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ABSTRACT

This doctoral study concerns itself with the emergent identity formation of art student teachers: the knowledge and cultural systems [including TV and movies] through which art teaching identity conceives itself, and the ontological consequences [affects on art student teachers’ collective and self (dis)identifications] that evolve from those identifications. I examine how media representations of arts educators might act as a catalyst to help unfold the perceptions and desires student teachers have and how they affect how art education and art educators’ professional identities get imagined by student teachers. Specifically, I consider them as becoming-teacher, the space or movement in between their state of being a student and their state of being a teacher. I do not look at them as students in the University, nor do I look at them as teachers in the classroom, rather, I attempt to understand the chaos of the transition and dynamism in between these two states—the very plane of immanence within which they are currently situated.

In order to understand the movement of becoming-teacher, the methodology of the study includes individual interviews with three art student teachers and a group interview with the same three participants that took place after watching several pre-selected DVD clips of popular Hollywood movies and a TV series featuring arts educators. The DVD clips were shown to help answer the main research question which is: How can popular visual culture representations of arts educators be used as a catalyst to unfold student teachers’ unconscious pedagogical desires and fantasies about teaching art? Using a content analysis approach, I construct three categories of pedagogical fantasies that art student teachers may possess and/or employ with partial regard to the type of teacher they are becoming or desire to become/be recognized as. These pedagogical fantasies, of 1)
subject-supposed-to-know, 2) student enchantment, and 3) ego-identification, support their desires and exist as necessary vehicles for turning their teaching realities into seemingly (deceptively) coherent wholes. These pedagogical fantasies support the student teachers’ desires for power/recognition, love/connections, and salvation/social justice.

Employing both Lacanian psychoanalysis and Deleuzo-Guattarian philosophy, I consider the affective investments student teachers might develop/employ in their teacher identities as well as how they may (re)negotiate those identities. Specific importance is given to exploring what might happen in those moments when art student teachers begin to realize their pedagogical fantasies about teaching (art) are merely (deceptive) illusions. To conclude, I suggest that teacher educators can use fantasy and desire as an impetus for discussion about/working through the anxieties of the profession of teaching art and art teacher identity.
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PROLOGUE

“You were such an awesome art teacher, Laura!”

Natasha∗ extolled this sentiment in my general direction as she told her husband the story of how she and I met. I briefly stared at her, lost in thought, transfixed by the enthusiasm and sincerity of her acclamatory proclamation. “Yeah, well I’ve changed a lot as a teacher in the past ten years since I taught you,” I meekly replied, reflecting on an entire decade in mere seconds as my tone of voice implied that I had changed for the better. After a brief pause, “Has it really been that long?” Natasha responded in amazement.

Indeed it had been ten years since Natasha and I first met in her high school art classroom. Back then she was a freshman enrolled in her beginning art class and I was the new young art student teacher completing my secondary placement in hopes of transitioning into a licensed art teacher. There was a lot of hope then, in who I was going to become, in what I was going to do once I was an art teacher, in who my students were going to become, and in what they were going to do with their lives. Amongst all this hopefulness, there was at least an equal amount of transitional chaos, too. I was a student teacher negotiating my “border crossings that may [have] be[en] fraught with trauma: the student-to-teacher-authority passage; the adolescent/young adult-to-adult” (Mackwood, 1997, p. 182), from the one sitting at her desk receiving information into the one standing

∗ All names in this dissertation have been changed.
in front of the class giving out information. Everything was changing; some of it I seemed to have control over, and some of it I didn’t. At times I felt like I was the only one struggling with these border crossings during student teaching and other times I felt like I was on top of the world. There were days when I dreaded the thought of getting out of bed to face the school routine and there were days when I woke up early, excited about seeing my students that morning. Looking back now, from the temporal distance of ten years in the future, and sitting in Natasha’s living room, I recognize that my 14 weeks of student teaching was one of the most chaotic times of my life, and somehow, one of the most rewarding. Sitting there, I realized I was still reaping one of those rewards as Natasha and I continued our conversation about our initial meeting so long ago and the many experiences we’d shared together since then. There was my college graduation, her high school graduation, her college graduation, birthdays, weddings, funerals and the time I taught her how to create and sew her own grunge-punk-rebel pants.

[...enter year 1999...]

Our relationship had started out as teacher-student. I was her teacher and she was my student. On a daily basis, during my seven weeks of student teaching at her school, Natasha saw me as the authority of art in her high school classroom, as did her schoolmates that were also assigned to my art classes. Despite our closeness in age, with only a couple of years between us in some cases, the students respected me as the one that had the right answer about all things art-related, and my judgments of whether their art work(s) were good or bad made a difference to their self-esteem as art students. I was the one they looked (up) to.
However, like my life at the time, one day that teacher-student relationship transitioned, too. On the last day of class, after I had completed my placement at her high school, Natasha, along with several other students, insisted that we keep in touch, eagerly handing over their email addresses and asking for mine in return. Reluctant at first because of my uncertainty of “teacher-student contact rules”, I told the handful of students to give me their addresses and then assured them I would write first and then they would know my address. In my mind I secretly doubted that I would contact any of them, but with their pleading faces and multiple hugs as I walked out the door, my heart strings told me otherwise. *Why did I form these connections with my students? Why did I mean so much to them and why did they mean so much to me? Perhaps most intriguingly, how did I, as a twenty-one year old student teacher, receive respect-as-educator from students that were only 2-6 years younger than I was?*

I realize there are several probable explanations for those questions that I had asked myself back then as a novice art student teacher and of which I still periodically wonder about today. Some explanations, specifically regarding why students saw me as respected purveyor of arts knowledge even though I was relatively young, may lie in the body of knowledge referred to as psychoanalytic theory (Lacan, 1977; Fink, 1997; jagodzinski, 2002). This literature supports the notion that while I may not have actually been that much older than my students, nor an astute authority on art, my students perceived me as the one supposed to know through a psychoanalytic concept referred to as transference. In Lacan’s psychoanalytic transference

1 There will be a series of italicized questions after some paragraphs in this prologue. They are italicized in order to be set apart from the rest of the text and to designate them as my inner thoughts. Not all of the questions will be answered within the text of this chapter, as they are intended to help set the stage for the rest of the document.
the student’s love for the teacher is initiated when s/he perceives in the teacher something that s/he doesn’t have: namely, the objet a\(^2\), the inexplicable “something” in the Real. The teacher is an Authority figure who is “supposed-to-know.” The loving student presupposes that this object is in the teacher “more than in him/herself,” creating the fantasy—the spell of transference. (jagodzinski, 2002, p. xxi)

The students in my class, perhaps especially Natasha, regarded me as the subject-supposed-to-know, the authority figure who is presupposed to know everything (in my case about art), or at the very least, volumes more about art than do any of them as beginning art students. After all, I was a senior in college who had just completed four years of *art school*—I should know something about it, and definitely more than they do, or else why would I be up there in front of the room and instructing them with lessons that I had created. In other words, it was my students’ supposition of an art student teacher who knows, who had something more than they had in themselves, that initiated the teaching and learning process rather than the art knowledge actually possessed by me as the teacher. Once I was stationed in front of the art room donning an apron, given a piece of chalk, and introduced by the cooperating teacher as ‘Miss Hetrick, the student teacher who will be instructing you for the next seven weeks’, the spell of transference had already begun for some. For others, it would take “some time for the transference to become established” (Evans, 1996, p. 197), being completely indifferent to me or thinking any number of potentially negative things about me as a teacher upon first sight/meeting. However, “sooner or later some chance gesture of the [teacher’s] is taken by the [student] as a sign of some secret intention, some hidden knowledge. As this point

\(^2\) The concept of the objet a will be addressed more fully in Chapter 2 of this document.
the [teacher] has come to embody the subject supposed to know; [then] the transference is established” (Evans, 1996, p. 197).

Transference is therefore incredibly important to education and specifically the teaching-learning process, or pedagogical encounter. Often identified as indistinguishable from love (Lacan, 1977), the concept offers a reasonable explanation for my students’ respect and love toward me as their student teacher because “[t]ransference may be understood as the general propensity to displace past relationships onto current experiences” (Robertson, 1994, p. 18). In the context of education, this is most often the students’ relationships with their teachers being considered and treated with reference to the students’ past relationships with their parents. So, the love and respect felt toward the parents is transferred to the love and respect felt toward the teachers who assume a similar authoritative position in the students’ academic experiences. Likewise, as in my case of not being that much older than my students during student teaching, the students may have also displaced past relationships with older siblings onto their pedagogical experiences with me. Still an authoritative position [in a familial hierarchical sense of birth order] as an older sibling, the transferred relationship may have placed me as more of a cool mentor than a loving, devoted mother or father, though any number of previous relationships could have affected the students’ engagement with me. In whatever ways the students’ past relationships affected how they related to me, “as soon as the subject who is supposed to know exists somewhere… there is transference” (Lacan, 1977, p. 232).

Just as there is a probable psychoanalytic explanation for the students’ feelings toward me as their teacher, likewise there is a comparable explanation for my feelings,
passions, and biases toward them, which is referred to as counter-transference (Fink, 1997). Similar to the students’ transference, my feelings toward the students could have been based on past relationships that I was displacing on the then-current pedagogical experiences. For example, perhaps Natasha reminded me of one of my dear friends from high school or college, or perhaps it was one of my younger cousins that she most spoke and acted like. Or perhaps, not inconsequentially, Natasha reminded me of myself at her age. Whatever previous relationships we were basing our pedagogical encounters on in the high school art classroom, the connections that we [students and I] made and the desire to ‘keep in touch’ were quite possibly the result of the reciprocal inter/intra play between the students’ transference toward me as the teacher (as the subject-supposed-to-know) and my counter-transference toward them as my students.

[...enter year 2009...]

The reason that Natasha and I had gotten together recently was because, just weeks before, she had emailed to inform me that she was accepted to go into the Peace Corps and would be stationed in Africa for the next two years. With a peculiar urgency in her message, she suggested we meet soon so she could see me again before she left the country in less than a month’s time. Deeply honored by her request, I assured her that I would do my best to make the necessary arrangements for a visit. As our email correspondence continued until a time and place were agreed upon, I couldn’t help but reflect on other former students of mine that have continued to keep in touch after various expanses of time have lapsed since our initial pedagogical encounters. What particularly piqued my interest was the realization that three of my former students had all contacted
me in the last year with an urgent plea to see me before they left the country for their individual life experiences. In addition to Natasha, one of her schoolmates, Alexander, had joined the US Marines and was about to be deployed to Iraq’s Anbar Province when he insisted that I see him, his wife, and two kids before they moved to his base in the Southeastern US for pre-deployment training. Because he was not quite sure where I was living due to my recent move, Alexander had frantically sought me out through a social-networking site to inform me of his pending departure and visit request by sending an email to my profile’s message box. Devastated when he told me he’d be stationed in one of the most dangerous sites of the war, I worried about him the entire expanse of time he was over there. I happily rejoiced when Alexander informed me a few months ago that he had safely returned to the States unscathed by the war he had been an intimate part of for nearly a year’s time.

Another former student, Rakesh, excitedly called me months ago to inform me that he was moving permanently to Germany at the beginning of this summer and wished to see me and have me meet his extended family before he left. He flew to Ohio from California (where I previously lived and he and I initially met) and set up a luncheon/college graduation party at his paternal grandmother’s house so we could all meet and spend quality time together before his departure. I knew that Rakesh’s decision to move to Germany had been partly due to my suggestion of such a move and my continuing verbal and emotional support as he found a way to make it happen. He gently reminded me of my influence as we said our final goodbyes and embraced in a lengthy bear hug.
Reflecting back now, I wonder why there was so much urgency in their personal pleas to see me one last time, especially before leaving the country. I knew that the initial connections we made as teacher and students were due to our (counter)transference in the classroom(s), but why were they so desirous of my acknowledgment after this long expanse of time? What fantasy could the site/sight/cite\(^3\) of a former teacher fulfill for these individuals? Why were their desires to be in the same place as me [site], to see me [sight], and to hear from me [cite] before their departures so fervent? Besides my own counter-transference, why did I immediately acquiesce when they petitioned my presence? What desires and fantasies could they be fulfilling for me?

[...enter year 2008...]

These close-knit, loving, even seemingly familial relationships with my former students became the impetus for the research topic that will unfold throughout the duration of this document, though it was not the first direction I had considered. Originally I had proposed a dissertation topic that explored visual culture as a paradigmatic shift within art education, and after only a couple of months of working on it, I soon dramatically lamented to my advisor that the topic wasn’t ‘making my heart sing.’ Looking across the desk at me quizzically, as Kevin so often does during our advisory meetings, he encouraged me to explain this assertion further. I told him that I was finding any number of other things to do, such as clean and re-clean my apartment, create/finish art projects that had been on hold for years, and other such mundane

\(^3\) This is a play on jagodzinski’s homology site/sight/cite, which captures Lacan’s three psychic registers, the Real=site, Imaginary=sight, and Symbolic=cite. For further explanation, refer to jagodzinski, j. (2006). Grasping the site/sight/cite of the image: A Lacanian Explication. *Journal of Social Theory in Art Education, 26*, 388-405.
activities, every time I sat down to work on my proposal. In effect, it wasn’t holding my interest and I could not foresee spending over a year writing a document that I didn’t feel passionate about. And of course the question that came next, seemingly so simple, yet so profound, was something like, ‘well, what are you passionate about?’ Briefly immobilized by his inquiry, delivered with his trademark calm and precision, I sheepishly responded that I didn’t know, but that I had just received very thoughtful emails from two former students (Alexander and Rakesh) on the same day that very weekend. Reading them had caused me to stop and think about what this gesture meant (to them and to me) and to consider why I had surprisingly cherished the receipt of these unexpected letters so much.

The conversation that pursued following that admission revolved around the idea that I really thought there was something there—in their act of writing these loving messages and in my astonishment at their arrival in my inbox. I wasn’t quite sure what it was, but why would students that I taught between four and nine years ago write such wonderful letters to me after all of these years? And why would I care about these letters so much that I was willing to discard months of work on my other proposal to start something new and of which I had no clue how to address? What was this idea that I couldn’t express in words? Why was, whatever it was that was unsayable, also exactly what was making my ‘heart sing’? Where did I go from here? Kevin listened intently to my stream of consciousness and then told me to start reading as much as I could find on teacher-student pedagogical relationships and teacher (as) subjects and then we’d meet again in a couple of weeks to see what I had found. After leaving that meeting I began frantically searching research databases, though I didn’t quite know what I was looking
for and wasn’t sure whether I would recognize it if I did find it. Days before I was to meet with Kevin again, he emailed and told me he had made a copy of an article that he read on his recent trip to Japan and he had placed it in my campus mailbox. It had reminded him of our previous conversation and he told me I should read it before our meeting so we could discuss it further.

Reaching into my mailbox, I pulled out an article entitled *Fantasy’s Confines: Popular Culture and the Education of the Female Primary-School Teacher* by Judith Robertson (1997). I took it home and began reading it, immediately fascinated by both the content, which included the “ways in which fantasy life affects the process of learning to teach” (p. 75) in beginning teachers, and the ways in which she wrote so passionately about her topic. After reading the first few pages it soon became apparent what particular section of her writing had resonated with my utterances from the meeting a few weeks before; it pertained to beginning teachers’ fantasies about receiving loving/love letters from future students. Instantly I thought of my mention of Alexander and Rakesh’s emails to me. Robertson begins by discussing how she showed twelve White, female, primary school teachers the movie *Stand and Deliver* (1987), which is about Jaime Escalante, a high school Calculus teacher that leads his disadvantaged Hispanic students to mathematical greatness. Robertson relates that after watching the movie together, she was surprised that all of the women were fascinated with one particular 90 second scene “in which students demonstrate explicit love for their cherished teacher” (Robertson, 1997, p. 77). Noting that this specific scene was not particularly significant to the plot of the movie, she felt the pattern of viewer response was. She used the females’ connections
to this screen instance to set the stage for her theorizing about the fantasy of the receipt of love letters in teaching.

Briefly, the notion of the ‘love letter’ in teaching as Robertson has conceptualized it within her article, pertains to the fantasized action of teachers receiving unexpected recognition and validation for their dedication to teaching and to their students from former [or future] students. There is a posting of praise and love from the students—former, current, or future—real or imagined—in actual writing or in thought/daydream. When the posting of love through a letter, book, award, etc is imagined:

[t]he tokens [letters] are narcissistic investments (signed, sealed, and delivered by the self to the self) in anticipation of the triumphant day when creative agency will at last be allowed dominion through teaching (a romantic idealization of the pedagogical encounter). The addressee of the posted missive is an ideal imaginary I, and the addresser is an ideal, imaginary other. Their triumphant fusion through subjective fantasy (and the feelings connected with this moment—ecstasy, beauty, sublimity) constitute the women’s desire to “be a teacher and make (that) difference.” (Robertson, 1997, pp. 83-84)

The imaginary posting of a love letter to the self (e.g. by way of a thought or daydream) reveals that a teacher secretly or at least unconsciously does expect the unexpected letter from her students, and by implication, desires to receive recognition and validation for all of her hard work. While there is nothing wrong with desiring recognition for hard work or for doing a good job, “[t]he fantasy testifies to a hidden self-aggrandizement” (Robertson, 1997, p. 84) that may at the same time function as a disavowal of the desire for love and acceptance. What Robertson is saying is that her participants’ fantasies of
receiving loving statements of real or imagined student adulation may have unconscious desires of love and recognition that are supporting that fantasy and making their jobs and working life more acceptable in the wake of the low intellectual valuation and occupational prestige of elementary teachers. “The women’s experience of children’s demands and their knowledge of how belittled work with children can be may evoke the real fear that they, as teachers, will fail. The dream of love is one way of forgetting the persecutory potential of the work of being together and making knowledge” (Robertson, 1997, p. 87). The fantasy of love and being loved makes real life livable and compels the teacher to return to work day after day, regardless of the actual conditions of her job or the (potentially unsupportive) views/behaviors present in society.

