you see as very important in this class? Why?*

*5) What issues do you see as less important in this class? Why?*

*6) What issues do you want to see developed further in this class?   Why?*

*7) Do you feel that the professor is thinking about you and   adjusting the course to me your needs?*

  *to help you grow as a learner?*

  *to challenge your thinking?*

*8) What are your overall thoughts about the course?*

*9) What has been the most helpful about this class?*

  *What has been the least helpful about this class?*

*10) Any other comments you'd like to make?*

APPENDIX E


Final Feedback Form

These are the final feedback forms that were done. April 30/92

The feedback forms were designed so that the students would give feedback as they might to a colleague. We were trying to come up with some sort of format where they would give constructive feedback. Because we felt the evaluation forms that were used by the college did not get at the things we were interested in.

*NAME*_____

*PLEASE FILL IN THE FOLLOWING:*

*Piercy Sand is thinking about redesigning ED 277. You are a colleague of hers on the planning committee. Could you please give her advice on the following:*

*1) Curriculum*

*2) Teacher-student relations*

*3) Student-student relations*

*4) Assignments*

*5) Readings (articles, texts)*

*6) In-class activities*

*7) Any additional comments*

APPENDIX F


Student Interview # 1
Name_____
Date_____
Time_____

1. If you were to explain to a friend about what you are learning in ED 277 what would you tell the friend?

2. Tell me what you think or feel about ED 277.

3. Do you feel you have a voice in this class? Why? Why not?

4. In this class I feel

very comfortable----------------------------uncomfortable
Please explain.

5. The issues raised in this class I take

very seriously-------------------------------not seriously

Please explain.

6. What aspects of this course are most important/ valuable/ thought-provoking for you?

7. What aspects of this course are least important/ valuable/ thought-provoking for you?

8. Do you find yourself thinking about the ideas explored in this course in your daily life outside of school? If yes, give an example(s).

9. In this class do you feel like you can challenge the instructor? Why? Why not?  Oppose the instructor?

Challenge your peers? Why? Why not? Oppose them?

10. Pick one or more of the following phrases (or create your own) that describe the main feelings you have so far about the course overall.

intellectually challenging        thought-provoking    exciting
busywork        superficial        confusing       relevant
frustrating absurd        fun        well-organized        strong
emotional response    disorganized        serious        irrelevant
boring        playful

Others?_____

11. How would you define equity?
      Probe- what does it include?

12. In my personal life equity issues are

very important------------------------not important

Please explain.

13. In my role as a teacher equity issues will be

very important----------------------not important

Please explain.

14. When I'm a teacher I think that I will have to work at
being equitable

very hard----------------------------not hard

Please explain.

15. Do you feel that the instructor reads gender bias into
things? (eg.- interactions, bulletin boards, videos etc.?)
Why? Why not?
  (how about race? class? )

16. What do you think about the gender requirement at
Albion? Why?

17. What advice would you give to a student in a future ED
277 taught by Piercy Sand?

18. Do you feel that my presence is affecting the class?
Why? Why not?

Student Interview # 2
Name_____
Date_____
Time_____

1. If you were to explain to a friend about what you are learning in ED 277 what would you tell the friend?

2. What words or phrases would you use to describe the <u>main feelings</u> you have about the course overall?

3. Did you feel you had a voice in the class? Why? Why not?

4. How did you feel about the comfort level in the class? Why?

5. How did you feel about the issues which were raised in this class?

6. What were the most important issues which were raised for you in this class?

7. What were the least important issues for you raised in this class?

8. Which issues do you think will be most useful for you as a teacher?

9. Do you find yourself thinking about the ideas explored in this course in your daily life outside of school? If yes, give an example(s).

10. Did you feel that you were able to challenge the instructor in this class? Why? Why not?

    Challenge you peers? Why? Why not?

11. How would you define equity? Are there things that you think about equity issues that you didn't think about before ED 277?

12. Do you see equity issues in your personal life any differently now than you did before ED 277?
    Please explain.

13. Do you see equity issues in your role as a teacher any differently than you did before ED 277? Why? Why not?
    Please explain.

14. Do you feel that when you are a teacher that you'll have to spend time thinking about equity issues in your classroom? Why? Why not?
    Please explain.

15. How do you feel about the way that gender issues were discussed in ED 277? (How about race? Class?)

16. Was there any particular class that stood out for you this semester? Why?

17. Do you think that you have grown intellectually, emotionally, or psychologically from your experience in ED 277? Why? Why not?

18. As a personal question here if appropriate.

19. What advice would you give to a student in a future ED 277 taught by Piercy Sand?

20. Any final comments?

## My Presence

I had asked in the original interview whether my presence was affecting the class. Nathan answered the question by stating:

> I don't even notice you're there, half the time. I
> don't know how to say it just doesn't seem to have that
> much effect. If you had a light, or something, it
> might, but [laughs] every once in a while, I get bored
> and play with the camera.

Karen answered the same question with: "Not that I can see.
I think everyone there all acts the same as they would in
any other class. Probably because of the setting of the
class I think they are probably even more comfortable."

Gary stated that he did not feel my presence affected the
class and when I probed why not he stated:

> I think that you motivate the class to bring out more
> ideas. I see you writing over there all the time and I
> think Piercy teaches better because you are there.
> Maybe to try and impress you or something. I know if I
> were Piercy I would be doing my damndest job to do very
> good. Your presence doesn't. Except video cameras.
> Just as a joke with their camera, for half an hour
> without break. No one moved and I was like this the
> whole hour.

I asked him "Now, why do you feel shy around those cameras?"
and he responded "Just that I am self conscious and
insecure." Then I asked him "Now, does it ever stop you from
saying things?" He replied "No."