Whereas my letters from my former students were actual and not imagined like most of those mentioned by Robertson’s research participants, the underlying fantasies and desires behind my cherishing of the emails could potentially have had the same motivations. Perhaps I saw Alexander and Rakesh’s letters as overdue or deserved recognition of my hard work and represented a love that I felt I was lacking from my own life. Perhaps that fantasy of student adulation helped make my life career choice more acceptable in the wake of the low intellectual valuation and low occupational prestige of being an art teacher. Whatever the fantasies or desires that could be motivating my captivation with these letters, through the suggested reading of Robertson’s article, I had a new path to follow, a new way to consider the thoughts that had been previously unknowable and unsayable to myself. I now had a direction and a topic that was making my heart sing and I was vastly looking forward to the research journey that would help me figure out why.
CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION

Straightening my back from the hunched over position above the dye stained sink, I quickly looked up into the bathroom mirror to catch the first glimpse of my new hair color. Instantly taken aback by the drastic change before me it took several seconds to recognize myself in the new image looking back. Only minutes earlier I had been a light blonde; now I had hair of dark red. “Surely this is still me. That is my face,” I reasoned. After the brief instance of misrecognition, I smiled approvingly. “Now they’ll take me seriously as a student teacher,” I audibly reassured myself. “Now I will show them.”

This very short narrative, depicting the memory of an event in my life during my undergraduate years at University, illustrates that even at the age of twenty-one and at the threshold of student teaching, I had a particular idea and internalized psychic image of what a serious teacher should look like, both to myself and to them- my students, including Natasha and Alexander. My natural blonde hair and youthful appearance were presupposed detriments to this conceptualization of a strong, knowledgeable, stern yet understanding, modest yet authoritarian, leader in the classroom- the subject-supposed-to-know (Lacan, 1964). This ideal image, that I held at the conscious level and perhaps even more so at the unconscious level, was so engrained in my being that I physically
changed my appearance to support the identity of teacher that I would soon be projecting to my students and other educators. I physically changed my body to represent the body that I thought should be standing in front of the classroom. Why did I feel it necessary to transform my appearance so noticeably? Where or how had my conceptualization(s) of teacher been formed? Why was I so sure that my students would then take me more seriously because I resembled the idea of teacher I had in my mind? Why did I so intimately desire for my students to recognize me as the brilliant, no-nonsense professional that should be respected and looked up to? Or perhaps equally as important, why did I think my students desired to see me as that teacher?

1.01 **Background to the Study:**

The origin of the psychic image of teacher, for myself and others, may be partially found situated within the visual representations of educators that pervade the collective consciousness through their ubiquity in popular US visual culture. Teachers, art educators included, “have long been the focus of popular images and stereotypes in [US] American culture. Perhaps this is because interaction with teachers is a shared experience for most and the image of schoolhouse and teacher conjure up common memories,” (McCullick, et al., 2003, p. 4). There is little doubt that art education, while not consistently present in all US schools, has been an integral part of many K-12* grade students’ lives in the US public education system for years. Furthermore, some visual

---

* “K-12” refers to the demarcation of grades ‘kindergarten through twelfth’ in most public and private schools throughout the US. This notation will be used in the study as a means of specifying between students who are situated within these grades and students who attend higher education [college] institutions. As a further note of importance, most preservice art teachers become certificated or licensed for K-12 visual arts, so it is a commonly used and understood notation within the field of art education.
culture imagery, which includes a plethora of books, magazine articles, movies, cartoons, and situation comedies, as well as other popular media, has been formed around the storylines of educators’ lives both inside and outside of the classroom (e.g. Half Nelson, 2006; Front of the Class, 2008; The Simpsons, 2010). The prevalence of this imagery in our everyday lives may partially affect the psychic image of teacher held by most individuals in the US, including the general public, current teachers, and preservice or student teachers (those about to become teachers).

“The influence of media representations upon that internalized image of the teacher we hope to become is undeniably significant for instructors and students in faculties of education, whether we assimilate those representations uncritically and passively, analyze and critique them, or dismiss them as irrelevant,” (Zook & Schlender, 2003, p. 71). While the entirety of the influence or impact of the media representations of educators on the general public, or specifically student teachers can not be fully known, these images can be used as a site for interrogation and critique of the fantasies and actualities of teacher culture, which is the “forms of consciousness, knowledge, sentiments and values that teachers use as part of their cultural repertoires in schools [which] are the result of social constitution” (Sachs & Smith, 1988, p. 423). This interrogation or critical analysis of teacher culture representations is mostly situated within the field of visual culture studies in art education which in part encourages individuals to dissect images and look at concepts such as social status or class, make

---

4 “The ‘social’ is composed of a number of overlapping discourses that are characteristic of schools everywhere. ‘Teacher culture’ is a signifier for the production and consumption of these discourses,” (Sachs & Smith, 1988, p. 423). While it can be said that there is no one set of beliefs and practices that are essential to teacher, the systematic formation of schools within the US provides certain conditions for shared commonalities. For a more thorough discussion of “teacher culture” please refer to Constructing Teacher Culture by Sachs & Smith (1988).
interferences about the nature of relationships between people, and/or consider situations of power and desire that may be present within those images (Duncum, 2006; Eisenhauer, 2006; Hetrick, 2007; Tavin, 2003). It is important for student teachers “to understand how and why visual imagery and objects are created and consumed, and how they influence who we are: our identities, desires, behaviors, and choices,” (Polaniecki, 2006, p. 39). Some of the student teachers’ choices that may be influenced by visual culture imagery are their decisions regarding their future careers and their emergent professional identities in relation to those careers.

In fact, student teachers might be soon applying for and assuming teaching placements as a beginning step in establishing their careers. Though student teacher means they are not yet certificated or licensed, nor have they held an unsupervised teaching position yet, they are usually involved in undergraduate or graduate programs with professors that are instructing them in content knowledge and methodologies of teaching as well as spending a determinant time in clinical placements\(^5\). These clinical placements are cooperating schools, elementary and secondary, public and private, regular and specialized, that allow student teachers to put theory into practice in a real classroom with actual K-12 students. While there, student teachers usually take over the course load of a participating educator [referred to as a cooperating or mentor teacher] that advises and monitors the student teacher’s process and progress.

\(^5\) At a placement the student teacher is responsible for creating and executing lesson plans and assumes all the other responsibilities of the cooperating teacher as practice and as a foretaste of actual teaching. The amount of time in the placement varies by discipline and University; however, most programs require 10-14 weeks at a placement. It is generally one of the last steps before acquiring the teaching license. As a further note, art education student teachers are required to have both a primary and secondary school placement as they are typically licensed for teaching grades K-12.
It is presumed that student teachers have an interest in teaching since many of them have invested so much time, money, and energy into taking classes and engaging in field placements in order to receive their teaching licenses. Because these individuals are choosing a future career in teaching, it might be assumed that they have an idea[s] of what a teacher is, or does, and what might constitute teacher culture, whether consciously or unconsciously. Likewise, they presumably also have an idea of whether they already fit within that psychic construction of teacher, whether they may someday fit, or not.

Since this group of student teachers is at the threshold of becoming professional educators and have not yet experienced all the actualities of full time teaching in the societal schooling system, they are ideal for garnering information on how they come to know themselves as teachers- as they are quite literally in the process of becoming teacher. Becoming, within the context of this study, means something different than the everyday usage of the term, typically understood as a state of turning into something else.

In Deleuzian philosophical terms, becoming is “the pure movement evident in changes between particular events… [it is] not a phase between two states [rather], becoming is the very dynamism of change, situated between heterogeneous terms” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 21). So, with regard to this research study, I am looking at the student teacher’s transitional movement evident in the change between being a student in the preservice college classroom and being a teacher in her own art classroom. Becoming teacher is not an end state that each student teacher is looking to achieve, but, rather it is an unfolding of identity that is a continuous process. Additionally, as Britzman (2003) points out, there is

---

6 The Deleuzian concept of becoming is more fully explicated in Chapter 2: Related Literature Review.
no single road to becoming… teacher or to critiquing its currency. Nor is there a single story of learning to teach. There are, however, some shared persistent dilemmas, contradictory realities, and common narratives that the newly arrived [nascent teachers] personally confront and internalize as their own. From this confrontation, we can assume some familiar themes made from that strange and volatile combination of school biography, school structure, and the desires of wanting to become a teacher but not yet knowing in advance what precisely this entails. (p. 6)

In other words, there is no one path that all those learning to teach will follow, with the same experiences, the same dynamism of change, or the same chaotic moments. However, the systematic formation of schools within the US provides certain conditions for shared commonalities and themes pertaining to the ideas of what it is or should be to teach and be a teacher. These themes are being called, in this present study, “pedagogical fantasies”. Instead of being understood in the vernacular sense as fantastic sceneries that help one escape reality, psychoanalytically speaking, fantasy is the implied or hoped for satisfaction one receives from the object-cause of desire and “enables and activates powerful structures of feeling” (Robertson, 1997, p. 85). Therefore, pedagogical fantasies are those fantasies that involve pedagogical encounters/exchanges between two or more people inside or outside of an educational setting such as a classroom. Consequently, herein, with particular attention to student teachers and their pedagogical fantasies about teaching art, is where my inquiry begins.
1.02 Statement of the Problem:

My doctoral study concerns itself with the emergent identity formation of art student teachers: the knowledge and cultural systems (including TV and movies) through which art teaching identity conceives itself, and the ontological consequences (affects on art student teachers’ collective and self {dis}identifications) that evolve from those identifications\(^7\). More specifically, I “examine how desire figures in specific instances of screen identification or how fantasy engagement with screen hero[in]es and screen stories affects what gets said or left unsaid about the work of teaching [art]” (Robertson, 1997, p. 76). Put another way, I consider and investigate how teacher culture may be socially constructed through TV and films, and the ways in which desire and the fantasies around teacher culture affect how art education and art educators’ professional identities get imagined by student teachers. Further, “the practice of teaching, because it is concocted from relations with others and occurs in structures that are not of one’s own making is, first and foremost, an uncertain experience that one must learn to interpret and make significant” (Britzman, 2003, p. 3). Hence, it is my aim to interpret and make significant the textured narratives of the student teachers’ responses to popular visual culture representations of teachers with the consideration of how the representations may arouse, channel, or predispose the participants’ future pedagogical desires.

Pedagogical desire is a concept that can be considered from a multitude of ways, including motivating educational forces, such as the proclivity to help others, the passion to learn, and/or the inclination to teach. Often the desire to teach “manifests itself in terms of wanting to ‘make a difference’ and effect change in a child’s life (Moore, 2004,

\(^7\) I owe my choice of wording to Robertson (1994, p. 8).
Such rationales often draw on redemptive discourses of wanting to improve students’ circumstances and provide better life choices (Marsh, 2002),” (Watkins, 2007, p. 303). In the case of my study participants, art student teachers, the desire to teach might also be a love of the subject and/or artistic processes and wanting to share this knowledge and/or technical ability with their students. While I consider these aspects of student teachers’ motivations to teach, I go beyond these initial reasons for joining the profession of teaching and explore how their desires may affect their decisions and perceptions of their future students, teaching, and professional learning. By invoking the theories of desire by Lacan and Deleuze & Guattari, I plan on complicating the seemingly obvious reasons that individuals (student teachers in particular) may initially desire to teach. While there are potentially many possible reasons a student teacher could offer when asked why she is deciding to become a teacher, there are several reasons that may be operating under the cloak of unconscious desires\(^8\). Additionally, I examine how the media representations of arts educators that I share with the participants might act as a catalyst to help unfold the perceptions and desires student teachers have of their emergent teaching identities and of their personal roles situated within art education.

1.03 Primary Research Question:

Teacher education programs and their accompanying texts usually contain tips about becoming new teachers and often address concerns of curriculum, getting to know and manage the student population, and dealing with everyday situations in the classroom.

\(^8\)It should be articulated that not all desire is unconscious and not all individuals are unaware of what motivates them to action.
(Salas, et al., 2004; Schwebel, et al., 2002; Roe, et al., 2006). Discussions of the act of teaching are often presented as “a daunting set of challenges for those just starting out” (Salas, et al., 2004, p. 3). While these are genuine concerns that perhaps should be expressed by teacher educators, “what we seldom do is help our students [teacher candidates] to think about how the symptomatic desires of the fictional teachers we meet in print, television, and film texts are refracted through the internalized notions of ‘self-as-teacher’ that we and our students bring to a teacher education program,” (Zook & Schlender, 2003, p. 71). In effect, I go beyond the discussion of the potentially daunting set of challenges that student teachers may encounter in their future classrooms and explore how their desires may affect their decisions and perceptions of their students, teaching, and learning. While I believe there is already a space for talking about the best practices of teaching, in undergraduate preservice methods courses and textbooks (such as those listed above), I feel there should also be a space for discovering and unfolding those motivating desires that initially lead one to teach or want to teach. Thus, my main research question is: How can popular visual culture representations of arts educators be used as a catalyst to unfold student teachers’ unconscious pedagogical desires and fantasies about teaching art?

I answer this question by first exploring literature on the concept of teacher culture embedded within art/media and general education studies; visual culture studies in art education; and several specific Lacanian concepts within psychoanalytic theory and several Deleuzo-Guattarian philosophical concepts. Once I complete an extensive review of related literature, I interview three art student teachers in regards to their ideas, reasons, and/or desires for becoming an art teacher and what it means to them to be
identified as an art teacher and committed to teaching. Based on their individual interview responses, I selected various TV and film representations of arts educators to view with them and to determine how the representations could serve as a catalyst for unfolding the perceptions art student teachers have of their emergent professional identities and pedagogical desires. I chose representations of art teachers because “it does seem reasonable to expect that material whose content explicitly referred to teaching [art] would in the long run have a greater chance of having… an impact than would material that had nothing to do with teaching at all” (Jackson, 1992, p. 68, as cited in Daspit & Weaver, 1999, p. 43). How I attempt to answer the main inquiry can be further delineated through the exploration of the supporting subquestions listed below.

1.04 List of Supporting Subquestions:

While my study centers on how various visual culture representations of arts teachers may serve as a catalyst for unfolding the perceptions student teachers have of their emergent professional identities and desires, several subquestions can be derived from this primary question that may provide further insight into my overarching research inquiry. The complexity and complicity of these representations cannot be underestimated with regard to their ability to help reveal student teachers’ psychic images and internalized perceptions of teacher. It is with this consideration that I formulate my supporting subquestions.

1) What affective investments might art student teachers develop/employ in their individual and collective teacher identities?
2) How do art student teachers (re)negotiate their teacher identities in accordance to possible dis-identifications with mediated images of teachers/teacher culture?

3) What might happen in those moments when art student teachers begin to realize their pedagogical fantasies about teaching (art) are merely (deceptive) illusions?

I answer these supporting subquestions by conducting individual interviews with three student teachers and one small group interview session (with the same three participants) which included watching several DVD clips of arts educators from TV and film. The interview questions were carefully constructed with these subquestions as the underlying impetus. This interview process is more fully delineated later in Chapter 3- Methodology near the middle of this dissertation. In attempt to keep a main focus in my research process, below I have listed the parameters to the study.

1.05 Parameters of the Study:

Within this study, it is necessary to set some boundaries (limitations and delimitations) in order to maintain focus and scope of the research. As Rossman and Rallis (1998) state, “limitations and delimitations of the study place some boundaries around it and set some conditions. These are the reservations and qualifications inherent in any research,” (p. 84). While my aforementioned research questions help define and frame the focus of the study, it is necessary to inform the reader that the researcher has an awareness of what she may be including and excluding from the research process due to ethical considerations and/or time and size constraints.
First, this study includes examining the representations of art teachers, including those in films or TV shows. While I understand there are many representations of all types of teachers (e.g. primary, secondary, and subject-specific) in popular visual culture, my main emphasis in this study is the representations of visual art/art history educators because of the connectivity to my own subjectivity and positionality within my course of study in the art education doctoral program. I am aware that all images and representations of teachers in visual culture potentially contribute to student teachers’ conceptualizations of teachers and teacher culture; however, I am most interested in how particular representations of art educators can act as a catalyst to help unfold art student teachers’ desires in their emergent professional identity formations.

Secondly, while the understanding of how individuals are influenced by different portrayals of teachers, including media messages (such as TV and films) “is a powerful starting place to address negative images that could affect public policy decisions about education” (Burbach & Figgins, 1993, p. 75, as cited in McCullick, et al., 2003, p. 6), policy is not the main focus of my study. I agree that particular representations of teachers, especially those construed as negative or inappropriate (racist, classist, gendered, abled, etc), should be under consideration and potentially exposed and demystified so that they do not adversely affect policy decisions made about art (and the funding of art programs) in schools. Similarly, while it may be equally important that the negative teacher representations are deflated so as not to deter qualified, high-caliber individuals from applying for/assuming teaching positions, addressing the effects of negative representations of educators and their (potential) resultant policy changes is not an area I spent a concentrated time researching. I do, however, remain cognizant of how
these potentially negative images, concepts, and ideas may influence the analysis and results of my research.

Third, I utilize concepts from the body of ideas referred to as psychoanalytic theory which was initially developed by Austrian physician Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). While Freud was the recognized creator of this body of knowledge, many successors and their ideas have proceeded from and branched out from his embryonic influences. Like most disciplines, since its inception, psychoanalytic theory has matured into a field with multitudinous theorists and concepts. Due to its vastness and the innumerable volumes written about its many aspects, I am aware that I will be merely scraping the surface of the psychoanalytic theoretical knowledge that is available to me. With this in mind, it is also important to acknowledge that I utilize the theories and concepts put forth by several different psychoanalytic theorists, such as Jacques Lacan, Sigmund Freud, and Anna Freud, as well as philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, often through the works of other scholars, such as Slavoj Žižek, Jan Jagodzinski, Yannis Stavrakakis, and Michalinos Zembylas, to provide a foundation for personal understanding. While at times their scholarly research may seem to be in opposition to one another, I employ the concepts of each theorist as they best help support the ideas and structure of my study and maneuver it forward.

Lastly, with regard to the methodology, the utilization of content analysis on individual and group interview transcripts, accompanied by a small sample size (N=3), may present particular limitations to the study and its results. First, though “purposive sampling cases are handpicked for a specific reason” (Lewin, 2005, p. 219), the very small sample size of three student teachers could raise issues of generalizability, or “the
possibility of expanding any claims of causality from the group or sample being studied to the population that the group represents” (Lewin, 2005, p. 216). However, in this research, I do not make claims as to the *generalizability* of the study, rather I am concerned with *transferability*, “regarding those criteria which are rooted in convincing the reader through drawing her or him into the world of the participants and sensing the believability of that world” (Goldbart & Hustler, 2005, p. 17). In other words, I am not claiming that the results of this research are indicative of all individuals in the field of art education, rather, that the results of this study “provide a flavour” (Mason, 2002, p. 126) of the relationships between the contexts and individuals sampled, which could be transferred to others in similar situations. Furthermore, though content analysis is a “nonobtrusive, nonreactive, measurement technique” (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 1998, p. 30), my own researcher bias as a White female, may cause me to overlook some nuances of White privileging that may be embedded within my questioning techniques or choice of DVD clips that I share with the participants.

**1.06 Significance of the Study:**

I am interested in the pre-service (student teaching) art education program because of my current position as a university supervisor of art student teachers and my intentions of being a future program manager/director at the university level. With the expectations of a lifelong career working with this population, I feel it is imperative for me and for them to explore how their personal desires may affect their decisions and perceptions of their future students, teaching, and learning. I also believe there should be a space for discovering and unfolding those motivating desires that initially led the
student teachers to teach as well as attempt to understand their struggles in grappling with their emergent identities. This is important because “the individual struggles of particular people become an allegory for the crisis of learning a profession and the more general condition of education as such” (Britzman, 2003, p. 12). Additionally, through gaining a keener understanding of my own desires, which may have been partly mediated by popular visual culture representations, I hope to become a more conscious and empathetic professor/advisor of future art educators who are in the midst of [re]forming their conceptualizations of their individual and collective teaching identities.

Second, current art education scholarship includes many articles that have been written about various interests of visual culture including [but not limited to] comic books and the lives of urban youth (Bitz, 2004); tourist souvenirs (Ballengee-Morris, 2002); teaching about surfing culture (Congdon & King, 2002), and also about why it should be a pedagogy within the field of art education (Chan, 2005; & Darts, 2004). However, there appear to be gaps in scholarship that explore the media representations of art teachers within popular visual culture. Similarly, there also appear to be gaps in scholarship that explore the pedagogical desires and fantasies of student art teachers. Except for an article by Atkinson (2004) which theorizes about how student teachers form their identities in initial teacher education through discursive practices, there is little written about this population from a psychoanalytic perspective. Similarly, an article by Unrath & Kerridge (2009), Becoming an Art Teacher: Storied Reflections of Two Preservice Students, that attempted to shed “light on the developmental process of becoming an educator and how humanistic values transfer into professional practice” (p. 272), did not theorize how their conclusions might affect students’ pedagogical desires
and fantasies in the classroom. When the two concepts of visual culture representations and student teachers’ desires are combined, there appears to be a distinct vacuity in the extant literature. Therefore, the findings from this study will contribute to the existing literature by answering the need for research outlining student art teachers’ conceptualizations of their emergent teaching identities as well as their desires within art education.

1.07 Summary and Design of the Study:

When I was initially conceptualizing my study of student teachers and their emergent professional identities, I knew I wanted to consider the space or movement in between the event of being a student and the event of being a teacher. I did not want to look at them as students in the University, nor did I want to look at them as teachers in the classroom, rather, I wanted to attempt to explore the chaos of the transition and dynamism in between these two events—their becoming teacher on the very plane of immanence⁹ within which they are currently situated. I want to consider their desires, and their struggles and hopes in grappling with their emerging identities, and potentially what influences these emotions/affects through the use of popular visual culture referents. In effect, I am investigating student teachers’ pedagogical desires and exploring the unfolding of their art teacher identity in the context of media representations.

In the following chapter, Chapter 2- Related Literature Review, I review scholarship written about the concept of teacher culture (Markgraf & Pavlik, 1998; ⁹ A plane of immanence “can be conceived as a surface upon which all events occur, where events are understood as chance, productive interactions between forces of all kinds. As such, it represents the field of becoming, a ‘space’ containing all of the possibilities inherent in forces” (Stagoll, 2005b, p. 204). This will be more fully explored in Chapter 2: Related Literature.
McCullick, et al, 2003; Reyes & Rios, 2003; Turvey, 2005; visual culture (Freedman, 1997; Tavin, 2002; Barrett, 2003; Walker, Daiello, Hathaway, & Rhoades, 2006); Lacanian psychoanalytic theory (Lacan, 1977, 2006; Evans, 1996; Fink, 1997; Todd, 1997; jagodzinski, 2002); and Deleuze-Guattarian philosophy (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, 1987; May, 2003; Zembylas, 2007; Watkins, 2008). I review this related literature in an attempt to situate my research within extant scholarship and to provide a foundation for understanding many of the Lacanian and Deleuze-Guattarian terminologies that are frequently employed throughout this study. Directly following in Chapter 3- Methodology, I fully outline the design of the study which includes individual interviews with three student teachers, a group interview with the same three participants after watching several pre-selected DVD clips featuring arts educators, and the creation/delineation of three categories of pedagogical fantasies through which to read the data. In Chapter 4-Unfolding of Data, utilizing the categories constructed in the previous chapter, I present excerpts of the collected data intermixed with excerpts from the TV and movie scenes that exemplify the pedagogical fantasy representative of each category. Immediately after, in Chapter 5- Interpretations of the Data, I offer various interpretations of the underlying desires that may be supported by the pedagogical fantasies found in the data (from Chapter 4), using various Lacanian and Deleuze-Guattarian concepts of desire and identity. Lastly, in Chapter 6- Conclusions & Implications, I explore what this study could mean within preservice art education classrooms and in the broader context of the field of art education.
CHAPTER 2- RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section I describe how my dissertation topic has been informed by literature from three major areas of study, including: the concept of teacher culture embedded within art/media and general education studies; visual culture studies in art education; and several specific Lacanian concepts within psychoanalytic theory and several specific Deleuzo-Guattarian philosophical concepts. Many of the ideologies from each discourse overlap and often complement one another. I briefly discuss each area of study separately and explain their influences and interconnectedness. Though this chapter is designated as a review of the related literature, citations and ideas from various scholars will be intertwined and embedded throughout the document. A sizable portion of the literature is positioned here as a foundation for understanding many of the Lacanian and Deleuzo-Guattarian terminologies that are frequently employed as well as for recognizing their placements in the workings of identity formation and desire. Several concepts will be reintroduced and expanded upon in later chapters of the study.

Within this chapter, the concept of teacher culture is explored first because I feel it is necessary to establish the foundational ideas the research is built upon. Next, a brief account of visual culture is provided for it is through this area of study that art/media studies, teacher culture, and the psychoanalytic/philosophic theories coincide. Also, the
ideologies and social concerns of visual culture are important in critically analyzing and interpreting teacher representations in the media and how they may affect our collective imaginings of teacher. Furthermore, visual culture in art education is the site where I consider how the visual representations of arts educators can be used as a catalyst to unfold the student teachers’ potentially unconscious pedagogical desires. I consider the concept of visual culture in art education, first, through a brief, yet broad overview, and then more specifically as it is concerned with psychoanalytic concepts. Lastly, Lacanian psychoanalytic theory and Deleuze-Guattarian philosophy are explored as the lenses through which the data collected is examined.

2.01 Literature of Teacher Culture:

When referring to any term with culture included, it is important to first define what is meant by the word culture. In this dissertation, I am defining culture as “the shared practices of a group, community, or society, through which meaning is made out of the visual, aural, and textual world of representations,” (Sturken & Cartwright, 2001, p. 3). Furthermore, culture can be thought of as not necessarily a group of things, but “as a set of processes or practices through which individuals and groups come to make sense of those things. Culture is the production and exchange of meanings, the giving and taking of meaning, between members of a society or group,” (Sturken & Cartwright, 2001, pp. 3-4). This includes those processes and practices that are shared by a group or groups of teachers, hence the concept teacher culture. Furthermore, as stated in Chapter 1-Introduction:
[f]orms of consciousness, knowledge, sentiments and values that teachers use as part of their cultural repertoires in schools are the result of social constitution. The ‘social’ is composed of a number of overlapping discourses that are characteristic of schools everywhere. ‘Teacher culture’ is a signifier for the production and consumption of these discourses. (Sachs & Smith, 1988, p. 423)

While it can be said that there is no one set of agreed upon beliefs and practices that are essential to teacher, the systematic formation of schools within the US provides certain conditions for shared processes, practices, and commonalities [work schedules, grading and assessment practices, laws governing appropriate behaviors with students, etc]. Through this definition of teacher culture, I explore some of the literature written about some film representations of this concept within general education and media studies.

Turvey’s (2005) article Who’d be an English teacher? considers the progress of first year English [subject] teachers in London classrooms. She contrasts the typical media representations of successful teaching “that focus on questions of personality and inspiration” (p. 3) with the actualities of “negotiation and accommodation” (p. 3) that she sees in her research participants’ interactions with their students. In particular, Turvey states that in most media representations “[t]eaching is so often seen as largely a question of the personality of the teacher, and any ‘problems’ in the classroom are dramatized as conflicts of personality—between the teacher and particular students, who are usually ‘won round in the end’—or between the teacher and an unsympathetic system,” (Turvey, 2005, p. 4). She relates how this is not the case in her actual dealings with first year English teachers who are new to the occupation.
Instead of having beautifully resolved endings where everyone gets along and the teacher forever inspires the students, Turvey found that these English teachers had to negotiate their roles as new teachers and rely on their content knowledge and past experiences to accommodate their students. It was only through the negotiation and accommodation of their students, with the teachers as the *subjects supposed to know*, not their overwhelmingly inspiring personalities, that the first year teachers were able to resolve issues in the classroom. Turvey’s article is an example of how media representations of teachers can affect the societal conceptualization of teacher as one who embodies an inspirational personality or suppositions of a teacher-who-knows that enables all students to learn and succeed. It is disappointing to both parents and teachers when this is not the actuality in their students’ classrooms. This revelation about personality versus negotiation and accommodation could also be potentially devastating for student teachers’ conceptualizations of the future teachers they would like to become. They might be very disillusioned when they are unable to use their personality to inspire and win over all of their students all of the time like is so often depicted in films (e.g. Dangerous Minds, Dead Poets Society, etc).

In the article, *Butches, Bullies and Buffoons: Images of Physical Education Teachers in the Movies*, McCullick, Belcher, Hardin, & Hardin (2003) examine film imagery of physical education teachers from 1993-2003. The authors are concerned that “media observers (i.e. movie viewers) can acquire symbolic representations of behavior through media images and these images are powerful and informative enough to inform subsequent behavior,” (McCullick et al., 2003, p. 3). In other words, though rather reductionist in thought, the authors worry that the representations of teachers that the
general public views in the media may inform their perceptions of all teachers and that could adversely affect how they respond to educators in school settings and/or society, as well as affect how they vote on school levies and budget delegation. The negative stereotypes or portrayals of teachers (ignorant dunces, strict disciplinarians, absent minded professors, etc) become a very real concern when it affects the public’s vote on their salary allotment or the legal action that may be taken if a society disagrees with the teachers’ classroom management styles, for example. Furthermore, McCullick, et al. (2003), posit that media images influence the way students view themselves, their teachers and their education. Likewise, the authors recognize that “[p]op culture is also a powerful contributor to how educators view their relationship to learning and to education as media significantly influence public impressions of different vocations and institutions (Joseph & Burnaford, 1994; Snyder, 1995; Glanz, 1997),” (p. 4). This is important because it is assumed that current students in the K-12 setting view these media images of teachers and teacher culture on a seemingly regular basis on their computers and TVs. What they see influences what they know of the actions, responsibilities, and the culture surrounding educators.

Similarly, in the article, *Imaging Teachers: In Fact and in the Mass Media*, Reyes and Rios (2003) consider the impact of mass media on teaching and the conceptualizations of teacher culture. Specifically they are concerned that “[t]he effects of mediated constructions are not inconsequential in how society perceives key actors in education, that is the educators themselves and the students with whom they engage,” (Reyes & Rios, 2003, p. 4). Instead of looking at physical education teachers such as McCullick et al did, Reyes and Rios examine media images of teachers from a Latina/os
perspective, including “the stereotypes in films and the abundance of reports on high school dropout rates, and low academic achievement of Latina/os,” (Reyes & Rios, 2003, p. 3). The authors are concerned about how the general public and even some educators consider these stereotypical images as truth when imagining and dealing with teachers and students- especially those of Latina/os backgrounds.

The authors review several teacher related media images (such as *Paying it Forward, Dangerous Minds, The Blackboard Jungle, Our Miss Brooks,* and *The White Shadow*) and come to the conclusion that “[t]hough there are some exceptions, mediated manifestations of the teaching profession are more often problematic and dangerous than inspiring and honorable,” (Reyes & Rios, 2003, p. 4), especially in regard to the media portrayals of the minority youth that are depicted. This mediated construction of ‘typical’ student behavior in popular visual culture may affect the student teachers’ concepts of teacher culture and consequently, affect their pedagogical desires in relation to their future students. This may be especially true of White teachers, such as my three research participants, that have been born and raised in small homogeneous neighborhoods in the Midwest. For example, “[i]n communities where there is limited contact with diverse populations or where travel is a distant reality, there is a reliance or dependency on the tube [TV] to inform and glean information about the outside world,” (Reyes & Rios, 2003, p. 5).

In direct accordance with Reyes and Rios, Freedman’s (2003) article *Acceptance and Alignment, Misconception and Inexperience: Preservice Teachers, Representations of Students, and Media Culture,* examines “student representations within the Dangerous Minds television series and further explores how preservice teachers perceive these
representations” (p. 79) in relation to their future teaching identities and to education in general. Freedman analyzes five specific episodes from the series and explores three overriding themes that she found throughout—“hero-teacher, teacher/student interactions, and angry and out-of-control adolescents” (p. 79). After showing the clips, Freedman had the class critically analyze them and consider how these media representations of students affect her preservice teachers’ mental images of teacher and teacher culture. She does this in order to “open up broader pedagogical discussions with regard to the ways media culture shapes our [their] understandings of the world, social power, public opinion, values, and behaviors,” (p. 79).

Of the articles and books that I have explored, most have been written regarding the media representations of general education teachers and teacher culture in popular visual culture (Turvey, 2005; McCullick, et al, 2003; Reyes & Rios, 2003; Freedman, 2003). In fact, so far, only one of the articles mentioned an art educator, and as only one of many examples of other teacher representations in films. Specifically, Turvey’s (2005) article, Who’d be an English teacher? (mentioned earlier in this section) briefly describes an art history educator played by Julia Roberts in the film Mona Lisa Smile10 (2003, Columbia Pictures). Only superficially addressed, Turvey’s article has one paragraph describing the movie and she ultimately ties this in with the conformity and loss of teacher spontaneity involved in lesson planning. Turvey briefly outlines how Roberts’ character deviates from the syllabus and shows art images not listed in the curriculum and as a result is reprimanded by the college president.

10 This is one of the several films that I will be using in this study during data collection-- to be further delineated later in the methodology chapter.
The discussion of *Mona Lisa Smile* in Turvey’s article does not touch on or critically analyze the representation of an art educator or the affects this may have on art student teachers’ conceptualizations of being an art teacher, nor was it used as a catalyst to help unfold unconscious pedagogical desires. Though this was not the main idea of her article, not critically analyzing the representations of an arts educators can be problematic because films can help sell particular social fantasies, symbolic desires, and help constitute what “is considered culturally valuable, how social identities are imagined,” (Pauly, 2003, p. 264), and potentially influence how art teachers are viewed/treated in society, as well as provide the coordinates for their desires. I believe these probable issues inherent in the imagery should be addressed through an informed critical analysis and interrogation. This is important for student teachers for many reasons, and therefore I will explore this process in the following section. This is where I transition into the literature on visual culture as a site for the informed critical analysis and interrogation that I am calling for.

### 2.02 Literature of Visual Culture:

Visual culture, as a field of study, in part, appertains to investigating images (e.g. media images found in advertising, films, on TV, the Internet, etc) that are prevalent in student teachers' everyday lives (Barrett, 2003; Freedman, 1997; Tavin, 2002). Beyond investigating various images, visual culturalists encourage student teachers (and all students) to challenge social issues, such as classism, racism, sexism, ableism, and power relations, and to become socially active in addressing and combating those issues in their lives and in their future classrooms (Bloom, 1999; Eisenhauer, 2007, 2008; Macgillivary,
2005). It is within this site/sight of visual culture that interrogating the representations of teachers in the media might help prepare student teachers to take part intelligently in the management of their conceptualizations of teacher culture and their expectations and motivating desires, in relation to or in opposition to, that of their surroundings. However, what is often left out of the discussion on visual culture is exactly that— the effect that student teachers’ surroundings (society, family, friends, etc) may have on identity formation in addition to the imagery they see everyday. For the most part, except for a few authors (Jagodzinski, 2002), visual culture in art education literature does not consider the psychic circumstances that may affect one’s conceptualization of his/her teaching identity, and especially not in regard to student teachers’ conceptualizations of teachers/teacher culture or their resultant desires.

Along with magazine advertisements, TV, and the Internet, films offer an area for student teachers to critically interpret the messages and representations that are being displayed before them in their everyday lives. While some scholars (Bauerlein, 2004; Dorn, 2005) would argue that films are a form of “low” culture and should not be included in the art or preservice curriculum, other scholars such as Tavin and Anderson (2003) understand the pedagogical potential that critically interpreting popular visual culture has for student teachers. “In the terrain of everyday life, popular culture is a significant site of learning that provides substantial experiences for children and youth [and student teachers]” (Tavin & Anderson, 2003, p. 21). The general public, children and adults, often formulate their opinions of people on the representations they see of individuals depicted in the various realms of the media, including TV and films. Because of this “these representations [particular forms of popular visual culture] are ideological
texts… [that] play a significant role in the symbolic and material milieu of contemporary society by shaping, and often limiting, perceptions of reality and constructing a normative ‘vision’ of the world [including teacher culture],” (Tavin & Anderson, 2003, p. 21). In other words, regardless of the perceived accuracy of the images, these perceptions of teachers' identities and cultures become part of the hegemonic view of society, and ultimately decide what constitutes normal and abnormal, appropriate and inappropriate, in the collective imagination of what it is to be a teacher. As stated earlier, though popular visual culture imagery may affect student teachers’ (and societal) conceptualizations of any particular group of people, this does not take into consideration the various other influences on identity formation (parents, religion, friends, etc) or the numerous ways individuals may formulate their opinions of others.

Though acquiring increased social awareness through analyzing media images may seem a bit deterministic (i.e. analyzing images causes social awareness) and perhaps overly idealistic, gaining an informed awareness of media images is relevant, since student teachers and the general public may see many representations of teachers during the week, some on TV- in cartoons or sitcoms (The Simpsons; Numb3rs), some on the Internet (YouTube), some in films (Art School Confidential; Front of the Class), and some in magazines or novels. Because so many of the same teacher images that student teachers see on a seemingly regular basis are seen by the rest of society, it is important that they understand the many strategies and techniques (exaggerated storylines, stereotypes, etc) that the media employs to capture their attention. It is within these various media strategies and techniques that potentially (un)conscious pedagogical desires can be recognized through the examination of the fantasy structures present in,
under, and around the representations. A critical examination of media imagery can lead to visual and verbal critiques by student teachers in the art education classroom.