Keith answered the question of whether my presence was
affecting the class by stating:

> Only during break when we go up and play with the
> camera and rap into the microphone and stuff. [laughs]
> No because, honestly, I when I'm into the discussion,
> I, I keep on I mean I'll forget that you're there or
> just won't--I mean I sometimes, I mean just, I mean,
> you're there, taking notes so, I mean, you look, sorta
> like a student the only difference is you're standing

590

up and every once in a while, you'll stop and look at
us all and then, I mean I do that, anyway so no, I
don't think your presence the, the camera might because
I mean, I can see people, like just like minor stuff,
like "Oh, the camera's gonna be there, so I better
dress nicely, today," something like that so, like,
people plan dressing nice on Tuesdays and Thursdays,
just for somethin' like that but I don't think it has a
major impact. I don't THINK it has 'cause, like, I've
had Darlene in the class before and she, like acts the
same way not, I mean, not exactly the same, 'cause its
different class.  But, I mean, she acts the same when
she asks questions and stuff; I don't see her changing.
you know, like speaking to the camera, or anything like
that.

And Dan stated no when asked and when I probed he stated:

'Cause, now, you know, you're, like, part of the class.
I mean, you've been there and I mean you're accepted
you know, some people mean I don't think there's too
many people that get paranoid by the camera or being
recorded you know, for me it doesn't bother me a bit I,
I'd be acting the same way.  You know, if you're there,
or if you're not there I think its kinda it's always
kinda neat, though, if you have somebody in the class,
observing you kinda feel, kinda, maybe important you
know.  So, maybe, it might help--actually, help in a
way if someone might speak up and say somethin' 'cause,
"Hey, this is a really good point--she might write this
down!"  So, I, I found that, like, my first time, when
I observed my class 'cause they were all curious about
it and I thank, you know, but now. . .its like I'm part
of the class, too, you know.

And Ellen also stated no, when asked further she stated:

Um I dunno, I just I, maybe it's your personality,
maybe it's, I think everybody just feels really
comfortable and I think everybody's I mean even that
wouldn't have affected me if I can raise my hand.  And
something said something.  I don't think that. . really
affects it all I think everybody's really comfortable.
with you I don't know, if it was to be somebody
different or if it's just that they, they don't care
and, I mean I feel very comfortable giving this
interview, I think eh, you know, they know if it's
gonna help or, if so, I think--I don't think it causes
a problem, at all.

And Matt explained that it affected the situation "a little
bit."  When I asked him to explain he stated:

I don't know as much as it's your presence as, I mean, just the equipment that is there. And I'm not sure that it's even that. I mean there's a group of us that goof around every once in a while when you do view the videos you got a "See no, Hear no, Speak no Evil." on it. [laughing] Um, I'm not sure that your presence, you know has that much effect on the class um 'cause there's classes that have TAs even though the TAs are other students. I don't see them having that much of an effect. Um and like I say, you really can't it unless you are in the same setting without, or, in a different situation if it were a male teacher if it was a male viewer. Um it may alter it possibly but, I really in the current setting I don't see any influence.

I asked about his mention of male teacher and male viewer, how about a male researcher?

I don't know as it would. I'm just saying as far as from a scientific standpoint. I say you know to fully test a situation you need to have all possibilities.

Debra replied:

I really don't think so. Now. Maybe at first, maybe at the very beginning but, no, I don't think so at all. Everybody just goes about. You know, they get into discussions just like everybody else and they kind of forget about, you know, the camera, whatever is going on. Because they want to be a good example on the camera and I just think, you know, they get into the discussions and they are just thinking about the discussions, they are not thinking about other things as maybe younger kids would be doing. Like kids in grade school or something. Unless maybe they are so out of it – there are a few immature people probably who do get affected a little bit but during discussion time they are being serious and they are not thinking about it.

And Tasha stated:

I don't think it does because I really don't notice you there. Because it is not like you make a lot of commotion or anything. You are there but you are not there. And plus, you were introduced like everybody else. So, it was like you were made a part of the class. You are not like somebody doing a research, just there to eavesdrop on us or anything. The only thing is I don't like the camera.My Dad is a big video freak. So, like, everywhere we go, we can go, you know, like we went to the Philippines and he had his

camera.  You know, he brought us to his old high school, you know, his high school basketball game, and he video taped it.  We went to a nice family dinner and he brought the camera along.  It's like everything we do with the family, it's like, my parents have a party every summer and  my Dad had to have it on tape and he stuck me with the camera and I had to walk around, and it's always there.

Table 1. Students' Interviews and Final Feedback Catalogue

| Interview # 1 | Interview #2 | Final feedback |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Tatiana Feb 27- 1992 (two tapes) | Tatiana April 29- 1992 | Handed in |
| 2. Tricia Feb 18- 1992 | Tricia April 30 - 1992 | Handed in |
| 3. Matt Feb 18 1992 | Matt May 5 1992 (two tapes) | Handed in |
| 4. Karen Feb 18 1992 | Karen April 29 1992 | Handed in |
| 5. Michelle Feb 27 1992 | Michelle April 29 1992 | Handed in |
| 6. Ellen Feb 25 1992 | Ellen May 5 1992 | |
| 7. Nathan Feb 25 1992 | Nathan April 28 1992 | Handed in |
| 8. Dan Feb 25 1992 | Dan April 28 1992 | Handed in |
| 9. Debra  Feb 27 1992 | | |
| 10. Gary Feb 27 1992 | | Handed in |
| 11. Keith Feb 13 1992 | Keith April 30 1992 | Handed in |
| 12. Tasha Feb 23 1992 | Tasha April 30 1992 | Handed in |
| 13. Emily Feb 27 1992 | Emily April 30 1992 | Handed in |
| 14. | Darlene May 5 1992 | Handed in |
| 15. | | Reid |

| Students' Interviews and Final Feedback Catalogue (Cont.) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Interview #1 | Interview #2 | Final Feedback |
| 16. | | Jackie |
| 17. | | David |
| 18. | | Josh |
| 19. | | No name given |

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbey, E. (1994, August). How to pick a woman. *Esquire: Magazine for men, 122,* 102-103. (Original work published 1966)

Acosta-Belén, E. (1993). Beyond island boundaries: Ethnicity, gender, and cultural revitalization in Nuyorican literature. In T. Perry & J.W. Fraser (Eds.) *Freedom's plow: Teaching in the multicultural classroom.* (pp. 121-142). New York: Routledge.