Anderson (2003) explains:

A frequent end goal of these critiques of visual culture is social reconstruction. That is, the critiques examine the given, socially centered concept that holds the position of social power; deconstructs the assumptions, values, and mores that lie at the heart of these privileged constructions in a quest to find their contradictions, disjunctions, and dysfunctions; and thereby moves them out of their positions of power, centralizing instead values, mores and institutions that were previously peripheralized. (p. 20)

As Anderson states, interpreting media representations breaks down the previously conceived notions that student teachers may have about themselves and others, possible power relations, and social mores surrounding teacher culture. Additionally, interpreting media representations of educators can help student teachers work through some of the fantasies they have around what it means to teach art and be an art teacher. Ideally, once these ideologies are taken apart, student teachers can begin (re)constructing their identities, the identities of other teachers, their teaching communities and practices, and even society’s views of teachers. However, though a few authors within art education have recently begun to address this topic (Duncum, jagodzinski), what is often neglected in the often idealized scenarios offered in visual culture studies is that although students and/or student teachers may become more aware of social values, assumptions, stereotypes, etc through critically analyzing media message, and also likely obtain a heightened social consciousness, they may potentially disavow that information and do
nothing with it after leaving the classroom. I kept this potential disavowal in mind as I interviewed the student teachers and examined their answers, considering how this may have affected their desires of becoming educators.

Additionally, though there was no literature in visual culture art education that explored the pedagogical desires and fantasies of student art teachers within the context of media representations, a *Studies in Art Education* article written by Unrath & Kerridge (2009), *Becoming an Art Teacher: Storied Reflections of Two Preservice Students*, attempted to shed “light on the developmental process of becoming an educator and how humanistic values transfer into professional practice” (p. 272). Except for a couple of potential conceptual similarities, this article approaches the narratives of beginning teachers in quite a different way than I do. First, in Unrath & Kerridge’s article, the phrase ‘becoming an art teacher’ refers to an actual developmental process of turning into something else, an art teacher. This is contrary to my use of the Deleuzo-Guattarian (1987) concept of *becoming* as an unfolding of identity that is a continuous process. Second, their study situated the participants’ answers (storied reflections) as three thematic traits “emphasized in the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) as desired art teacher characteristics: (a) altruism;… (b) area competence;… and (c) sense of community” (p. 278). While my study also considers student teachers’ personal desires in the context of the National Board’s desires for the preferred characteristics of their teachers, I do this in consideration of the National Board as the big Other and possessor of art education knowledge, whereas the authors’ solely relate the findings to the NBPTS’s set characteristics. To clarify, Unrath and Kerridge’s study reported that the two participating preservice students “seemed to have already exhibited
a few of the attributes of exemplary teachers” (p. 283); however, they did not follow up with the implications of this conclusion nor why that is necessarily a positive or negative concept. In other words, beyond stating that their study’s results matched the National Board’s preferred art teacher characteristics, there was no further interpretation of the data, nor an exploration of how that ‘match’ with the NBPTS might affect students’ pedagogical desires and fantasies in the classroom. Therefore, this theoretical absence is where I situate my research. Now, shifting from the broader view of art education and visual culture studies that I just provided, I concentrate on a more specific aspect of visual culture literature that is available- that which includes psychoanalytic and philosophic theories.

2.03 Visual Culture and Psychoanalytic/Philosophic Theories:

While some art education scholars (Darts, 2008; Sweeny, 2008) continue to critically examine various visual culture issues (racism, gender, etc) and sectors of the media (TV, film, advertisements) using assorted techniques (deconstruction, media analysis), some art educators (jagodzinski, 2001b, 2005, 2006, 2007a, 2007b; Tavin, 2008; Walker, Daiello, Hathaway, & Rhoades, 2006) have taken the concept of visual culture to a different level by incorporating aspects of psychoanalytic/philosophic theories into their numerous studies. Though “Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, [is] a perspective not frequently found in art education” (Walker, et al., 2006, p. 309) and Deleuze and Guattari are “two names that seldom, if ever, find their way into mainstream art education journals [because] their writings are difficult” (jagodzinski, 2005, p. 130), there have been several articles and essays written about psychoanalytic/philosophic
theories in relation to visual culture/art education. Some of those topics include
“recognizing subjectivity as a primary factor in art education practice with visual culture”
(Walker, et al., 2006, p. 309); contemplating the “objet a around aesthetics” (Tavin, 2008, p.269); utilizing “the Lacanian psychic register of the Real, the circulation of desire, and
the surplus enjoyment of jouissance…to articulate the fantasy structure of the series [The
X-Files]” (jagodzinski & Hipfl, 2001, no pagination); and attempting to “affectively
politicize the visual art educator to the global condition of water in the larger context of
designer capitalism” (jagodzinski, 2007b, p. 341). While this is not an exhaustive list of
the topics I found written about visual culture/art education in relation to
psychoanalytic/philosophic theories, I will explore some of these articles in more detail
below.

Of the articles written about visual culture/art education in relation to
psychoanalytic/philosophic theories, the majority of them were informed by and written
from a Lacanian perspective. Most illustrative of this is the article, Complicating Visual
Culture, by Walker et al., (2006), which considers “the contribution of Lacanian
psychoanalytic theory in recognizing subjectivity as a primary factor in art education
practice with visual culture” (p. 309). The authors begin with a brief discussion of
“subjectivity as background to a consideration of critical pedagogy and psychoanalytic
pedagogy” (p. 309), then explore the concept of mapping one’s identity, and continue
with an exploration of Lacan’s three psychic registers-the Real, Imaginary, and Symbolic
[with added length dedicated to Lacan’s objet a]. Putting their theoretical explorations to
use, the authors immediately employ Lacan’s theoretical framework to examine the
artwork of Glenn Ligon. The authors believe that Lacanian psychoanalytic theory can “be
of value in visual culture for encouraging students (and teachers) to self-interrogate how their own desires are being expressed or repressed through their relationships with images” (p. 316). This article is helpful for furthering an increased understanding of the three psychic registers of Lacan, as is its intimate discussion of subjectivity helpful in relating the self to images. Specifically, the authors’ notion of identity formation which is “operating from the premise that a subject’s identity is built upon and sustained by an unconscious identification with images” (p. 313), relates closely to my idea of student teachers potentially forming parts of their identities through (dis)identifying with representations of teachers they may see in various sectors of visual culture.

Another article about visual culture/art education written with a Lacanian perspective is jagodzinski’s (2006) *Grasping the site/sight/cite of the image: A Lacanian explication*, which offers a “preliminary exploration of the homology site/cite/sight …which knots Lacan’s three psychic orders (Real, Imaginary, Symbolic) in complex ways, [and]…to what makes psychoanalysis an important theory to help us think through the banality of the image in postmodernity” (p. 391). Similar to the Walker, et al. (2006) piece mentioned above, jagodzinski’s article explores images through the framework of Lacan’s three psychic registers, also with special attention to the objet a. While both of these articles provide knowledge of the registers [in relation to subjectivity and images] which aids me as a researcher in examining the possible mediations that help form student teachers’ desires to become educators, neither article explored student teachers as the main subjects within their discussion. In fact, I found this to be a concept that is currently absent within most of the articles, except one, that I read about visual culture/art
education written with a Lacanian perspective. Fortunately, discovering these specific absences offers greater impetus for me to conduct this study.

The one article that had student teachers as the main subjects within the discussion and was written from a Lacanian perspective was *Theorising how student teachers form their identities in initial teacher education* by Atkinson (2004). “By analyzing student narratives of school experiences the article argues that although reflective, reflexive and critical discourses are helpful interrogatory tools, they presuppose a prior subjectivity which fails to acknowledge the idea that it is through such discursive practices that subjectivity emerges” (p. 379). Atkinson posits that those three discourses rely too heavily on the ability of language for student teachers to grasp a better understanding of the self as teacher-subject, teaching, learning, and their students. He claims such discourses put too much confidence in the power of language and disregard the non-symbolizable aspects of teaching, learning, and pedagogical encounters that may be better understood through Lacan’s notion of the Real. Atkinson also believes that these non-symbolizable aspects “have powerful ontological effects manifested in processes of desire that cannot be fully accommodated in the symbolic but are structured by fantasy in which subjectivity emerges” (Atkinson, 2004, p. 379). The author utilizes Žižek’s theory of ideology to suggest that student teachers can make sense of their teaching experiences through fantasy. He also argues that reflective, reflexive and critical discourses are “always already interpellatory and that they produce their own boundaries and policing mechanisms, their own normative frameworks” (Atkinson, 2004, p. 392). In other words, the student teachers’ subjectivities do not exist prior to their reflective/reflexive practices, but rather, the practices, being ideological, interpellate the student teachers as ‘student
teachers’ and help frame their identifications with teaching. Atkinson’s article was very helpful in navigating my conceptualization of the psychic connection between fantasy and student teacher subjectivity. However, I extend his assertions by also considering the connections amongst student teacher fantasy, subjectivity, and pedagogical desires in the context of media representations of arts educators.

Of the articles written about visual culture/art education in relation to psychoanalytic/philosophic theories, few were written from a Deleuzo-Guattarian point of view, and when articles were inclusive of theorists Deleuze & Guattari, the authors generally incorporated a Lacanian-Deleuzo-Guattarian point of view (inclusive of all three theorists combined). Exemplary of this is jagodzinski’s (2008) call for a “new assemblage of Lacan-and-Deleuze-and Guattari, which can challenge the inherent biologism of designer capitalism’s Third Culture” (p. 159). This culling technique is similar to the theoretical method I use when I consider the data I collected during the course of this study; however, as I will soon illustrate, none of the authors combined the theories of Lacan, Deleuze, and Guattari in the same manner as I do (outlined in the following section of literature review on psychoanalytic/philosophic theories). For example, in jagodzinski & Hipfl (2001b), the authors state that “Lacanian psychoanalysis is well-suited to make sense of the seeming non-sense that ‘The X-Files’ presents for its viewers” (no pagination). The authors examined various episodes and characters of the TV show through utilizing several aspects of Lacan’s three psychic registers, particularly the psychic register of the Real, which is “a pre-symbolic inchoate substance that is both unknowable and ubiquitous” (jagodzinski & Hipfl, 2001b, no pagination). jagodzinski & Hipfl’s article was mostly informed by Lacan and this in regard to examining a TV series,
and their interview participants’ answers about the show. However, intermittently dispersed in a couple of places, the authors did suggest ways that Deleuze & Guattari’s idea of “paranoid-interpretive regime of significance” could be instructive in relation to reading certain aspects of the series, too. However, beyond two brief references to Deleuze & Guattari, the vast majority of the article was dedicated to exploring Lacanian thoughts in relation to visual culture (in this case, a popular US TV series from the 1990s).

Similarly, jagodzinski’s (2005) article, *Virtual reality’s differential perception: On the significance of Deleuze (and Lacan) for the future of visual art education in a machinic age*, combines the theories of both Deleuze and Lacan to forward the author’s conception of virtual reality “as a machinic assemblage that disrupts representation, [and] opens up a self-reflexive abyss as already explored by video artists in the 1970s” (p. 129). To further this, jagodzinski concerns himself with the future of visual art education and its challenge for keeping up with the newest technologies, not only in regard to utilizing the technologies, but also the changes of perception “enabled by the new technologies… [specifically] the nonlinearity of time, its paradox of interpassivity, and, lastly, its critical potential for identity as doubled-reflection” (p. 129). jagodzinski’s application of Deleuze includes explorations of the concept of “the fold” (p. 132-133); the terms “objectile” (p. 132) and “superject” (p. 133) in relation to the virtual as a space; the term “‘crystalline’ as opposed to ‘solid’ to begin to get at this dimension of changed perceptions” (p. 137); and the concept of subjectivity as a “collection of disorganized identities” referred to as the “Body without Organs (BwO)” (pp. 136 & 138). Deleuze’s concepts and terminologies are evenly dispersed throughout the article, mixed in with references and
explanations from a Lacanian perspective- with regard to the three psychic registers and Paul Campus’ installation/performance video artwork from 1975. jagodzinski does an excellent job of furthering the ideas of both theorists (Deleuze and Lacan) by giving their ideas (roughly) equal weight and consideration instead of pitting them in opposition to one another. jagodzinski’s methodology is a notable example that I considered when constructing my literature review of psychoanalytic/philosophic theories and his article also provided structural frameworks that mirrored how I attempted to combine theorists’ concepts to further explore my research inquiry.

Upon reading several other articles that considered visual culture/art education from a psychoanalytic/philosophic perspective (Garoian, 2006; jagodzinski, 2007, 2008; Robinson-Cseke, 2007; Tavin, 2008), I was met with the same absences that I have mentioned throughout this section. Specifically, most of the articles pertained to issues that were read through the Lacanian psychic registers, and most often in regard to individuals’ interactions with visual culture imagery (Garoian’s brief mention of Deleuze & Guattari in relation to collage, and Tavin’s mention of the objet a around aesthetics, were exceptions). Whereas one author, Robinson-Cseke (2007) did consider her own identity as an art teacher, she did so as an exploration of her “video [that] progresses through images of learning, teaching, art, and art making; images of performance and identity space” (p. 101), and solely in relation to Lacan’s three psychic registers. While Robinson-Cseke’s article did address her evolving art teacher identity, it was seemingly in a cursory manner that served more as an accompanying artist’s statement to the production of her video, than an informative ‘how-to’ of considering identity formation.
It is these perceived gaps within the visual culture literature that neglect to address student teachers’ identity formation through psychoanalytic/philosophic theories that I am most concerned with. This study, in part, is a response to filling those absences within the literature. Similar to jagodzinski’s (2005) article, I intend on furthering the ideas of several theorists (most notably, Lacan, Deleuze & Guattari) by giving their ideas approximately equal consideration, favoring one theorist over another only when one theorist’s concepts may prove more fitting than another’s for explaining the narrative that is unfolding. Though some scholars might argue that Deleuze & Guattari structured their work around interrogating and/or destroying Lacan’s theorizations, and yet others would argue that their work extended that of Lacan, I perceive Lacan, Deleuze & Guattari’s work to have more conceptual similarities than differences, and those disparities emanating mainly from the language used to explain their various concepts. Therefore, I employ the concepts of each theorist as they best help develop the main ideas of my study. Now I examine some of the discourse of psychoanalytic/philosophic theories as they relate to the literature and ideas of both teacher culture and visual culture studies.

2.04 Literature of Psychoanalytic/Philosophic Theories:

In this section I utilize the theories and concepts put forth by several different psychoanalytic/philosophic theorists\(^{11}\), such as Jacques Lacan, Gilles Deleuze, and Felix Guattari. Jacques Lacan (1901-1981), French philosopher and clinician of

\(^{11}\) Due to its vastness and the innumerable volumes written about its many aspects, I am aware that I will be merely scraping the surface of the psychoanalytic/philosophic theoretical knowledge that is available to me. However, in the manner of Deleuze & Guattari, I aim to “lift a dynamism out of the book [fields of psychoanalytic/philosophic theories] entirely, and incarnate it in a foreign medium [student teachers’ lives within art education]” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. xv) as the authors dare one to do with their theories.
psychoanalysis, is often associated with a linguistic turn in psychoanalysis, “that is to say, a turning away from biology in therapy and metapsychology so as to stress the element of language as dominant both in clinical practice and in theory” (Rabaté, 2003, p. xii).

Lacan, a successor of Austrian physician Sigmund Freud, invented several concepts [such as ideal-ego and ego-ideal] over the course of five decades of intense research and borrowed from different traditions [e.g. math, science, and the liberal arts] though his references remained Freudian (Rabaté, 2003). Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) was a “professor of philosophy at Universite de Paris VIII… his works on the history of philosophy… are distinguished by their sobriety, economy of expression, and depth of insight… his aesthetic commentaries… are distinguished by the[ir] philosophical rigour and discipline” (Goodchild, 1996, p. 1). Though Deleuze wrote many books on philosophical thought by himself, he also authored texts with his writing partner, Félix Guattari (1930-1992). “Félix Guattari [was] a practicing psychoanalyst and lifelong political activist. He [had] worked since the mid-1950s at La Borde, an experimental psychiatric clinic founded by Lacanian analyst Jean Oury. Guattari himself was among Lacan’s earliest trainees,” (Massumi, 1987, p. x). Together they coauthored several works, including their two best known texts, Anti-Oedipus (1983) and A Thousand Plateaus (1987), which are both indicative of their theorizations and discourses that counter psychoanalytic theory, especially “in their attack on psychoanalysis’ own Oedipus complex (the holy family: daddy-mommy-me)” (Seem, 1983, p. xv).

While at times Lacan and Deleuze & Guattari’s scholarly research may be in opposition to one another, I employ the concepts of each theorist as they “instigate productive connections” (Lorraine, 2005, p. 207) and best develop the main ideas of my
study. I begin with the theories that pertain to the theme of identity as it applies to the study of student teachers’ emergent identities. First, I provide a very brief background of Lacan’s three psychic registers- the Real, Imaginary, and Symbolic as a contextual site for the concepts of ideal-ego and ego-ideal, which I explain immediately following. This is also where I situate a sketch of one of Lacan’s concepts, the Discourse of the University, as it positions and describes the field of art education as the Symbolic Other. Next I provide a brief explanation of the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of becoming as it provides the framework with which to examine the student teachers’ chaotic transitions in (re)forming their emergent identities. Then I shift my emphasis to theories that revolve around the theme of desire which are connected to the theme of identity. I begin with a brief discussion of desire and then segue into the specific Lacanian concepts of jouissance and fantasy in relation to why some individuals may become teachers. Lastly, I briefly explore the concept of pedagogy of desire in Deleuzo-Guattarian terms.

2.05 Psychoanalytic/Philosophic Concept of Identity:

While identity is a word or concept that seems to get mishandled and/or overused in mainstream US vernacular, it is an important concept to explore and attempt to understand within the classroom, both in consideration of students’ identities and teachers’ identities, and in consideration of student teachers’ emergent professional identities. Identity is a concept that can be, has been, and remains to be considered from many different theoretical and ontological standpoints. While perhaps “one of the most accepted definitions of identity is that proposed by Miller (1963, 1983) who defines the term as a set of observable and inferable attributes that identifies a person to him and to
others” (Diab & Mi’ari, 2007, p. 427), there are many other conceptualizations of identity that add to the academic discourse as well as attempt to trouble its seemingly tenable pith. Upon perusal of literature from general education (Søreide, 2006; Watson, 2006; Smith, 2007b) and identity studies (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000; Perry, 2002; Stets & Burke, 2005), many diverse understandings of identity were posited by scholars.

Similar to Miller’s definition cited in Diab & Mi’ari above, “a traditional notion of identity is of something well-defined about oneself, fixed and unchanging, something inside of us ‘like the kernel of a nut’ (Currie, 1998, p. 2),” (Watson, 2006, p. 509). Analogous to this notion is identity’s more colloquial understanding “in terms of a person’s self-image or fundamental values and beliefs” (Garrett, 1998, p. 1). While these definitions, and others of their ilk, have been more or less accepted as certainty since Lockean times (1632-1704), more contemporary and alternative views argue that identity can never be something that is just interior because identity is necessarily relational, to do with recognition of sameness and difference between ourselves and others. Identity only has meaning within a chain of relationships, i.e. there is no fixed point of reference for ‘an identity’. (Watson, 2006, p. 509)

There are other definitions of identity that correspond to Watson’s alternative view that dispel or trouble the concept of identity as an ‘unchanging core’ due to the influences of external forces such as family, environment, and society. Some of these other definitions of identity include the field of sociology’s identity control theory (ICT), in which identity is understood as “the set of meanings that define who one is in terms of a group or classification (such as being an American or female), in terms of a role (e.g. a
stockbroker or a truck driver [or a teacher]), or in terms of personal attributes (as in being friendly or honest)” (Stets & Burke, 2005, p. 45). And then there are those that posit that “identity is not something one has, but something that develops during one’s whole life” (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004, p. 107).

With so many plausible definitions or conceptualizations of identity, which at times may seem as if they are in conflict, it is understandable that the concept of identity is continuously contested and researched within scholarly literature from various disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and education (Bracher, 2002, 2006; Garrett, 1998; Martin & Barresi, 2003; Thye & Lawler, 2005). This is also true with various aspects of teachers and teacher identity. For example, within the past two decades, specifically in the literature on teacher education, “the development of one’s identity as a teacher is being touted as one of the most important pieces in the process of learning to teach (Borich, 1999; Britzman, 1991 & 1994; Danielewicz, 2001; Knowles, Cole, & Prestwood, 1994; Lortie, 1975; McClean, 1999; Quan, Phillion, & He, 1999; Zeichner, 1990)” (Pittard, 2003, p. 3). In other words, the concept of teacher identity and its development has been widely researched (though not exhaustively through all disciplines) with regard to student teachers in the process of learning to teach or becoming licensed teachers. In the very midst of transitioning between the identities of a university student to that of a classroom teacher, this population may, at times, have conflicting ideas of who they are and who they want to become as good teachers. However, according to Pittard (2003), “the argument has been made that ‘good’ teachers continue to develop over time and are always cognizant of their identities as teachers; they do not simply ‘act’ like good teachers, teaching/being a teacher is a part of who they
are,” (p. 3). In other words, Pittard (2003) is in agreement with Beijaard et al. (2004) who state that identity develops during one’s whole life, which includes one’s whole life as a teacher. This ideology correlates with Deleuze & Guattari’s concept of *becoming*, or the very dynamism of change situated between two states. Consistent with this reasoning, too, is Danielewicz’s (2001) assertion that identity is under constant construction. It is worth quoting her relevant passage at length as it eloquently synopsizes the concept of identity as it will be conceptualized in this study. This passage also shares congruencies with both Lacan and Deleuze & Guattari. Danielewicz (2001) writes

> All identity categories, even those that seem biologically designated like gender or race, are processes under construction. They are not unified or fixed entities that exist permanently inside individuals. This process of becoming is what I call identity development. As persons in the world, we are continually engaged in becoming something or someone, such as parent, woman, white person, old person, teacher. Because identities are conditional, restless, unstable, ever-changing states of being, they can never be ultimately completed. Though identities are fluid, individuals do have recognizable selves. We might think of a person’s identities as points of fixation, temporarily arrested states, that are achieved moment by moment in the course of relations between individuals. (p. 3)

Danielewicz’s assertion about *points of fixation* and *temporarily arrested states* share congruencies with Lacan’s point de capitation or anchor point of understanding; while her notion that people’s identities are *ever-changing states of being that can never be ultimately completed* resonates with Deleuze & Guattari’s concept of *becoming*. As Danielewicz states, identities are processes under construction. She also posits that persons in the world are continually engaged in becoming something or someone.
While keeping Danielewicz’s sentiments in mind, in this study, I borrow Mark Bracher’s rather unconstrained definition of identity, being “the sense of oneself as a more or less coherent and continuous force that matters in the world” (Bracher, 2002, p. 94). Though our identities may constantly be [re]forming or changing it is important for educators, current and emergent, to be aware of the various components and desires that may constitute these identities. The “fundamental challenge for educators, then, is to understand the multiple identity components and desires that pervade the educational field; and to variously recruit, redirect, reinforce, circumvent, or neutralize these forces in all parties, and particularly in themselves and their students” (Bracher, 2002, p. 93). As an educator, recognizing the implicit desires of self and others may help stimulate the underlying dynamic in the classroom and/or alleviate potential misunderstandings and misdirection that could arise from ignorance or misinterpretation of unknown desires, such as the desire for recognition.

These known and unknown desires can also affect a student teacher’s identity formation as a future educator. As I will more fully outline in the following subsection, “any identity is constructed through a variety of identifications with socially available objects, that is to say, images and signifiers. Both subjective and social reality are articulated at the Symbolic and Imaginary level,” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 43). The Symbolic and Imaginary are references to two of Lacan’s three psychic registers (the Real, being the third), which can offer ways of understanding and exploring identity and identity formation.

Although many Lacanians are reluctant to use the word identity and prefer to emphasize intrapsychic disruption and difference and ignore continuity
and sameness, Lacan’s accounts of the activities of these three registers point clearly to the homeostatic, repetitive function of each: the drives of the Real, the unified body image of the Imaginary, and the master signifiers and ossified knowledge systems of the Symbolic order all function, both individually and conjointly… to continuously reiterate the momentary states of the individual subject and to thus produce a fundamental sense of sameness and continuity through time that is unmistakable to both the individuals themselves and to others who know them. (Bracher, 2006, p. 14)

Similar to the Lacanians’ preference for ignoring continuity and sameness, Deleuze posits that though we represent what we think and talk about, “a series of unidentifiable processes [of becoming] are always at work behind that representation. There can be no identity without pure differences standing in the background as a condition for the illusory appearance of a pure, well-determined identity” (Williams, 2005, p. 125). At first, this theorization may seem to be in contrast to the “homeostatic, repetitive” functions of each of the three registers as Bracher (2006) explained above. However, though there are particular repetitive functions within each register, the Lacanian concept of identity can also be thought of as a necessary illusion (illusory, deceptive images) of a recognizable individual with a momentary sameness (an anchor point in the signifying chain, a point de capiton) within time that is slippery, and will continually shift and change. With consideration of this, it becomes apparent that scholars of Lacan and Deleuze & Guattari may handle the concept of identity in distinct ways, though to me as I mentioned before, they appear to have more similarities than differences. Most of the differences seem to be at the level of the Symbolic wording/language that is chosen and
utilized in explaining and expanding on the notion of identity, as opposed to a completely disparate conceptual difference. Going forward, I will remain cognizant of Lacan and Deleuze & Guattari’s conceptualizations of identity which can be considered both individually (as slightly differing takes on exploring identity), and in tandem (as ways of furthering each other’s ideas). Throughout the course of the psychoanalytic/philosophic theories subsection, I hope to elucidate these ideas, similarities, differences, and potential furtherings more completely. I begin with Lacan and a brief introduction to his three psychic registers.

2.06 Lacanian Concept of the Three Psychic Registers:

This section is an abbreviated and specific background of Lacanian psychoanalytic theory in regard to the three psychic registers: the Real, the Imaginary, and the Symbolic. This provides a contextual site for understanding where the concepts of ideal-ego and ego-ideal reside- and this in relation to the student teachers and their emergent professional identities. Due to their importance in understanding the construction of identity, I begin with a brief explanation of the psychic registers and then I describe the concepts of ideal-ego and ego-ideal in more detail. This section, while cursory in breadth, is only intended as an anchor point- a *point de capiton*- for understanding the structural components of the psychic registers.

According to Lacan, the psyche can be divided into three major structures that help shape our lives and our desires- the Real, the Imaginary, and the Symbolic. Within these structures, different psychic faculties reside. Building off the ideas of Freud, Lacan replaced Freud’s psychic faculties of the id, the ego, and the super-ego with the concepts
of ideal-ego (in place of Freud’s ego) and ego-ideal (in place of Freud’s super-ego). Lacan did not have a replacement for Freud’s notion of the id which is “the dark, inaccessible part of our personality,” (Freud, 1953-74). When exploring the registers, what should remain under constant consideration is that “all the categories comprising the Lacanian triad-- imaginary, symbolic, real-- are ontological but none is all-encompassing or immanent,” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 98). Inextricably intertwined, the three registers together create one’s subjectivity.

First, there is the Real, which is not actually real, but a pun on reality. It is at the level of the unconscious. It is virtual memory and it has to do with feelings and the affected body (jagodzinski, 2008, class lecture), and with emotions such as anxiety and trauma. The Real is “what remains outside [the] field of representation, what remains impossible to symbolize: ‘What cannot be said in its language is not part of its reality… The [R]eal, therefore, does not exist, since it precedes language… [it] resists symbolization’ and thus exists ‘alongside’ our socially constructed reality,’ (Fink, 1995, p. 25),” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 45). In other words, it can be said that the Real is impossible because it cannot be expressed in language and once we express it in language, it is no longer in the realm of the Real. It is “a site that can never know itself, that can never be entirely transparent to itself, no matter what the context is” (jagodzinski, 2007a, p. 79). The Real is that which is unknown, unsayable, and exists as a pre-Symbolic state of bliss/wholeness where all of our needs were initially met—primarily by our caretaker(s).

Second, the Imaginary is the limit of what can be seen. It is on the semiotic level of signifier over signified creating the mental image and the Imaginary is always framing
perception [it seemingly puts you in control] (jagodzinski, 2008, class lecture). The Imaginary is an illusory space where we image objects and imagine ourselves, and which is always deceptive. Identification is a key component of this register, as are alienation and narcissism. These characteristics are affiliated with the dual relationship between the ego and the counterpart [namely oneself and his/her mother]. The Imaginary “corresponds to the mirror stage and marks the movement of the subject from primal need to what Lacan terms ‘demand.’ …the ‘imaginary’ is primarily narcissistic even though it sets the stage for the fantasies of desire” (Felluga, 2003, no pagination). Similar to the Symbolic [mentioned next], it can be at the level of consciousness. As a note, and to be explored more later, the concepts of the Ideal-Ego and fantasy reside as image(s) in the Imaginary register but are made sense of by way of the Symbolic register.

Third, the Symbolic is the limit of what can be heard or said and is on the level of language and representation. “Canceling out the real, the symbolic [which has the dominant role here] creates ‘reality’, reality as that which is named by language and can thus be thought and talked about,” (Fink, 1995, p. 25, as cited in Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 45). Similar to the Imaginary, it can also be at the level of consciousness and this is where the Ego-Ideal resides. “Whereas the Real concerns need and the Imaginary concerns demand, the Symbolic is all about desire, according to Lacan” (Felluga, 2003, no pagination). Additionally, the Symbolic is primarily a linguistic order that encompasses the Law—the big Other, the socially constructed customs and morals by which we are governed. Whereas the Imaginary constitutes a dualistic relationship, the Symbolic is always a triadic relationship between the subject, the big Other, and meaning (the signified). What is important to remember is that these three psychic registers are
fused with one another, but heterogeneous to each other. They will influence each other, and us, our actions and our desires, throughout our adult lives. These three registers can offer ways of understanding and exploring identity and identity formation, especially the Imaginary through images, and the Symbolic through signifiers. It is within these two registers, specifically, that the concepts of ideal-ego and ego-ideal reside, respectively. Now that I have provided a rather compendious contextual background, I first explore more fully the concept of ideal-ego.

2.06.01 Lacanian Concept of Ideal-Ego:

As mentioned above, the psychoanalytic concept of ideal-ego resides in the Imaginary register. It is “the ideal of perfection that the ego strives to emulate” (Felluga, 2003, no pagination) or as Žižek (1989) explains “imaginary identification is identification with the image in which we appear likeable to ourselves, with the image representing ‘what we would like to be’” (p. 105). In other words, the ideal-ego is a collection of images or conglomeration of traits of others [such as parents, teachers, heroes, etc] that we may wish to emulate in our adult lives. To put it another way, the ideal-ego is constituted, in that the collection of others [traits, appearances, actions] form the elements or parts of the self’s ideal identity; they compose the ideal that the self would like to become, or how we see ourselves at any given moment. We set the others up as a mirror for ourselves, in order to see ourselves in them and them in ourselves. Through this process we appear likeable to ourselves; though we are never what we think we are supposed to be. However, what must also be considered in understanding the
ideal-ego is that “imaginary identification is always identification on behalf of a certain gaze in the Other” (Žižek, 1989, p. 106, emphasis in original).

To put this another way, we are acting as a certain ideal of ourselves in order to please/appease a particular other for whom we believe is watching us as we are performing the act of the ideal for that other’s gaze. As an example, as emergent art educators, the student teachers have collected the traits of others (classmates, professors, visiting speakers, visual culture representations, teachers in films, etc) of whom they would like to become more like. Through this conglomeration of traits, they have constructed their ideal-egos of the type of art educators they would like to become. With this image in their consciousness, they perform this ideal-ego to others that they psychically believe are gazing at them. The student teachers “imitate the other at the level of resemblance” (Žižek, 1989, p. 109). They are identifying themselves with the images of the others inasmuch as they are like them. These others may be the same classmates, professors, visiting speakers, and visual culture representations from whom they collected the traits of which they’d like to become. Or the others could be former teachers, different classmates and current/past professors that, because the student teachers are not yet teachers, they need an ideal-ego to identify with, and/or a figure to guide them in their imagining teacher.

On the Symbolic level, they are enacting this in identification of the parental gaze, student gaze, or professorial gaze to which they want to appear likeable. On the Imaginary level, this is the image that is visible to others, how they act and how they appear- for example, their enactment of a subject supposed to know.
In the Imaginary register, the realm of visual-spatial images of self and world, we desire to be recognized for our bodily appearance or physical performance, or more generally for our agency, which is grounded in our body’s effectivity. We manifest this desire in the often arduous, expensive, or time-consuming activities through which we attempt to shape our body image and agency: exercising, dieting, buying [teacher-ish or professional looking] clothes and grooming supplies, grooming ourselves, and practicing and rehearsing various [teacher looks, stances, movements, skills, etc]. (Bracher, 2002, p. 94)

Put another way, many teachers [including those presently teaching and student teachers] spend a lot of time and money to appear to themselves likeable, to be the image or physical representation/manifestation of what they believe a teacher should look like. As an example, to refer back to my introductory narrative, this is perhaps why I dyed my light blonde hair dark red. I was attempting to transform myself into the psychic image of teacher that I held at the conscious level and that I had created from a conglomeration of the physical traits of Others that, to me, represented teacher. In order to further understand the ideal-ego, it is important to also understand the psychoanalytic concept of ego-ideal. I address this concept below.

2.06.02 Lacanian Concept of Ego-Ideal:

As stated above, the psychoanalytic concept of Ego-Ideal resides in the Symbolic register. For Lacan, “the ‘ego-ideal,’ is when the subject looks at himself [sic] as if from that ideal point; to look at oneself from that point of perfection is to see one's life as vain and useless. The effect, then, is to invert one's ‘normal’ life, to see it as suddenly
repulsive” (Felluga, 2003, no pagination). Or as Žižek (1989) explains, symbolic identification is “identification with the very place from where we are being observed, from where we look at ourselves so that we appear to ourselves likeable, worthy of love” (p. 105, emphasis in original). In other words, instead of identifying with the image of perfection representing what we would like to be, the ego-ideal is symbolic identification from the point of view of the perfect Others who we believe are observing us or from the point of view of that perfect representation we hold of ourselves.

Furthermore, the ego-ideal is constitutive, in that it has the power to create or establish a system of necessary or essential parts [images, traits] to form the perfect ideal of self. Similarly, what must also be considered is that the ego-ideal is always already subordinating the ideal-ego. “It is the symbolic identification (the point from which we are observed) which dominates and determines the image, the imaginary form in which we appear to ourselves likeable” (Žižek, 1989, p. 108). To put this another way, the Symbolic, with its laws, conventions, and images for perfection, will always be the authority- through language- over the Imaginary images of perfection that exist at the level of resemblance. For example,

In the Symbolic register, we desire to be recognized as embodying certain signifiers. Students and teachers, for example, often desire recognition from each other as “intelligent,” or “brilliant,” or “an excellent teacher,” or “excellent student,” respectively. (Bracher, 2002, p. 94)

To illustrate this point, these words, “intelligent, brilliant, excellent, etc” represent a meaningful signifier or linguistic entity that constructs a psychic image by which the teacher wants to be known or signified. It is the language used in the Symbolic register
that dominates and determines the image, the imaginary form in which they appear to themselves likeable in the Imaginary register. This will affect how the teachers present themselves so that their desired signifier [i.e. intelligent] represents their signified [the visual appearances they put forward for the gaze of Others]. Put more eloquently, a teacher whose identity includes the master signifier “intelligent” will not only “desire to be recognized by others as possessing this signifier, they will also desire to perform and embody it—that is, to actualize the signifiers of their ego idea[1]” (Bracher, 2002, p. 98).

However, it is important to note that “in symbolic identification we identify ourselves with the other precisely at a point at which he [sic] is inimitable, at the point which eludes resemblance” (Žižek, 1989, p. 109). In this instance, for the student teachers as emergent art educators, this may be them with a resume of many highly-esteemed academic teaching awards, an always-ready impressive vocabulary of art terminology, an inspiring pedagogy, and a name that is respectfully known and honored inside and outside of their art classrooms (by students, parents, administrators, etc). For them, these are the points that elude resemblance. They cannot imitate others with these attributes/accomplishments, but this is what they may see as the point of perfection of which they would like to achieve, which in actuality is never attainable- and at the same time the impossible point of perfection from which they view their ideal-egos. This impossibility of attaining the perfection of the ego-ideal may be partly what impels student [and current] educators to keep going, to keep teaching, always in pursuit of the perfection that eludes them. At times this may create a tension when they must negotiate between who they think they are and they want to be, as well as who they are really struggling to become (Shariff, 2008). These possible tensions, negotiations, and struggles
are aspects that I consider during my interviews and interactions with the student teachers and also during the subsequent data analysis.