Adams, C. J. (1990). *The sexual politics of meat: A feminist-vegetarian critical theory.* New York: Continuum.

Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). *Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove.* Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Allison, P. C., & Pissanos, B. W. (1993-1994). The teacher as observer. *Action in Teacher Education: Feminist Pedagogy in Teacher Education, 15*(4), 47-54.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(1), 3-42.

Anzaldua, G. (1983). La Prieta. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua, G. (Eds.), *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color* (pp. 198-209). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

American Association of University Women. (1992). *The AAUW report: How schools shortchange girls: A study of major findings on girls and education.* Washington, DC: AAUW Educational Foundation.

Apple. M. (1985). Teaching and "women's work": A comparative historical and ideological analysis. *Teachers College Record, 3,* 445-473.

Asad, T. (1986). The concept of cultural translation in British social anthropology. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds), Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography (pp. 141-164). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Atwood, M. (1989). Cat's eye. New York: Bantam Books.

Ayim, M. (1985). Genderized education: Tradition reconsidered. Educational Theory, 4, 345-350.

Banks, J. (1991-1992). Multicultural education: For freedom's sake. Educational Leadership, 49(4) 32-36.

Barnes, J. (1988). Homophobia. In C. McEwan (Ed.), Naming the waves: Contemporary lesbian poetry (p. 6). London: Virago Press.

Beatty, B. (1989). Child gardening: The teaching of young children in American schools. In D. Warren (Ed.), American teachers: Histories of a profession at work (pp. 65-97). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Bem, S. L. (1987a). Probing the promise of androgyny. In M. R. Walsh (Ed), The psychology of women: Ongoing debates (pp. 206-225). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bem, S. L. (1987b). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender schematic society. In M. R. Walsh (Ed), The psychology of women: Ongoing debates (pp. 226-245). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Berger, J. (1972). Ways of seeing. New York: Penguin.

Bigelow, W. (1989). Discovering Columbus: Rereading the past. Language Arts, 66, 635-643.

Bigelow, B. (1994). Getting off the track: Stories from an untracked classroom. In B. Bigelow, L. Christenson, S. Karp, B. Miner, & B. Peterson Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice: A special issue of Rethinking Schools. (pp. 58-65). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Bigelow, B. & Christensen, L. (1994). Promoting social imagination through interior monologues.  In B. Bigelow, L. Christenson, S. Karp, B. Miner, & B. Peterson Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice: A special issue of Rethinking Schools. (pp. 110-111)). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Bierhorst, J. (1994). The way of the earth: Native America and the environment. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Biklin, S. K. (1985). Can elementary schoolteaching be a career? A search for new ways of understanding women's work. Issues In Education, 3, 215-231.

Bleier, R. (1986). Lab coat: Robe of innocence or Klansman's sheet? In T. de Lauretis (Ed.), Feminist studies: Critical studies (pp. 55-66). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Bowles, J. P. (1990). Tilling and soil improvement. In J. P. Bowles, B. B. Pesch, & W. C. Mulligan (Eds.), Plants & gardens: Soils (pp. 68-70). New York: Brooklyn Botanic Garden, Inc.

Bravo, E. & Miller, L. (1994) What teachers can do about sexual harassment.  In B. Bigelow, L. Christenson, S. Karp, B. Miner, & B. Peterson Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice: A special issue of Rethinking Schools. (pp. 103-105). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Britzman, D. (1990, April). Reconstituting our teaching practices: Relationships among literary theory, pedagogical practices, and self-critique. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Boston, MA.

Brunner, D. D. (1994). Inquiry and reflection: Framing narrative practice in education. New York: State University of New York Press, Albany.

Brutal hate crimes against all races on the increase. (1993, January 24). The Seattle Times, p. A4.

Bunch, C. (1983). Not by degrees: Feminist theory and education. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack (Eds.), Learning our way: Essays in feminist education (pp. 248-260). New York: The Crossing Press.

Bunch, C. (1987). Passionate politics. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Buscaglia, L. (1982). <u>Living, loving & learning.</u> New York: Ballantine.

Calkins, L. M. (1986). <u>The art of teaching writing.</u> Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1988). <u>Becoming critical: Education knowledge, and action research.</u> London: The Falmer Press.

Carroll, L. (1978). <u>Alice in wonderland and through the looking glass.</u> Kingsport, TN: Kingsport Press.

CBS Evening News. (1994, March 30). (C. Chung & D. Rather).

Cervantes, L. D. (1990). Poem for the young white man who asked me how I, an intelligent, well-read person, could believe in the war between races. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua, G. (Eds.), <u>This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color</u> (p. 4-5). San Francisco: an aunt lute foundation book.

Cheney. (1987). Eco-feminism and deep ecology. <u>Environmental Ethics, 9,</u> 115-145.

Chesler, P. (1989). <u>Women and madness.</u> New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Christensen, L. (1991). Unlearning the myths that bind us: Students critique stereotypes in children's stories and films. In B. Bigelow, B. Miner, & B. Peterson <u>Rethinking Columbus: Teaching about the 500th anniversary of Columbus's arrival in America: Special issue of Rethinking Schools dedicated to the children of the Americas.</u> (pp. 53-55). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Christensen, L. (1994). Building a community from chaos. <u>Rethinking Schools: An Urban Educational Journal, 9</u>(1), 14-17.

Chrystos. (1983). I walk in the history of my people. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua, G. (Eds.), <u>This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color</u> (p. 57). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Cirlot, J. E. (1971). <u>A dictionary of symbols.</u> New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1988). Studying teachers' knowledge of classrooms: Collaborative research, ethics, and the negotiation of narrative. <u>The Journal of Educational Thought, 22,</u> 269-282.

Clarke, C. (1983). Lesbianism: An act of resistance. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua, G. (Eds.), <u>This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color</u> (pp. 128-137). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Clifford, G. J. (1982). "Marry, Stitch, Die, or Do Worse": Educating Women for Work. In H. Kantor & D. B. Tyack (Eds.), <u>Work, youth, and schooling: Historical perspectives on vocationalism in American education</u>. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Clifford, J. (1986). Introduction: Partial truths. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), <u>Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography</u> (pp. 1-26). Berkely, CA: University of California Press.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). <u>Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography.</u> Berkely, CA: University of California Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. <u>Harvard Educational Review, 61,</u> 279-310.

Cohen, D. (1988). <u>Teaching practice: Plus ca change....</u> National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. East Lansing MI: Michigan State University.

Cohen, E. (1986). <u>Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom.</u> New York: Teachers College Press.

Combahee River Collective. (1983). A black feminist statement. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua, G. (Eds.), <u>This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color</u> (pp. 210-218). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. Educational Researcher, 19(4) 2-14.

Crowley, J. (1981). <u>Little, big.</u> New York: Bantam.

Daly, M. (1984). <u>Pure lust: Elemental feminist philosophy.</u> Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, M. (1978). Gyn/Ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, M. (1985). Beyond god the father. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, M., & Caputi, J. (1987). Websters' first new intergalactic wickedary of the English language. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daniels, W. L. (1990). Managing compacted and heavy (clayed) soils. In J. P. Bowles, B. B. Pesch, & W. C. Mulligan (Eds.), Plants & gardens: Soils (pp. 68-70). New York: Brooklyn Botanic Garden, Inc.

Davis, B. H. (1983). Teaching the feminist minority. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack (Eds.), Learning our way: Essays in feminist education (pp. 89-97). New York: The Crossing Press.

de Beauvoir, S. (1952/1974). The second sex. New York: Vintage.

de Lauretis, T. (1986). Feminist studies/critical studies: Issues, terms, and contexts. In T. de Lauretis (Ed.), Feminist studies: Critical studies (1-19). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University press.

de Lauretis, T. (1990). Upping the anti (sic) in feminist theory. In M. Hirsch & E. K. Keller (Eds.), Conflicts in feminism (pp. 255-270). New York: Routledge.

Delmar, R. (1986). What is feminism? In J. Mitchell & A. Oakley (Eds.), What is feminism: A re-examination (pp. 8-33). New York: Pantheon Books.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 280-298.

Dennison, G. (1969). The lives of children: The story of the First Street School. New York: Random House.

Devall, B., & Sessions, G. (1985). Deep ecology: Living as if nature mattered. New York: Peregrine Books.

Dewey, J. (1966). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: The Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1963). Experience & education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company .

Dickens, C. (1859/1980). A tale of two cities. New York: Signet.

Doll, W., Jr. (1992). A post-modern perspective on curriculum. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dickinson, E. (1993). Emily Dickinson: Selected poems. New York: Gramercy Books.

Donovan, J. (1990a). Animal rights and feminist theory. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 15, 350-375.

Donovan, J. (1990b). Feminist theory: The intellectual traditions of American feminism. New York: Continuum.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1903/1944). The souls of black folk. New York: Dover Publications Inc.

Du Bois, B. (1979). Passionate scholarship: Notes on values, knowing and method in feminist social science. In G. Bowles & R. D. Klein, (Eds.), Theories of women's studies (pp. 105-116). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Dworkin, A. (1974). Woman hating. New York: E. P. Dutton.

Eble, K. E. (1983). The aims of college teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Eisenstein, H. ((1983). Contemporary feminist thought. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co.

Ellesworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review, 59, 297-324.

Erikson, E. H. (1950). Child and society. New York: W. W. Norton.

Faludi, S. (1991). Backlash: The undeclared war against American women. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Fay, B. (1987). Critical social science. New York: Cornell University Press.

Featherstone, H., Pfeiffer, L., & Smith, S. (1993). Learning in good company: Report on a pilot study. (NCRTL Research Report 93-2). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1992). The concepts of method and manner in teaching. In F. K. Oser, A. Dick, & J-L Patry (Eds), Effective and responsible teaching: The new synthesis (pp. 95-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Feinberg, W., & Soltis, J. F. (1985). School and society. New York: Teachers College Press.

Finley, P. (1988). Malaise of the spirit: A case study. Fairbanks, AK: College of Rural Alaska, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Firestone, S. (1972). The dialectic of sex: The case for feminist revolution. New York: Bantam Books.

Fox, W. (1989). The deep ecology-ecofeminism debate and its parallels. Environmental Ethics, 11, 5-25.

Fox-Genovese, E. (1991). Feminism without illusions: A critique of individualism. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Friedan, B. (1969/1984). The feminine mystique. New York: Dell.

Freire, P. (1968/1985). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1988). Literacy: Reading the word and the world. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Freud, S. (1961). The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (James Strachey, trans. & ed.). London: The Hogarth Press.

Frye, M. (1983). The politics of reality: Essays in feminist theory. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Frye, M. (1991). Introduction. In M. Murphy. Are you girls traveling alone? Adventures in lesbianic logic (pp.11-16). Los Angeles, CA: Clothespin Fever Press.

Frye, M. (1992). White woman feminist. In M. Frye Willful virgin: Essays in feminism 1986-1992 (pp. 147-169). Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Gallop, J., Hirsch, M., & Miller, N. K. (1990). Criticizing feminist criticism. In M. Hirsch & E. K. Keller (Eds.), Conflicts in feminism (pp. 349-369). New York: Routledge.

Gannett, C. (1992). Gender and the journal: Diaries and academic discourse. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gardner, H. (1991). The unschooled mind: How children think and how schools should teach. New York: Basic Books.