2.06.03 Lacanian Concept of Discourse of the University:

Like any other academic discipline, the knowledge that is considered good or necessary to keep the art education field alive, growing, and differentiated from other disciplines is constructed and maintained by a “broad group of educators representing a wide range of discipline-based knowledge and pedagogical experience in art education… [It is] created and reviewed by national committees that include[s] K-12 teachers, district and state arts supervisors, and museum and university educators” (NAEA, 2009, p. 3). In other words, the field of art education, like other disciplines such as math and science, is created by scholars, theorists, and practitioners that together formulate the knowledge base deemed foundational and/or necessary for arts educators and which is then further sustained and reinforced by those same individuals. In psychoanalytic terms, the field of art education is the big Other of the Symbolic Order, the linguistic order that encompasses the Law—the socially constructed customs, rules, regulations and morals by which we are governed as arts educators. This concept, of the field of art education as the big Other, as the ultimate guardian and administrator of arts knowledge and truth, situates itself within a larger Lacanian concept of the *Discourse of the University* (Fink, 1998).

Briefly, Lacan’s four discourses, that of the Master, the University, the Hysteric, and the Analyst, seek to account for the structural differences among discourses (Fink, 1998). More specifically, Lacan
presents an account of knowledge as a symbolic and social network. Each discourse formalizes a position of the subject, its relation to that which is excluded by its discourse, to its master signifier, and to its knowledge. The structural relation of these key elements constitutes the operation of the discourse, so that the formulae represent stable structures of discourses of knowledge. In this theory, Lacan describes the different relations of the subject to other subjects, to its objects, and to the different forms of its knowledge. (Campbell, 2002, p. 79)

Presented as mathemes, and in a manner that visually resembles two fractions side by side, Lacan’s four discourses involve a counter-clockwise rotating of four main subject positions that show various power relationships between the positions. The four positions are that of the commanding agent, or the Other (S1); the other (S2); the objet a, or the product/loss produced (a); and truth, the split between conscious and unconscious, brought on by the signifier ($), (Fink, 1998). In the Discourse of the Master, the primary discourse from which all others derive, the master (nonsensical signifier- S1), the dominant or commanding position, must be obeyed, without reason or justification—simply because s/he said so.

The student teachers’ subject positions fit within Lacan’s Discourse of the University, where “‘knowledge’ replaces the nonsensical master signifier in the dominant, commanding position” (Fink, 1998, p. 33). In this rendering, the commanding master in charge is replaced by systematic knowledge, where everything has reason and justification— it is not simply because s/he as teacher said so. “The authority of the pedagoge rests on a knowledge that is not his ‘own’ but the Other’s. The teacher’s authority depends on the pupils’ or students’ trust in the fact that the knowledge
transmitted could be authorised by reference to relevant sources,” (Hyldgaard, 2006, p. 151). In other words, the student teacher as subject-supposed-to-know is not the master of all that is and who commands the student to do her will without reason. Rather, the art teacher as subject-supposed-to-know is an authority dependent upon the arts-related knowledge of the Other, in this case, the discourse of the field of art education. Her authority is not nonsensical (without reason) as is the master’s, but is dictated by the knowledge put forth by scholarship from relevant sources (journals, textbooks, etc) within her field. She has authority because she has the knowledge (and teaching license) that the Other deems favorable or necessary for her to be regarded as enough of a leader/expert to teach the arts and consequently reinforce its (field of art education as Other) esteemed status as arbiter of arts truth. Put another way, “the task of the pedagogue is not to produce knowledge. The task of the subject-supposed-to-know is to transmit knowledge that is already given. The pedagogue is merely a middleman, a sort of wholesaler” (Hyldgaard, 2006, p. 152). The art teacher as pedagogue (subject-supposed-to-know) is not the master or originator of arts knowledge, but rather a transmitter of the knowledge already existing within the field. It is important to understand where the knowledge that art student teachers are responsible for originates from. Art education, as the Other, and its various governing components such as NAEA, acts as the main arbiter of arts knowledge that is considered significant to the collective identity and defining continuity of the discipline. Student teachers are not the creator of this knowledge though their successfulness as a teacher candidate is reliant on having a ‘considerable’ working expertise of the Other’s knowledge and expectations.


2.07 Deleuze-Guattarian concept of becoming:

While Lacan’s concepts of ideal-ego and ego-ideal are excellent ways of reading into and analyzing student teachers’ emergent identities, the Deleuze-Guattarian concept of becoming provides this study’s conceptual framework for the process that they are currently going through—becoming-teacher. After a brief introductory definition of becoming, I segue into a more detailed discussion of the Deleuze-Guattarian concept of becoming with references to several authors’ various readings and interpretations of the concept (Colebrook, 2002a; May, 2003; Semetsky, 2006) in addition to that of Deleuze & Guattari (1987). I also include brief descriptions of various conceptual amplifications of becomings, such as becoming-woman, becoming-animal, and becoming-imperceptible to further elucidate the magnitude of the concept. Lastly, I consider the art student teachers’ subjectivities in relation to the notion of becoming-teacher. To begin, in Deleuzian philosophic terms, becoming is

the pure movement evident in changes between particular events. This is not to say that becoming represents a phase between two states, or a range of terms or states through which something might pass on its journey to another state. Rather than a product, final or interim, becoming is the very dynamism of change, situated between heterogeneous terms and tending towards no particular goal or end-state. (Stagoll, 2005, p. 21)

In other words, becoming is not an end product, but rather an energy constituted by change that is situated between two events (such as the event of being a student and the event of being a teacher). For clarity’s sake, this definition needs some more unpacking, and perhaps this can best be accomplished by providing an historical portrait of the term
and its conceptual changes through time of which lead to its current understanding and usage within Deleuze-Guattarian theorizing.

Before I begin discussing the concept of becoming, I will briefly share Deleuze’s ideas about philosophy as they create a structural understanding for the role of his other concepts. For Deleuze (& Guattari) “philosophy is not a matter of description or explanation. ‘Philosophy does not consist in knowing and is not inspired by truth. Rather, it is categories like Interesting, Remarkable, or Important that determine its success or failure.’ Philosophy is… practical and normative” (May, 2003, p. 140). In other words, to Deleuze, philosophy does not set itself up as that which is right, or the initiator of rules by which to live life. Instead, philosophy contributes to our way of life through being interesting, remarkable, or important—by being novel or different and instigating new ways of looking at things. In other words, philosophy motivates us to move think in directions/ways that we may not have considered prior, to explore new kinds of thoughts and relations.

This is where the Deleuzian concept of becoming enters into the discussion. Becoming can be considered interesting, remarkable, and important simply because it is a different way of looking at the movement of how things (people, animals, etc) change or traverse through time. Or, more aptly put, “becoming is the unfolding of difference in time and as time” (May, 2003, p. 147). One of the main ideas to grasp, in order to more fully understand becoming, is that of difference. Deleuze’s concept of difference, or difference-in-itself, is distinct from the conventional usage of the term, typically meaning difference from the same (over time). Instead, Deleuze does not subordinate difference to sameness, where by implication two or more entities must be comparable in some manner
in order to observe their variation of sameness, hence the net variation equaling their difference. Difference-in-itself is “the uniqueness implicit in the particularity of things and the moments of their conception and perception” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 72). To clarify, Deleuze focuses on the individuality of each person, thing or event and how it is perceived and experienced at that moment, not assuming a pre-existing unity with other items of its ilk. Rather, Deleuze’s “conception of difference seeks to privilege the individual differences between them,” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 73), and this is especially plausible in the context of the unique circumstances of a particular entity’s production.

Furthermore, “being as difference is a virtually existent pure duration whose unfolding we can call becoming, but only on the understanding that the difference which becomes is not specific something or set of somethings, but the chaos which produces all somethings” (May, 2003, p. 147). Put another way, becoming is not becoming the actual physical subject/object, but the very dynamism of change (chaos) that continually occurs in the process of life, as the affirmation of being. “If becoming is the affirmation of being, it is the affirmation of difference in itself, of a pure difference that is not reducible to the identities, the actualities, that present themselves to us” (May, 2003, p. 148). In other words, becoming is difference itself; we cannot name it, or recognize it by some stable identity that is presented to us in the real world- in actuality. It is nothing we can touch. To Deleuze (before working with Guattari), becoming was a concept that “brings together difference in itself, time, and virtuality. It is a concept by means of which one jettisons traditional philosophy’s search for stable identities and allows oneself to see
things by means of instability, play, and ceaseless creativity. In short, becoming is the antithesis to stability; it is instability and change and each becoming has its own duration. However, becoming “must be conceived neither in terms of a ‘deeper’ or transcendental time, nor as a kind of ‘temporal backdrop’ against which change occurs,” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 22). Becoming is its own time; it is “Deleuze’s version of pure and empty time” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 22). I will address this concept of time with specific regard to my participants more in later chapters, so that I can now transition into the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of becoming which evolved as a result of their collaboration. I begin with several specific concepts, such as the notion of minority, majority, molecular, and molar, to further delineate the conceptualization of becoming.

In order to more fully understand the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of becoming, I briefly explain the concepts of majority and minority in the Deleuzo-Guattarian sense, as they are different than the common understanding of the terms. So, in fact,

“[w]hen we say majority, we are referring not to a greater relative quantity but to the determination of a state or standard in relation to which larger quantities, as well as the smallest, can be said to be minoritarian... Majority implies a state of domination, not the reverse. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 291)

To put it another way, majority does not refer to the highest number of individuals [e.g. two-thirds majority needed to vote in a law], but rather majority has to do with power, and domination, with majoritarian “identities our current arrangements bestow upon us” (May, 2003, p. 149). Likewise, minority [minoritarian] or minorities do not refer to

---

12 Creativity is understood in this context as more of the act of creation or production, not the commonly accepted usage of the term in (art) education as an originality in expressive art-making, or inherently imaginative.
“specific groups of people. Rather, they are fluid movements of creativity that subvert the
dominant, i.e., majoritarian” (May, 2003, p. 149). With that, it should be stated that all
becomings are minoritarian, so there is no becoming-man, becoming-human, becoming-
White, etc, because they are dominant and therefore cannot be fluid movements of
creativity that subvert the dominant. Since those are dominant positions, one must
become-minoritarian [the other half of the power dyad: woman, animal, non-White, etc] to unfold difference and see the world from a new perspective, different from the
majoritarian perspectives the current cultural and societal arrangements may bestow upon
us.

In becoming-minority, becomings return us to the unfolding of difference
in time. What becomings undermine are stable identities, those “fixed
terms” given to us by the majority culture as the framework within which
our world is to be understood and acted upon. In understanding stable
identities, becomings do not substitute other stable identities or fixed
terms for the abandoned ones… Rather they return us to process itself, to
the temporal unfolding of difference in itself, that difference which is
always betrayed when it is, as it is inevitably, frozen into stable identities.
(May, 2003, p. 150)

In other words, becoming-minority subverts the dominant identities that culture and
society has framed us within, but does not replace those disrupted identities with new or
different ones. Likewise, when becoming-minority, it does not mean that one becomes the
other identity in form and physical being [molar entity]. Instead, “all becomings are
molecular: the animal, flower, or stone one becomes are molecular collectivities,
haecceities, not molar subjects, objects, or form that we know from the outside and recognize from experience, through science, or by habit” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 275). Molar subjects or objects, such as woman, are recognizable forms that are defined by science [actual mass or substance of an entity] and “endowed with organs and functions and assigned as a subject” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 275). Molecular relates more to the atomic properties and subatomic movements of entities, which implies not becoming the actual physical subject/object, but being in proximity and assuming periods of movement and rest of the molar subject/object. In short, becoming “promotes a way of seeing reality that diverges from the traditional view, and… opens onto other ways of seeing, thinking, and acting in the world” (May, 2003, p.149). Now that I have had a general discussion of the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of becoming, I continue by including brief descriptions of various types of specific molecular becomings, such as becoming-woman, becoming-animal, and becoming-imperceptible. This is important “since all becoming is the unfolding of difference, there is no necessary sameness to any two becomings. What all becomings share is not the specific character of their creative acts, but the return to difference, difference in itself” (May, 2003, p. 150). However, though there is no necessary sameness to any two becomings, there is a continuity and consistency in all becomings which I hope to elucidate in the following subsections, beginning with becoming-woman.

13 Haecceities, “events, incorporeal transformations that are apprehended in themselves” (p. 507) are a Deleuzo-Guattarian concept that is inscribed on the plane of consistency. For a thorough discussion, see Deleuze & Guattari (1987). A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.
2.07.01 Becoming-woman:

*Becoming-woman* is the first mode, or molecular segment, of *becoming* that begins all other becomings and that all becomings must pass through. This is because becoming is about difference, recognizing difference, viewing the world from the perspective of something/one else. Since “[m]an, as the subject, has always functioned as that point of stable being or identity which somehow must come to know or perceive an outside world” (Colebrook, 2002c, p. 139), *becoming-woman*, as a minoritarian movement helps women win “back their own organism, their own history, their own subjectivity” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 275). In other words, every woman must *become-woman* first in order that man may also *become-woman* for there to be an unfolding of difference, so there can be fluid movements of creativity which subvert the dominant. I quote Deleuze & Guattari at length as this passage may more clearly expound the concept of *becoming-woman*.

Becoming-woman is not imitating this entity [molar] or even transforming into it. We are not, however, overlooking the importance of imitation, or moments of imitation… these indissociable aspects of becoming-woman must first be understood as a function of something else: not imitating or assuming the female form, but emitting particles that enter the relation of movement and rest, or the zone of proximity, of a microfemininity, in other words, that produce in us a molecular woman, create the molecular woman. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 275)

To clarify, *becoming-woman*, as with any *becoming*, does not imply taking the actual form of that which one is in the process of becoming. Instead, it means entering into a
zone of proximity and producing a molecular\textsuperscript{14} woman in us, that is “open and disperse[s] [itself] in a continuum of duration” (Conley, 2005b, p. 173). This is also true with \textit{becoming-animal}, which I explore briefly in the following subsection.

\textbf{2.07.02 \textit{Becoming-animal}:}

The next conceptual amplification situated within the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of \textit{becoming} that I briefly discuss is that of \textit{becoming-animal}. “There is a reality of becoming-animal, even though one does not in reality become animal” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 273). What Deleuze & Guattari mean by that is similar to what they mean when they posit that \textit{becoming-woman} does not imply becoming the molar entity of woman, in that one \textit{becomes-animal} only molecularly.

That is the essential point for us: you become-animal only if, by whatever means or elements, you emit corpuscles that enter the relation of movement and rest of the animal particles, or what amount to the same thing, that enter the zone of proximity of the animal molecule. You become-animal only molecularly. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, pp. 274-275)

Therefore, \textit{becoming-animal} is not to have power or dominion over an animal, nor is it to become the molar entity of the animal. “Rather, becoming-animal is the power, not to conquer what is other than the self, but to transform oneself in perceiving difference” (Colebrook, 2002c, p. 133). Likewise, \textit{becoming-animal} is not assuming the characteristics of the animal, its strengths and weaknesses, nor peculiarities. Furthermore,

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Molecular} relates more to the atomic properties and subatomic movements of entities, whereas \textit{molar} is the actual mass or substance of the entity. For a more thorough definition of each term, reference Conley (2005b).
becoming-animal is not, then, attaining the state of what the animal *means* (the supposed strength or innocence of animals); nor is it becoming what the animal *is*. It is not behaving like an animal. Becoming-animal is a feel for the animal’s movements, perceptions and becomings: imagine seeing the world as if one were a dog, a beetle or a mole. (Colebrook, 2002c, p. 136)

Keeping in line with what is suggested by *becoming-woman*, *becoming-animal* is a minoritarian movement that helps one be motivated to move/think in directions/ways that s/he may not have considered prior. It offers seeing the world from a perspective that is different from the stable identities of *human*, those fixed terms given to an individual by the majority culture as the framework within which her/his world is to be understood and acted upon. *Becoming-animal* allows one to see the world from a non-human standpoint, opening up new understandings and perspectives, new conceptualizations of the very being of difference. Moving on, “[i]f becoming-woman is the first quantum, or molecular segment, with the becomings-animal that link up with it next, what are they all rushing toward? Without a doubt, toward becoming-imperceptible” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 279). I now briefly consider the concept of *becoming-imperceptible* in the following subsection.

**2.07.03 Becoming-imperceptible:**

The last conceptual amplification situated within the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of *becoming* that I briefly discuss is that of *becoming-imperceptible*. “But what does becoming-imperceptible signify, coming at the end of all the molecular becomings that begin with becoming-woman?” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 279). When
something/someone is imperceptible, it is impossible or difficult to perceive by the mind or senses: it is not easily apprehended. So in a Deleuzo-Guattarian sense “becoming-imperceptible is the challenge of abandoning or transforming the perceived image of thought or point of view from which we judge and order life… we become free from the human, open to the event of becoming” (Colebrook, 2002c, p. 129). In other words, we abandon that which we know—of ourselves and of the world around us. “Becoming-imperceptible means no longer knowing who or what we are; it means seeing with greater openness the differences, intensities and singularities that traverse us” (Colebrook, 2002c, p. 130). Though this may be difficult to grasp, hence, imperceptible, becoming-imperceptible is the last of the molecular becomings because it disavows all that we know and compels us to look at everything differently, or to look at difference itself. Deleuze & Guattari suggest that in becoming-imperceptible we become like everybody else—to go unnoticed as ourselves. In order to do this we must “[e]liminate all that is waste, death, and superfluity,’ complaint and grievance, unsatisfied desire, defense or pleading, everything that roots each of us (everybody) in ourselves, in our molarity” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 279). Once we have all given up what it is to be us [as molar entities] we are all then molecular and in being all the same, we are nothing more than abstraction—non-human—imperceptible. When becoming-imperceptible we are no longer human and can no longer perceive things through our senses. We are freed to consider the dynamism of change itself- which folds back on difference in time and as time—hence the end of all molecular becomings. To summarize, Deleuze & Guattari’s molecular becomings start with becoming-woman, “and end up with becoming-imperceptible, which is nothing other than the return to difference in itself, to a difference
without identity” (May, 2003, p. 151). Difference-in-itself, as explained before, is the
uniqueness inherent in the particularity of things and the moments of their creation and
how they are perceived. A difference without identity is possible when one does not
presume a pre-existing unity, but rather considers the world and experience as it is
observed, here and now.

So through exploring *becoming* and the various conceptual amplifications situated
within the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of *becoming*, it can be said that it is an interesting
and remarkable, and therefore, important, philosophical perspective. And according to
Deleuze & Guattari, “the point of a philosophical perspective [e.g. *becoming*] is not to
tell us what the world is like… but to create a perspective through which the world takes
on a new significance” (May, 2003, p. 142). The whole of *becoming*—*becoming-woman,
becoming-animal, becoming-minoritarian*—is to view the world from a different
perspective in order for our dominant understandings to be creatively subverted and
challenged, opening up new [and refreshing] frames of reference: unfolding difference.
Now that I have I included short descriptions of various types of specific *becomings*, such
as *becoming-woman, becoming-animal, and becoming-imperceptible*, I briefly consider
the relationship between *becoming* and Deleuzo-Guattarian subjectivity to illustrate its
connectedness to my research participants.