Gearhart, S. M. (1983). If the mortarboard fits... radical feminism in academia. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack (Eds.), Learning our way: Essays in feminist education (pp. 2-18). New York: The Crossing Press.

Gilbert, S. M., & Gubar, S. (1984). The madwoman in the attic: The woman writer and the nineteenth-century literary imagination. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1987). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. In M. R. Walsh (Ed.), The psychology of women: Ongoing debates (pp. 278-320). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1989). Prologue. In C. Gilligan, N. P. Lyons, & T. J. Hanmer (Eds.), Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School (pp. 1-5). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1990). Preface: Teaching Shakespeare's sister: Notes from the underground of female adolescence. In C. Gilligan, N. P. Lyons, & T. J. Hanmer (Eds.), Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School (pp. 6-29). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., Rogers, A., & Brown, L. M., (1990). Epilogue: Soundings into development. In C. Gilligan, N. P. Lyons, & T. J. Hanmer (Eds.), Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School (pp. 314-334). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilman, C. P. (1892/1899/1973). The yellow wallpaper. New York: The Feminist Press at The City University of New York.

Giroux, H. A., & Freire, P. (1988). Introduction.  In K. Weiler Women teaching for change: Gender, class & power. (pp. ix-xiv). Boston: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Giroux, H. (1992). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. Educational Researcher, 21, 4-11.

Goodman, J., & Kelly,T. (1988). Out of the mainstream: Issues confronting the male profeminist elementary school teacher.  Interchange, 19, 1-14.

Gordon, M. (1986, September). All about Adam: Like father, like son ... and unexpectedly like me. GQ  p. 179, pp. 186-187.

Greenawalt, K. (1983). Discrimination and reverse discrimination. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. London: Sage Publications.

Greene, M. (1978). Landscapes of learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Griffin, S. (1978). Woman and nature: The roaring inside her. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Grumet, M. R. (1988). Bitter milk: Women and teaching. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Hamilton, M. C. (1988). Using male generics: Does generic he increase male bias in the user's imagery? Sex Roles. 19, 11/12. 785-799.

Grumet, M. R. (1989, January). Dinner at Abigail's: Nurturing collaboration. Real Professionalism (pp. 20-25). Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association.

Hate and Hope. The Michigan response: Success, anger, anxiety. (1994, February 13). The Detroit News and Free Press. Comment, pp. 1F-6F.

Hawkins, D. (1974). I, thou, and it. In The informed vision: Essays on learning and human nature (pp.48-62). New York: Agathon. (Original work published 1967)

Hedges, E. R. (1973). Afterword. In C. P. Gilman (1892/1899/1973), The yellow wallpaper. New York: The Feminist Press at The City University of New York.

Henry, A. (1993-1994). There are no safe places: Pedagogy as powerful and dangerous terrain. In <u>Action in Teacher Education: Feminist Pedagogy in Teacher Education,</u> <u>15</u>(4), 1-4.

Hill, C. E. (1990). <u>Writing from the margins: Power and pedagogy for teachers of composition.</u> Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hirsch, M., & Keller, E. F. (1990). Conclusion: Practicing conflict in feminist theory. In M. Hirsch & E. K. Keller (Eds.), <u>Conflicts in feminism</u> (pp. 370-385). New York: Routledge.

Hodson, D. & Dennick, R. (1994). Antiracist education: A special role for the history of science and technology. In <u>Antiracist Education.</u> 94, <u>5</u>, pp. 255-262

Hollingsworth, S. (Fall, 1990) Teachers as researchers: Writing to learn about ourselves--and others. In <u>The Quarterly of the National Writing Project & the Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy.</u> pp. 10-18.

hooks, b. (1989). <u>Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black.</u> Boston, MA: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1994). <u>Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.</u> New York: Routledge.

Houston, B. (1985). Gender freedom and the subtleties of sexist education. <u>Educational Theory, 35</u>(4), 359-369.

Howe, L. K. (1977). <u>Pink collar workers: Inside the world of women's work.</u> New York: Avon Books.

Hull, G., Scott, P. B., & Smith, B. (Eds.). (1982). <u>All the women are white, all the blacks are men, but some of us are brave: Black women's studies.</u> Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press.

Humm, M. (1990). <u>The dictionary of feminist theory.</u> Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Hurtado, A. (1989). Relating to privilege: Seduction and rejection in the subordination of white women and women of color. <u>Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 14,</u> 833-855.

Jackson, D. (1992). <u>How to make the world a better place for women: In five minutes a day.</u> New York: Hyperion.

Jackson, P. (1986). The practice of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jones, A. (1993, November). Why doesn't she leave? Mirabella, 54, 176-181.

Jordan, J. (1990). Where is the love? In G. Anzaldua (Ed.), Making face, making soul haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by women of color (pp. 174-176). San Francisco: an aunt lute foundation book.

Keller, E. F. (1986). Making gender visible in the pursuit of nature's secrets. In T. de Laurentis (Ed.), Feminist studies: Critical studies. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kingston, M. H. (1976). Woman warrior: Memoirs of a girlhood among ghosts. New York: Vintage International.

Klein, R. D. (1983). How to do what we want to do: Thoughts about feminist methodology. In G. Bowles & R. D. Klein (Eds.), Theories of women's studies (pp. 88-104). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kohl, H. (1984). Growing minds: On becoming a teacher. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Kohn, A. (1991). Caring kids: The role of the schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 496-506.

Kohn, A. (1986). No contest: The case against competition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kozol, J. (1990). The night is dark and I am far from home. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Laing, R. D. (1971). The politics of the family: And other essays. New York: Penguin Books.

Laird, S. (1988). Reforming "woman's true profession": A case for "feminist pedagogy" in teacher education? Harvard Educational Review, 58, 449-463.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern. New York: Routledge, Chapman, and Hall.

Le Guin, U. K. (1986). Bryn Mawr commencement address. In _Dancing at the edge of the world: Thoughts on words, women, places_ (pp. 147-160). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Le Guin, U. K. (1976/1987). Is gender necessary? Redux. In _Dancing at the edge of the world: Thoughts on words, women, places_ (pp. 7-16). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Lessing, D. (1975). _A small personal voice: Essays, reviews, interviews._ New York: Vintage books.

Lessing, D. (1994). _The golden notebook._ New York: Harper Perrenial. (Original work published 1962)

Lewis, C. S. (1960). _The four loves._ London: Fontana Books.

Lewis, M. (1990). Interrupting patriarchy: Politics, resistance, and transformation in the feminist classroom. _Harvard Educational Review, 60,_ 467-488.

Lewis, M. (1989, March). _Problems of practice in radical teaching: A feminist perspective on the psycho/social/sexual dynamics in the mixed gender classroom._ Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA.

Lewis, M., & Simon, R. (1986). A discourse not intended for her: Learning and teaching within patriarchy. _Harvard Educational Review, 56,_ 457-472.

Limbaugh, R. (1992). _The way things ought to be._ New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.

Limbaugh, R. (1993). _See I told you so._ New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.

Lindberg, A. M. (1906/1975). _Gift from the sea._ New York: Pantheon Books.

Like It Is. Dr. Peggy McIntosh. Show # 778. (August 10, 1990) WABC-TV. Transcript pp. 1-12.

Lipkin, A. (1992, Fall). Project 10: Gay and lesbian students find acceptance in their school community. _Teaching Tolerance,_ 25-27.

Littlebear, N. (1983). Earth-lover, survivor, musician. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua (Eds.), This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color (pp. 157-159). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Lockheed, M. E. (1984). Sex segregation and male preeminence in elementary classrooms. In E. Fennema, & M. J. Ayer (Eds), Women and education (pp. 117-135). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Lorde, A. (1983). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua (Eds.), This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color (pp. 98-101). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lugones, M. (1990). Habland cara a cara/Speaking face to face: An exploration of ethnocentric racism. In G. Anzaldua (Ed.) Making Face, making soul Haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by women of color (pp. 46-54). San Francisco, California: an aunt lute foundation book.

Lugones, M. (1987). Playfulness, "world"-travelling, and loving perception. Hypatia, 2(2), 3-19.

Lugones, M. C., & Spelman, E. V. (1984). Have we got a theory for you! Feminist theory, cultural imperialism and the demand for "the women's voice." In A. M. Jaggar (Ed.), Feminist frameworks: Alternative theoretical accounts of the relations between men and women (pp. 19-31). New York: McGraw-Hill.

MacGregor, M. M. (1991, July) Presentation at SEED (Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity) Workshop, Palo Alto, California.

Macy, J. (1992). The greening of the self. In J. Welwood (Ed.), Ordinary magic: Everyday life as spiritual path (pp. 262-273). Boston: Shambhala.

Martin, J. R. (1982). Excluding women from the educational realm. In S. L. Rich & A. Phillips (Eds.) (1985), Women's experience and education (Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series #17, pp. 158-174). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

McIntosh, P. (1983). Interactive phases of curricular re-vision: A feminist perspective (Working Paper No. 124). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies (Working Paper No. 189). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1990). Interactive phases of curricular and personal re-vision with regard to race (Working Paper No. 219). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, P. (1985). Feeling like a fraud. Work in Progress No. 18. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

McIntosh, P. (1989). Feeling like a fraud: Part two. Work in Progress No. 37. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

McKechnie, J. L. (Ed.). (1979). Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary. (2nd ed.) New York: Simon & Schuster.

McNeil, L. (1986). Contradictions of control. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Melnick, S., & Zeichner, K. (1994, February). Teacher education for cultural diversity: Enhancing the capacity of teacher education institutions to address diversity issues. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Michell, M. (1993). Forgive me mother for I have sinned. Unpublished manuscript.

Michell, M. (1994). Michael's story: The struggle to be open minded. In Sears, J. T. (Ed.) Bound by diversity: Essays, prose, photography, and poetry by members of the lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender communities. Columbia, SC: Sebastian Press.

Mies, M. (1983). Towards a methodology for feminist research. In G. Bowles & R. D. Klein (Eds.), Theories of women's studies (pp. 117-139). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Millett, K. (1970). Sexual politics. New York: Ballantine Books.

Miller, J. B. (1986). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, C., & Swift, K. (1988). The handbook of nonsexist writing: For writers, editors and speakers. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Mills, J. (1989). Womanwords: A dictionary of words about women. New York: Free Press.

Miner, B. (1994). Why students should study history: An interview with Howard Zinn. In B. Bigelow, L. Christenson, S. Karp, B. Miner, & B. Peterson Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice: A special issue of Rethinking Schools. (pp. 150-155). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Minnich, E. K. (1983). Friends and critics: The feminist academy. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack (Eds.), Learning our way: Essays in feminist education (pp. 317-329). New York: The Crossing Press.

Mitchell, J. (1971). Woman's estate. New York: Penguin Books.

Moraga, C., & Anzaldua, G. (Eds.) (1983) This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color. New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Moraga, C. (1983). La Güera. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua (Eds.), This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color (pp. 27-34). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Moraga, C. (1983). Refugees of a world on fire: Foreword to the second edition. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua (Eds.), This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color (pp. i-iv). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Morrison, T. (1987). Beloved. New York: Knopf.

Morrison, T. (1970). The bluest eye. New York: Washington Square Press.

Murdock, M. (1990). The heroine's journey: Women's quest for wholeness. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.

Morgan, K. P. (1985). Freeing the children: The abolition of gender. Educational Theory, 35, 351-357.

Murphy, M. (1991). Are you girls traveling alone? Adventures in lesbianic logic. Los Angeles, CA: Clothespin Fever Press.

Newman, J. M. (1986). Finding our way. In J. M. Newman (Ed.), Finding our way: Teachers exploring their assumptions (pp. 7-34). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Newman, J. M. (1991). Interwoven conversations: Learning and teaching through critical refection. Toronto: OISE Press.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 496-510.