**2.07.04 Becoming and Deleuzo-Guattarian Subjectivity:**

The concept of subjectivity- or the psychical sense of oneself- has been seemingly
theorized in as many different ways as has the concept of identity. Whereas some
modernist scholars may still consider one’s subjectivity as similar to personal identity, or
“something well-defined about oneself, fixed and unchanging, something inside of us ‘like the kernel of a nut’” (Currie, 1998, p. 2), Deleuze (& Guattari), similar to most postmodern scholars, conceptualize subjectivity in quite another way. For example, Deleuze “abandons the old image of the subject as a fixed substance or foundation stone… [t]he Deleuzian subject is an assemblage of heterogeneous elements whose source is not the interiority of the traditional image of thought… subjectivity is not given” (Boundas, 2005, p. 268). In other words, subjectivity is not something that is pre-existing, nor recognized as an unchanging core, or a central being, rather it is something that is always under construction and influenced by external sources. So, for Deleuze, “one’s self must be conceived as a constantly changing assemblage of forces, an epiphenomenon arising from chance confluences of languages, organisms, societies, expectations, laws and so on” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 21). Of course, these external confluences could also include images and representations that are portrayed in the media—on TV and in films—which would affect the assemblage of forces that constitute one’s sense of self, or subjectivity. In order to more fully grasp becoming, Deleuze & Guattari’s theorization of subjectivity should also be considered in relation to the concept.

Subjectivity, when understood as a process of becoming, differs from the traditional notion of the self looked at, and rationally appealed to, from the so called top down approach of the macroperspective of theory; instead Deleuze recognizes the micropolitical [pluralistic and particular versus the universal and absolute of the ‘macroperspective’] dimension of culture as a contextual and circumstantial site where subjects are situated and produced. As a qualitative multiplicity, subjectivity does not presuppose
identity but is being produced in a process of individuation which is always already collective. (Semetsky, 2006, p. 3)

To put this another way, the self does not have a predetermined identity, rather it is always already in the process of being produced and/or changed through individuation, which in Deleuzo-Guattarian terms is “a genetic account of individuals” (Boundas, 2005, p. 129), and is the process by which social individuals become differentiated one from the other. Of course the process of individuation is collective because there must be a group of people in order for individuals to perceive the uniqueness of the particularity and individual differences between themselves and others. Individuation can not take place in a vacuum because there would be no way to perceive what produces one differently than other individuals or beings. “The supposed real world that would lie behind the flux of becoming is not, Deleuze insists, a stable world of being; there ‘is’ nothing other than the flow of becoming. All ‘beings’ are just relatively stable moments in a flow of becoming-life” (Colebrook, 2002c, p. 125). To iterate, subjectivity does not presuppose identity, as it is constantly being produced with relation to others and outside sources. Beings are momentary instances of stability within cycles of continuous change.

An article within art education that illustrates the cycles of continuous change that can occur through the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of becoming, is *Postmetaphysical Vision*, written by jagodzinski (2008). It is worth quoting this relevant passage at length to do justice to the examples that jagodzinski provides as epitomizing, and hence further explaining, the concept of *becoming* using various entities.

‘becoming woman,’ (overcoming the face of man and his transcendent identity) ‘becoming animal’ (overcoming the face of the state and its
fascist tendencies), ‘becoming machine,’ (overcoming the human by recognizing the inhuman) ‘becoming child’ (overcoming the inertia adulthood through creative inventiveness), all subject to different speeds and movements that can lead to ‘becoming imperceptible’ (overcoming the self through the fragmentation as ‘becoming-other’) (D + G, 1987). (Jagodzinski, 2008, p. 155)

In the manner of what Jagodzinski describes (as he is becoming Deleuze & Guattari), and further exploring the connection between becoming and subjectivity, student teachers are ‘becoming teacher’ or in a sense overcoming the face of student and her passive/receptive identity of gathering knowledge, and transitioning to the active teacher identity of one supposed to know. In other words, for me to consider student teachers as ‘becoming teacher’, I need to look at the dynamism, or compelling forces moving between their two states- that of student and that of professional educator.

**Becoming-teacher** is a minoritarian movement, and as such can be considered as a legitimate process of becoming, and more specifically as a molecular becoming. I now consider how becoming-teacher aligns with the specific conceptual affirmations of becoming-woman and becoming-animal. “The subject-in-process [art student teacher], that is, as becoming, is always placed between two multiplicities, yet one term does not become the other; the becoming is something between the two… a pure affect. Therefore becoming does not mean becoming the other, but becoming-other” (Semetsky, 2006, p. 6.

---

15 Though the specific way I take up and utilize Deleuze & Guattari’s concept of becoming may not perfectly or completely fit their discursive formulation, I offer and employ the concept in a particular way that best fits my study and provides yet another conceptual amplification of its relevance and usefulness, in this case, with imagining teaching.

16 In the case of the student teachers, I posit that they are potentially moving from one minoritarian state [of student] to another minoritarian state [of teacher]. In effect, it may seem as if they are moving to a more dominate power role within their current relationship in the teacher-student dyad, but essentially, the student teachers are traversing one minority subjectivity to another minority subjectivity.
italics in original). Put another way, just like with becoming-woman and becoming-
animal that were referenced earlier, becoming-other or becoming-teacher does not mean
that a subject, in this case a student teacher, becomes another person (teacher) in
actuality. Instead, to reiterate, becoming is the dynamism of change between the two
states, of student and teacher, not the actual end state of having become a teacher.

Becoming-teacher is not imitating this molar entity or even transforming into it.
However, as Deleuze & Guattari would argue, one cannot overlook the importance of
imitation, or moments of imitation of the teacher. These indissociable aspects of
becoming-teacher must first be understood as a function of something else: not imitating
or assuming the teacher form, but emitting particles that enter the relation of movement
and rest, or the zone of proximity, of a micro-teachernesss, in other words, that produce
in the student teachers a molecular teacher. Emitting particles that enter the relation of
movement and rest of a teacher could include utilizing teacher-speak, standing in front of
the class looking back at the students, and/or holding one’s posture in an authoritative
teacher pose, etc. So in effect, becoming-teacher allows the student teacher to see the
world from a non-student standpoint, opening up new understandings and perspectives,
new conceptualizations of the very movement and being of difference between her/his
current state and another state.

Returning to and expanding on Semetsky’s (2006) quotation mentioned at the
beginning of this subsection, the media, and more specifically, popular visual culture TV
programs and movies featuring representations of (art) teachers, can be viewed as within,
what Deleuze & Guattari term, a micropolitical (pluralistic and particular) dimension of
culture as a contextual and circumstantial site where subjects are situated and produced.
What this means is that becoming-teacher, as a continual process, is one that is constantly in flux and is affected by external sources, such as but not limited to, TV and movies, languages, organisms, societies, parental expectations, and/or laws. The popular (re)presentations of teachers that are portrayed and produced on the big and small screen may potentially have an effect/affect on what student teachers believe is the molar form of teacher and hence influence or predispose their pedagogical desires accordingly. Consequently, this may affect their emission of particles that enter the relation of movement and rest, or the zone of proximity, of a micro-teacherness that I briefly alluded to above, or in other words, that produce in the student teachers a particular molecular teacher. Therefore, I want to explore popular culture representations of art teachers as a catalyst to help explore one site where student teachers’ conceptualizations of what it is to become-teacher may be produced and situated, though I will keep in mind that becoming-teacher does not substitute other stable identities or fixed terms for the abandoned one of student. It is precisely this potential chaos of movement between the two states that I am interested in exploring. Now that I have touched on various psychoanalytic and philosophic methods of considering identity, I transition into the concept of desire.

2.08 Psychoanalytic/Philosophic Concept of Desire:

Desire is a concept that can be considered from a multitude of ways, including the more colloquial sense as sexual appetite or urge, the connection between lovers, an unsatisfied longing or craving based on lack, and/or lust; but also in a more productive sense, such as motivating educational forces, including the proclivity to help others, the
passion to learn, and/or the inclination to teach and form connections with students. Desire is “a term that rarely appears in educational research. Where it does occur, it is most likely to be in relation to student-related concerns about sexual harassment (O’Brien, 2000; McWilliam, 1995, 1996) rather than a teacher’s desire to teach” (McWilliam, 2004, p. 137). Perhaps the word desire can be troubling for some individuals due to its tendency to be given socially-implied, sexually-explicit connotations; mention the word in the context of education, especially involving teachers and students in the classroom, and it’s misconstrued as something akin to blasphemous. This is unfortunate, because I believe that “[d]esire is a crucial aspect of the pedagogic process…[however] it is [also] something that is considerably downplayed and even demonized in relation to the teacher,” (Watkins, 2008, p. 113). Desire, within the context of this dissertation, is not necessarily defined as a sexual appetite or urge (that may lead to the aforementioned student-related concerns about sexual harassment), but rather, considered as both a probable Lacanian “desire of… [and] lack in the Other” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 47), and also as a Deleuzo-Guattarian productive, transformative force that “runs in a flow that is continuous and is always becoming” (Zembylas, 2007, p. 336). These two conceptualizations of desire may be seen as the antithesis to each other, as Deleuze & Guattari have even said that “desire is in no sense connected to the ‘Law’ [Symbolic Order] and cannot be defined by any fundamental lack” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 112) as Lacan would suggest. Though seemingly bifurcated in meaning and/or intent, I employ the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of desire to further that of Lacan in regard to exploring student teachers’ potential desires of teaching.
2.09 Lacanian Psychoanalytic Concept of Desire:

In Lacanian terms, desire is usually associated with lack, with an acquisitive longing for what one cannot have. This is caused by a separation from the Real, where initially all needs are met, to an emergence in the Symbolic, where there is a disrupting realization that our needs will ultimately never be completely met. This realization stirs up a desire for what we lack; for what we can no longer have since our traversing into the Symbolic realm of language and representation. “Human desire is the desire of the Other… not ‘natural’, endogenous appetites or tendencies that would push the subject in one direction or another irrespective of his/her relations with the Other; desire is always inscribed in and mediated by language,” (Rodriguez, 2001, p. 57). In other words, Lacanian desire is a dialectical relationship with the other; it is dependent on and mediated by the language of the symbolic. Or, as Stavrakakis (2007) more astutely synopsizes

"desire is always the desire of the Other; it is conditioned by its symbolic dependence, the implication being that it is, by definition, unsatisfiable and alienating. The price for gaining access to reality [predominately symbolic reality, socially constructed reality] is the sacrifice of the real of need. We are forced to look for it within the symbolic, soon to realize that no identification, no social construction or relation, no Other, can fully restore or recapture it for us. But it is exactly this impossibility, this lack in the Other, which keeps desire… alive. We never get what we have been promised, what we were expecting from the Other, but that’s exactly why we keep longing for it. (p. 47, emphasis in original)
In other words, this traversal into the Symbolic register from the realm of the Real, produces an insatiability in us that provokes us to spend our lives searching for that vibrating and intense pleasure we once knew as infants (where all of our needs were met by the Other, namely our mothers). In Lacanian terms, desire is a movement toward an object cause of desire that will never be satisfied. “The gap between the real and reality [Symbolic] is unbridgeable, but this is also what stimulates human desire, the unending (ultimately failed) attempts of reality to colonize and domesticate the real, to represent it fully” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 45). In terms of education and pedagogy, this desire is exemplified by teachers that are looking to the Other (their students) to supply for them their desires- the desire to be recognized as the subject supposed to know, the authority, the desirable body in front of the class, the stern yet understanding, modest yet authoritarian, leader in the classroom. The teachers are looking to their students to reassure and validate their ego-ideals--the point of perfection from which the teachers are viewing themselves through the supposed or perceived student gaze. This of course, by definition, is impossible, unsatisfiable. This coerces the teacher into continually going forward, looking to her students for partial appeasement of her conscious and unconscious desires. Understanding desire in the classroom is also “acknowledging that pedagogical power involves a conflict of motives, recruiting the desires of potential learners in the interests of maintaining teacher pleasure/authority” (McWilliam, 1996, no pagination). This epitomizes a painful pursuit of failed attempts for the pleasure of fulfilled needs by way of the teacher’s students. Or rather, it is a teacher’s pleasure in the displeasure of unfulfilled desires from her students and/or from the act of teaching itself. This is in part what Lacan terms jouissance.
2.09.01 Lacanian Concept of jouissance:

Attempting to explain how the constitutive parts of desire function in Lacanian psychoanalysis, I start with the concept of jouissance, which is integral to the functionings of desire. In fact, “without taking into account enjoyment, the whole Lacanian framework loses most of its explanatory force. All things considered, jouissance emerges as the central hypothesis of Lacanian theory,” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 77). Jouissance is a painful enjoyment, “a paradoxical enjoyment that cannot be fully represented in meaning” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 71). Jouissance is the pleasure in displeasure, existing in a pre-Symbolic state at the level of the Real, and which Lacan “presents as an internal antimony, a knot of satisfaction and suffering. In this sense, jouissance is a type of satisfaction that includes its contrary, exquisite pain” (Levy-Stokes, 2001, p. 102). To reiterate, jouissance is the pleasure in displeasure, or the enjoyment in dissatisfaction. It is a part of desire, but according to a March 1958 lecture by Lacan, jouissance is distinct from desire, though he does not make this explicitly clear. As Lacan states, “the subject does not simply satisfy a desire, he enjoys [jouit] desiring, and this is an essential dimension of his jouissance” (Lacan, 1957-58, as cited in Evans, 1999, p. 5). Evans’ (1999) interpretation of Lacan’s statement provides clarity on this distinction between desire and jouissance where Lacan neglected to do so. I quote Evans at length as this passage elucidates the matter rather efficiently.

Desire is not a movement towards an object, since if it were then it would be simple to satisfy it. Rather, desire lacks an object that could satisfy it, and is therefore to be conceived of as a movement which is pursued endlessly, simply for the enjoyment (jouissance) of pursuing it. Jouissance is thus lifted out of the register of the satisfaction of a biological need, and
becomes instead the paradoxical satisfaction which is found in pursuing an eternally unsatisfied desire. (Evans, 1999, p. 5)

In other words, desire and jouissance are not the same concept, but rather, jouissance is activated by the continual pursuit of a desire that will ultimately remain unfulfilled. Therefore they are distinct, as one is motivated by the other, but they are also intimately intertwined. Jouissance is “an imaginarization of enjoyment as fullness, which promises to bring back something irretrievable lost through socialization” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 78). In other words, jouissance is not actually the pleasure of receiving/experiencing whatever it is we are desiring— in fact, we don’t receive or experience it— the object of desire— at all, or if so, only partially. It is only the thought, the hope, or the promise of receiving or experiencing what we desire that creates the pleasure of fantasy. The paradox is that we can only experience pleasure from what we desire if it is lacking or unavailable to us. “As soon as we get hold of it all its mystique evaporates!” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 78). However, with this continual pursuit of the desire of an object’s spectral after-effects that is always out of reach, or not actually there, one might ponder why any object (or its magical aura) that may be within reach could not be sought in its place, hence foregoing the lack and thus assuaging the displeasure of not having. This is because, like Evans (1999) stated above, jouissance is lifted out of the register of the satisfaction of a biological need. “If, for example, desire were simply a matter of biological drives, one passionate interest might satisfy as well as any other, but of course objects are not readily interchangeable” (Kirshner, 2005, p. 84). This is because individuals are very particular beings that enjoy specific items, goals, and objects in life.
and are exclusive in their choices. This is where Lacan’s object cause of desire, the *objet petit a*\(^{17}\), enters into the maneuverings of desire.

As stated, the *objet a* is the object cause of desire. It is the “leftover of the primal lost object that is always desired but that can never be attained” (Bernstein, 2006, p. 714). The *objet a* is not actually the *object* of desire, but rather, it is the *cause* of the desire. Put more succinctly,

any object what-so-ever could be elevated to the status of *objet a* as long as it is understood that *objet a* refers to an object’s spectral or magical effects. This is the aspect of an object that remains unconscious and cannot be assimilated consciously into the Symbolic Order. It is *not* the actual material object that is fantasmatc, but its elevated status. The actual object functions only as a “lure” or an aesthetic surface appearance, which can be identified by a signifier and its signification. It completes or makes the fantasy possible. (Jagodzinski, 2004, p. 33, emphasis in original)

In other words it is the spectral or magical effects around the *objet a* that draws an individual toward the object and makes fantasy possible. “It is in the measure of the subject’s identification with this object, the object a [sic], that the fundamental fantasy is constituted and around which desire is designated and follows its metonymic pathway” (Marks, 2001, p.126).

As an example, the concept of the *objet a* can also apply to teachers and teaching.

“As according to Lacan, an individual never desires the other as a whole person, he or she

\(^{17}\) The *objet petit a* is often left untranslated from the original French. “The ‘a’ in question stands for ‘*autre*’ (other), the concept having been developed out of the Freudian ‘object’ and Lacan’s own exploitations of ‘otherness’. The ‘*petit a*’ (small ‘a’) differentiates the object from (while relating to it) the ‘*Autre*’ or ‘grand *Autre*’ (the capitalized ‘Other’)” (Sheridan, 1977, p. xi as cited in Kirshner, 2005, p. 84). Hereafter referred to as ‘*objet a*’.  
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only desires a fragment \textit{in} the person around which he or she constructs a fantasy of love and desire” (Bernstein, 2006, p. 714). For some teachers this may be a student that is always participating and responding to questions, is fully engaged in the material or lecture, gives a look that implies interest (in the subject, in the teacher), and/or verbally acknowledges that this teacher is the best teacher, the most intelligent teacher, etc. For example, in the moment in which the teacher is seized by the student’s look in which she finds and constructs meaning, she embarks on a quest of filling in with her own fantasies the gap opened up between her student’s look and her desire to be desired by him/her. Between the “meaningful” glance and the meaning she imbues in it, a whole story unfolds that wraps the teacher in a tale of desire with the student(s) (Bernstein, 2006).

The objet \textit{a} is at one and the same time the hole of an object and that which moves the object. It marks the loss of the missing object and in pointing to this loss, propels the subject [teacher] into a circuit of desire for other objects [students] which hold the allure of filling the void. (Bernstein, 2006, p. 715)

This is the instant where one of the two modalities of \textit{jouissance}—fantasy—factors into the functioning of desire. The other modality of \textit{jouissance} is symptom, and will be discussed in tandem, as fantasy is the pleasurable side while symptom is the displeasurable side of \textit{jouissance}.