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education. New York: Longman.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Oates, J. C. (1994). Foxfire: Confessions of a girl gang. New York: Plume.

Obbink, L. A. (November, 1992). Feminist theory in the classroom: Choices, questions, voices. English Journal, 38-43.

Orbach, S. (1985). Fat is a feminist issue. New York: Berkeley Books.

O'Reilley, M. R. (1993). The peaceable classroom. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Paglia, C. (1991). Sexual personae: Art and decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickenson. New York: Vintage Books.

Paine, L. (1990). Orientation towards diversity: What do prospective teachers bring? (NCRTL Research report 89-9). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Paley, V. G. (1989). White teacher. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Partnow, E. (1978). The quotable woman: An encyclopedia of useful quotations. New York: Anchor Press.

Paulus, T. (1972). Hope for the flowers. New York: Paulist Press.

Peck, M. S. (1987). The different drum: Community making and peace. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.

Perkins, D. (1992). Smart schools: From training memories to educating minds. Toronto, Canada: The Free Press.

Perry, T. & Fraser, J. W. (1993) Reconstructing schools as multiracial/multicultural democracies: Toward a theoretical perspective. In T. Perry & J.W. Fraser (Eds.) Freedom's plow: Teaching in the multicultural classroom. (pp. 3-24). New York: Routledge.

Perry, W. (1968). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in college years. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Pharr, S. (1988). Homophobia: A weapon of sexism. Little Rock, Arkansas: The Chardon Press.

Piercy, M. (1973). Unlearning to not speak. In To be of use. (p. 38). New York: Doubleday.

Piercy, M. (1976). Woman on the edge of time. New York: Fawcett Crest.

Piercy, M. (1979). Vida. New York: Fawcett Crest.

Piercy, M. (1987). Gone to soldiers. New York: Fawcett Crest.

Putnam, J., & Burke, J. B. (1992). Organizing and managing classroom learning communities. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Radicalesbians. (1973). The woman-identified woman. In A. Koedt, E. Levine, & A. Rapone (Eds.), Radical feminism. (pp. 240-245). New York: Quadrangle.

Rich, A. (1971). When we dead awaken: Writing as re-vision. In B. C. Gelpi & A. Gelpi (Eds.), A Norton critical edition: Adrienne Rich's poetry and prose (pp. 166-177). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Rich, A. (1979). Foreword: On history, illiteracy, passivity, violence, and women's culture. In On lies, secrets, and silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978 (pp. 9-18). New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Rich, A. (1973-74). Toward a woman-centered university. In On lies, secrets, and silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978 (pp. 125-155). New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Rich, A. (1977). Claiming and education. In On lies, secrets, and silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978 (pp. 231-235). New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Rich, A. (1978). Taking women students seriously. In On lies, secrets, and silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978 (pp. 237-245). New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and the lesbian Existence. In Adrienne Rich's poetry and prose. Gelpi, B.C. & Gelpi, A. (Eds.) (1993). New York: W.W. Norton & Company. pp. 203-224.

Rich, A. (1984). Invisibility in academe. In A. Rich (1986) Blood, bread, and poetry: Selected prose 1979-1985 (pp. 198-201). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Rich, A. (1994). The facts of a doorframe: Poems selected and new 1950-1984. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Rogers, A. (1993). Voice, play, and a practice of ordinary courage in girls' and women's lives. Harvard Educational Review, 63, 265-295.

Rose, P. (1993). Introduction. In P. Rose (Ed.), The Norton books of women's lives (pp. 11-37). New York: Norton.

Rose, H. (1986). Women's work: Women's knowledge. In J. Mitchell & A. Oakley (Eds.), What is feminism: A re-examination (pp. 161-183). New York: Pantheon Books.

Rosenbaum, J. E. (1986). Institutional career structures and the social construction of ability. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of teaching (pp. 139-171). New York: Greenwood Press.

Roy, A. (1994). Review: Critical literacy, critical pedagogy. College English, 56, 693-702.

Roychoudbury, A., Tippins, D., & Nichols, S. (1993-1994). An exploratory attempt toward a feminist pedagogy for science education. <u>Action in Teacher Education: feminist Pedagogy in Teacher Education, 15</u>(4), 36-46.

Rubin, G. (1975). The traffic in women: Notes on the "political economy" of sex. In R. R. Reiter (Ed.), <u>Toward an anthropology of women</u> (pp. 157-210). City, ST: Monthly Review Press.

Ruether, R. R. (1975). <u>New woman new earth: Sexist ideologies and human liberation.</u> San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Rury, J. L. (1989). Who became teachers?: The social characteristics of teachers in American history. In D. Warren (Ed.), <u>American teachers: Histories of a profession at work</u> (pp. 9-48). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Ryan, W. (1966/1976). <u>Blaming the victim.</u> New York: Random House.

Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (1982). <u>Sex equity handbook for schools.</u> New York: Longman.

Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1994). <u>Failing at fairness: How America's schools cheat girls.</u> New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Sagor, R. (1991). What Project LEARN reveals about collaborative action research. <u>Educational Leadership, 48</u>(6), 6-10.

Saint Exupery, A. D. (1943). <u>The little prince.</u> New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Saliers, E. (1992). "Virginia Woolf." On Indigo Girls <u>Rites of passage</u> [cd]. New York: Virgin Songs, Inc.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). <u>The culture of the school and the problem of change.</u> Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sarton, M. (1990). <u>The education of Harriet Hatfield.</u> New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Schaef, A. W. (1985). <u>Women's reality: An emerging female system in a white male society.</u> New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Schwab, J. (1976). Education and the state: Learning community. In _Great ideas today_ (pp. 234-271). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Schwab, J. J. (1978). Eros and education: A discussion of one aspect of discussion. In I. Westbury & N. J. Wilkof (Eds.), _Joseph J. Schwab: Science, curriculum, and liberal education: Selected essays_ (pp. 105-132). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sears, J. T. (Ed.) _Bound by diversity: Essays, prose, photography, and poetry by members of the lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender communities._ Columbia, SC: Sebastian Press.

Sedlak, M., Wheeler, C., Pullin, D., & Cusick, P. (1986). _Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American high school._ New York: Teachers College Press.

Seidman, I. E. (1991). _Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences._ New York: Teachers College Press.

Smith, D. (1987). _The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology._ Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Snow, M. (1962). _The Michael Snow project._ March 11-June 5, 1994. Art Gallery of Ontario. Toronto, Canada.

Solomon, B. M. (1985). _In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in America._ New Haven: Yale University Press.

Soltis, J.F. (1992). Foreword. In W. Doll, Jr. (pp. ix-xi) _A post-modern perspective on curriculum._ New York: Teachers College Press.

Spender, D. (1983). Theorising about theorising. In G. Bowles & R. D. Klein (Eds.), _Theories of women's studies_ (pp. 27-31). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Spender, D. (1985). _Man made language._ Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul Publishers.

Starhawk. (1993). _The fifth sacred thing._ New York: Bantam Books.

Stein, N. & Sjostrom, L. (1994). Flirting vs. sexual harassment: Teaching the difference. In B. Bigelow, L. Christenson, S. Karp, B. Miner, & B. Peterson <u>Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice: A special issue of Rethinking Schools.</u> (pp. 106-107). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Steinem, G. (1983). Why young women are more conservative. In <u>Outrageous acts and everyday rebellions</u> (pp. 211-218). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Steinem, G. (1983). Men and women talking. In <u>Outrageous acts and everyday rebellions</u> (pp. 176-190). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stoltenberg, J. (1990). <u>Refusing to be a man: Essays on sex and justice.</u> New York: Meridian.

Stoltenberg, J. (1993). <u>The end of manhood: A book for men of conscience.</u> New York: Dutton.

Strober, M. H., & Tyack, D. (1980). Why do women teach and men manage? A report on research on schools. <u>Signs: Journal of women in culture and society, 5,</u> 494-503.

Style, E. (1988, June). Curriculum as window and mirror. In <u>Listening for all voices: Gender balancing the school curriculum</u> (pp. 6-12). Proceedings of a conference held at Oak Knoll School, Summit, NJ.

Sugg, S. S., Jr. (1978). <u>Motherteacher: The feminization of American education.</u> Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Tan, A. (1989). <u>The joy luck club.</u> New York: Ballantine Books.

<u>The international Webster's encyclopedic dictionary.</u> (1975). Chicago: The English Language Institute of America, Inc.

Thomas, R. W. (1992, November) <u>Issues in diversity: Implications for teaching, learning and teacher education.</u> Presentation given at the Michigan Partnership for New Education, Professional Development Schools Fall Institute, East Lansing, MI.

Tijerina, A. (1990). Notes on Oppression and violence. In G. Anzaldua (Ed). <u>Making face, making soul: Haciendo caras, creative and critical perspectives by women of color.</u> (pp.170-173) San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation Book.

Tong, R. (1989). *Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Torton Beck, E. (1983). Self-disclosure and the commitment to social change. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack (Eds.), *Learning our way: Essays in feminist education* (pp. 285-291). New York: Crossing Press.

Tripp, R. T. (Ed.). (1987). *The international thesaurus of quotations.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Tuttle, L. (1986). *Encyclopedia of feminism.* London: Longman.

Uris, L. (1977). *Trinity: A novel of Ireland.* New York: Bantam Books.

Veblen, T. (1899/1994). *The theory of the leisure class.* New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Villanueva, V., Jr. (1983). *Bootstraps: From an American academic of color.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Wagner, J. (1986). *The search for signs of intelligent life in the universe.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Wallace, P. (1993-1994). Authority and egalitarianism: What can they mean in the feminist classroom? *Action in Teacher Education: Feminist Pedagogy in Teacher Education, 15*(4), 14-19.

Warren, K. J. (1989). Rewriting the future: The feminist challenge to the malestream curriculum. *Feminist Teacher, 4*(2/3), pp. 46-52.

Warren, K. J. (1994). Introduction. In K.J. Warren (Ed.), *Ecological feminism.* (pp. 1-7). New York: Routledge.

Watson, J. D. (1968). *The double helix: A personal account of the discovery of the structure of DNA.* New York: Menot Book, New American Library.

Weaver, C., & Henke, L. (Eds.). (1992). *Supporting whole language: Stories of teacher and institutional change.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

*Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary.* (1984). Springfield, Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster Inc., Publishers.

Weiler, K. (1988). Women teaching for change: Gender, class & power. Boston: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Wescott, M. (1979). Feminist criticism of the social sciences. In S. L. Rich & A. Phillips (Eds.) (1985), Women's experience and education (Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series #17, pp. 149-157). Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review.

Williams, M. (1922). The velveteen rabbit. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Women's Resource Center. (1994, February). College women's thoughts on feminism.... Wisdom, Words, and Women (newsletter, p. 1). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Woo, M. (1983). Letter to Ma. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua (Eds.), This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color (pp. 140-147). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Woolf, V. (1929). A room of one's own. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Wong, N. (1983). In search of the self as hero: Confetti of voices on New Year's night. A letter to myself. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldua (Eds.), This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color (pp. 177-181). New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Wong, S.C. (1993). Promises, pitfalls, and principles of text selection in curricular diversification: The Asian-American case. In T. Perry & J.W. Fraser (Eds.) Freedom's plow: Teaching in the multicultural classroom. (pp. 109-120). New York: Routledge.

Yamato, G. (1990). Something about the subject makes it hard to name. In G. Anzaldua (Ed). Making face, making soul: Haciendo caras, creative and critical perspectives by women of color. (pp.20-24) San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation Book.

Zeichner, K. (1993). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. (NCRTL Special report). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.