\textbf{2.09.02 \textit{Lacanian concepts of fantasy and symptom:}}

To iterate, we pursue the \textit{objet a} [not an actual object, but an object’s spectral effects] as an attempt to fill that Symbolic lack, to imagine life as whole; but as we find
that to be impossible or always fleeting, this is where the Lacanian concept of fantasy finds its distinctive placement. “The \textit{objet a} supports the fantasy which in turn supports desire. Reality (RL- real life) and fantasy are therefore intimately related. There is no separation between them” (jagodzinski, 2004, p. 40). To illustrate within an educational or pedagogical situation, a teacher’s pursuit of her students’ respect (through engagement in the material, through an interested look, positive behavior, etc) supports the fantasy that by receiving that love and respect her life will be whole, which can never actually be, so she will continue to desire it. For example, staying late grading papers to gain her students’ respect and recognition as a caring/devoted teacher sets up the desire to suffer (staying late at school when she could/should be home) and a suffering to desire (the repeated act that causes pleasure)—which is also known as a symptom. However, it is that fantasy of fullness (through her job, through her students) that makes real life livable and compels the teacher to return to work day after day, regardless of the actual conditions or low academic valuation of her job or the (potentially unruly or unthankful) behaviors present in her classroom.

Fantasy does not “simply realize a desire in a hallucinatory way… a fantasy constitutes our desire, provides its coordinates, i.e. it literally ‘teaches us how to desire’” (Žižek, 1999, p. 191). Fantasy is the attempt to recapture the lost completeness or fullness that was experienced in the Real, when all needs were met. Fantasy, instigated by its many possible manifestations (the love of a person, the respect of students, a particular pair of shoes) of the \textit{objet a}, always directs its aims to fulfilling what it can not; to receive or experience the \textit{objet a}—the object cause of desire. The pleasure of fantasy is created by the thought, the hope, or the promise of receiving what ones desires, not through the
actuality of receiving the object(s) of desire. The paradox is that one can only experience
enjoyment from what s/he desires if it is lacking or unavailable to her/him. This sets up
the structure of fantasy, the pleasurable modality of *jouissance*, the pleasure/enjoyment of
seeking what one can never find, which causes a displeasurable realization.

As stated previously in the discussion of Lacan’s three registers, the concept of
fantasy resides as an image(s) in the Imaginary register but we make sense of it by way of
putting it into language in the Symbolic register. “Although Lacan recognizes the power
of the image in fantasy, he insists that this is due not to any intrinsic quality of the image
in itself but to the place which it occupies in a symbolic structure; the fantasy is always
‘an image set to work in a signifying structure’ (E, 272)” (Evans, 1996, p. 61). So in other
words, though the fantasy is an illusory image, or myriad images, the images are named,
known, and structured through the language of the Symbolic. While fantasy is an
image(s), what is important to point out here is that

fantasy from a psychoanalytic perspective does not exclusively concern
fantastic sceneries, whose ultimate motive would be to escape reality.
Rather, fantasy is primarily seen as a necessary vehicle for turning reality
into a coherent whole, indicating that if we disconnect fantasy from our
experience of reality, the latter will collapse, disintegrate into an
amorphous mass (Žižek, 1997). (Bloom & Cederstrom, 2009, p. 160)

In other words, fantasy is not an imaginative story line one conjures up to escape from
reality (RL) and live in a dream world; rather, fantasy acts as a veil against the lack
casted by the pre-symbolic Real enjoyment (jouissance) that is constantly eluding us
since our traversal into the Symbolic Order. Therefore, fantasy has a certain protective
function as it is “conceived of as a relatively stable way of defending oneself against
castration, against the lack in the Other” (Evans, 1996, p. 60). It is the function of fantasy
to smooth over or fill in the gap/hole of the Symbolic. Since we do not know what will
fill the hole, we continuously pursue the objet a in hopes of exclaiming ‘that’s it!’ But
alas, we never do. So to put it another way, fantasy functions as a screen; it’s always
there, but what is projected on it may change—meaning the desire or perceived lack
setting in motion the desire may change, but the fantasy screen itself is immobile. It is
always there supporting our reality, or else we would fall apart psychically. “Fantasy…
signifies a scenario promising to cover over lack or, at any rate, to domesticate its
trauma” (Stavrakakis, 2008, p. 1057). The trauma of knowing that we can never be a
complete subject—who lacks lack—would be overwhelming and in some cases life-
threatening without a fantasy scenario that promises to make us whole: at just the right
time it “intervenes to foster contentment through an imaginary satisfaction. Fantasy
allows subjects to take solace in the image of past (and future) satisfaction” (McGowan,

The structure of fantasy protects us from reality (the lack of the Symbolic Order),
and conversely, at times protects us from who we Really are. As an example, Žižek
(1999b) relates a story of a quiet, kind professor that dreams he is a murderer. When he
awakes from the dream, the professor is relieved to have found it only a dream so he can
continue his life as a nice, normal person. Žižek considers this from a different
perspective. Instead of the professor awaking to find that he only dreamt he was a
murderer, Žižek (1999b) suggests that “the professor wakes in order to be able to
continue his dream (of being a normal man like everyone else), to escape the psychic
reality of his desire” (p. 21). In other words, it was not a nice professor dreaming he was a murderer, but a murderer dreaming he was a quiet professor in real life. The fantasy shields him from his real desire, from that desire which is beyond language or knowledge. To put this more succinctly

[our everyday reality, the reality of the social universe in which we play our usual roles as decent ordinary people, turns out to be an illusion resting on a specific ‘repression’: on ignorance of the real of our desire. This social reality then becomes nothing more than a fragile symbolic tissue which can be torn at any moment by the intrusion of the real. (Žižek, 1999b, p. 21)

In short, our reality, our real life, our RL, is in need of fantasy—the necessary fantasy. It shields us from the Real, from the potential monster lurking within us all, from the real desire that monster may harbor. It also shields us from Symbolic reality—reducing the anxiety caused by the lack in the Other, by the not knowing of what the Other wants from us, by the uncertainty of what will fill our lack (this time!). However, importantly, fantasy also “relies on the subject’s distance from it in order to be effective... when the subject gets too close to the fantasy, the fantasy breaks down” (McGowan, 2004, p. 163). This breakage of the fantasy structure happens because when we get too close, we soon realize it is only imaginary, an image, a deception—it is a product of our own positing. So in order to keep the fantasy structure going, we must keep our distance from it so that it can in turn protect us from our unending/unfillable lack.

While most of my discussion has been more on the fantasy side of jouissance, there is also the other side of jouissance—the symptom. The symptom—an unconsciously satisfying repeated act derived from someone’s dissatisfaction—is
“initially thought and experienced as trouble, anomaly, deviation, constraint, that is to say, as problem[s]” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 79). However, within clinical practice, with the (psycho)analyst and the analysand, symptoms can also lead to breakthroughs of long held conflicts and feelings of lack, that are inevitable since the time of one’s traversal from the Real into the Symbolic. However, “there is a painful pleasure to which the subject is attached despite him or herself. The symptom clearly satisfies something in the subject: ‘the subject would not be riveted to this symptom if it were not a mode of jouissance for him” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 79). It should be noted that we all have symptoms since we have all traversed from the Real into the language world of the Symbolic, hence the lack of the completeness or fullness we once knew, and the continual search to regain it—desire. As jagodzinski (2002) adequately synopsizes:

*Our symptoms uniquely define each of us as teachers.* Some of us stay after class too long talking with our students, seemingly never coming home; others leave as quickly as they can, never paying attention to the voices they hear. Some of us continually worry that we are not “reaching” all our students, not meeting their needs and igniting their desires. We blame ourselves and suffer burnout. (p. xx)

Despite these scenarios, or personal self-debasing idiosyncrasies as they might be viewed, teachers still teach. Student teachers still desire to become educators. Therefore, it seems as though Lacan’s concept of jouissance, the pleasure in displeasure, is one plausible explanation for this phenomenon (of selfless love and countless hours devoted by some teachers). However, another probable explanation is the Deleuzo-Guattarian
concept of desire and more specifically, *pedagogy of desire*, which I discuss in the following subsection.

### 2.10 Deleuzo-Guattarian Philosophic concept of desire:

First, I will start with a discussion of desire as theorized by Deleuze & Guattari and which is in opposition to that of Lacan’s conceptualization of desire. Then I will explore the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of *pedagogy of desire* as it could relate to student teachers. First,

the work of Deleuze & Guattari (1984) is less restrictive than that of Lacan in this respect [of desire]. Their work *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (1984) theorizes ‘desire’ as a duality, constituted in discourse. Their insistence on desire [is] not simply the result of the body being acted upon, but an active flow which is the power of becoming of the body… It becomes possible to look at desire in pedagogical work as ‘a productive rather than acquisitive force’ (Fox, 1993, p. 83). (McWilliam, 1996, no pagination)

As I mentioned previously, in Lacanian terms, desire is usually associated with lack, with an acquisitive longing for what one cannot have. This is different from Deleuze & Guattari’s notion of desire as a transformative and productive force. For Deleuze and/or Deleuze & Guattari, and unlike Lacan, “desire does not begin from lack—desiring what we do not have. Desire begins from connection; life strives to preserve and enhance itself and does so by connecting with other desires” (Colebrook, 2002b, p. 91). In other words, whereas Lacan’s concept of desire is instigated by lack, Deleuze & Guattari’s concept of desire is the exact opposite, as its impetus is forming connections; forming
connections with other individuals and/or with other desires. However, desire is not reduced to sexual relations between persons nor is desire “internal to a subject, any more than it tends towards an object” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 113). Instead, desire can be thought of as a flow that combines with extrinsic elements to create/assemble/machine desire. These extrinsic elements could include: various stories from history, societal systems/institutions, micropolitical or societal expectations, and/or visual culture representations, etc. So for Deleuze and Guattari, “desire only exists when assembled or machined. You cannot grasp or conceive of a desire outside a determinate assemblage, on a plane which is not preexistent but which must itself be constructed” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 136, italics in original). The plane which is not preexistent, that Deleuze references above, is a plane of immanence—a space where all events occur.

“It is the plane that secures conceptual linkages with ever increasing connections, and it is the concepts that secure the populating of the plane on an always renewed and variable curve” (WP, p. 37). This does not mean that the plane of immanence is merely the system of those concepts; rather, it is the difference itself... out of which the concepts are formed and on which they are articulated. (May, 2003, p. 142)

Therefore, the plane of immanence, where all events occur, must also be created or constructed by an individual or group as a space where desires or connections can be assembled. And desire is assembled, “in fact, desire is directed primarily at the proliferation of desire. Desire aims to produce: this production is itself the process of desire” (Bignall, 2008, p. 138). Whereas Lacan theorizes desire as a lack, Deleuze & Guattari theorize that “desire produces reality rather than being caused by a perceived
lack in the real” (Bignall, 2008, p. 138). To summarize, Deleuze & Guattari’s concept of desire can be understood as “freely flowing connections or associations… [i]t is qualitative connectivity and not a desire for something in particular” (Olkowski, 2002, p. 19). Now that I have provided a cursory explanation of what desire constitutes in Deleuzo-Guattarian terms, I will briefly discuss how desire’s constitutive parts collectively function in Deleuze & Guattari’s theorizations.

First, for Deleuze & Guattari, desire “functions neither as a universal principle governing the whole of existence, nor as an underlying ground determining the nature of all existence—instead, desire lies outside or alongside existence” (Goodchild, 1996, p. 11). In other words, desire is its own entity that needs to be explored as a self-positing and self-producing force. For Deleuze & Guattari (1983), “[e]verything revolves around desiring-machines and the production of desire” (p. 380). So when one attempts to explain how desire functions in Deleuzo-Guattarian theorizations, it may be advisable to start with the plane of immanence, which was briefly mentioned earlier as the space where all events occur and out of which concepts are formed and on which they are articulated. The plane, the determinate assemblage, is where desire produces and connects; where desire “constantly couples continuous flows and partial objects that are by nature fragmentary and fragmented. Desire causes the current to flow, itself flows in turn, and breaks the flows” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 5). For a (student) teacher, a plane of immanence can be the classroom within which the teacher works with her students. This is so for the teacher because “each group or individual should construct the plane of immanence on which they lead their life and carry on their business” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 136). For teachers, this non preexistent, constructed plane of immanence may be
their classroom as it is a place where they carry out their business of teaching students. At
other instances, different planes of immanence for a teacher could be the school office,
the teachers’ lounge, or the copy room—wherever the teacher leads her life or does her
job—all planes of which, in turn, make the assemblage of their own desires possible. On
whatever plane of immanence in the school the teacher exists at any given moment,
forming connections (with her students) assembles her desires.

Next, when considering how desire functions, the concept of desiring-machines
should be mentioned. Deleuze & Guattari suggest that “‘desire is a machine, a synthesis
of machines, a machinic arrangement- desiring machines’” (Roberts, 2007, p. 116).
However, with that being said, it should be made clear that desire as a machine is not a
metaphor. Deleuze & Guattari consider desiring-machines as “binary machines, obeying
a binary law or set of rules governing associations: one machine is always coupled with
another” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 5). In fact, they consider everything in desiring-
production as machines, “real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines,
machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary couplings and
connections” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 1). One machine connects to another machine
which connects to yet another machine. They all connect in the process of desiring-
production. “The process of desiring-production satisfies desire by creating it, in a
perpetual feedback motion, which is… driven… by creativity and the positivity of
production, and by the feeling of intensity that results from the creative transformation of
being” (Bignall, 2008, p. 138).

So how can Deleuze & Guattari consider desiring-production, or desire, as
positive, when psychoanalytic theorists consider desire as fueled by lack, or the lack of
some thing/one? This concept can be illustrated through discussing one’s pursuit of her/her interests in life. For example, if a student is interested in becoming a teacher, she will go to college, take the appropriate education courses, study for exams, go through student teaching, seek a job, interview, and set up her classroom. This student may actually be interested in pursuing all of this, and do all of it in a collected and structured manner.

But that interest exists as a possibility only within the context of a particular social formation, our capitalist formation. If you are capable of pursuing that interest in a concerted and rational manner, it is first of all because your desire—your drives and impulses—are themselves invested in the social formation that makes that interest possible. Your drives have been constructed, assembled, and arranged in such a manner that your desire is positively invested in the system that allows you to have this particular interest. This is why Deleuze can say that desire as such is always positive. (Smith, 2007a, p. 74)

To summarize, desire in the theorizations of Deleuze & Guattari functions as a desiring-machine that connects with other machines in a productive flow on a plane of immanence. Desire produces and reproduces desire; it is a productive force. Quite simply, it can be said that “the politics of desire is the sole purpose of Deleuze and Guattari’s thought” (Goodchild, 1996, p. 5).

However, to reiterate, though the politics of desire is highly integral to Deleuzo-Guattarian theorizing “desire is viewed not just as an experimental, productive force, but also as a force able to form connections and enhance the power of bodies in their connection” (Ross, 2005, p. 63). This can be another way to consider the connections or
relationships between some (student) teachers and their students— as those that enhance the power of both in their connection in the classroom (and beyond). In other words, as opposed to Lacan’s theory that desire is conditioned by its symbolic dependence, Deleuze and Guattari suggest that desire is more of a social and material flow. “Desire, therefore, is not simply ‘spoken into existence’; it has a corporeal basis derived from an individual’s ongoing affective engagement in the world” (Watkins, 2008, p. 119). This idea of a social and material flow that is not spoken into existence, but created from an individual’s affective experience with the world and those in it, leads into a discussion on the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of pedagogy of desire which I explain further below.

2.11 Deleuzo-Guattarian Concept of Pedagogy of Desire:

With consideration of the Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of desire as a productive force, several scholars (Zembylas, 2007a, 2007b; Watkins, 2006, 2007, 2008) have written about how this applies to pedagogy— referred to as pedagogy of desire. In this study, the concept of pedagogy may be thought of as both the broader definition of “the relational encounter among individuals through which many possibilities for growth are created” (Zembylas, 2007a, p. 332), and the more specific educational definition of “the measurable, accountable methodology used to transmit course content ” (Giroux & Simon, 1988, p. 11). It is with a combination of the two definitions that I conceptualize the term pedagogy. To clarify, my definition would include the measurable, accountable methodologies of instruction and the relational encounters that occur among individuals [teachers and students] inside and outside of the classroom setting.
Zembylas (2007a) suggests that “[a] pedagogy of desire can be theorized in ways that mobilize creative, transgressive and pleasurable forces within teaching and learning environments,” (p. 331). In other words, both students and teachers can have positive, pleasurable experiences and encounters in the classroom. This is differentiated from the unsatisfiable and alienating desire of the Other that Lacan would suggest exists among teacher(s) and student(s). Instead of having Lacanian desire, which is exemplified by student teachers that are looking to the Other (their students) to fulfill for them their desires, a Deleuzo-Guattarian pedagogy of desire implies that “desire is an act of creation rather than the lack of fulfillment” (Zembylas, 2007a, p. 337). This is not to say that Lacanian desire does not create a temporary satisfaction as desires are partially met; however, as opposed to a student teacher looking to her students for partial appeasement of her conscious and unconscious needs and desires, a teacher enabling pedagogy of desire would be creating and transforming knowledge and relational encounters along with her students in the classroom.

Additionally, desire in the pedagogic process would emphasize “the potential productive union of teacher and student desire as an intersubjective dynamic rather than as competing forces” (Watkins, 2008, p. 114). Instead of the student teacher looking to her students to fulfill certain desires, and in turn, her students looking to her to fulfill their various desires, the force of their desires could be put together in a dynamic force that ideally creates a transformative pleasure for all involved (as opposed to only one or the other potentially feeling pleasure as his/her desire is temporarily fulfilled). For example, Deleuze & Guattari conceptualize desire as a productive and transformative force, which can manifest itself in a teacher’s thoughts and actions in a classroom in order to
impart/share knowledge with her students. In other words, since desire is forming
connections, for (student) teachers as knowledge-machines, this could be the connections
made with students as learning-machines. This would include the machinic assemblage of
actions, passions, and bodies reacting to one another (classroom, blackboard, teacher,
desk, seat, student, textbook, paper, words, feelings) producing various effects in one
another’s affective experience of the world, on their particular plane of immanence.
Considering that the teacher’s desire is not reduced to sexual relations between persons
nor is her desire “internal to a subject, any more than it tends towards an object”
(Deleuze, 1993, p. 113), her desire can be thought of as a flow that combines with
extrinsic elements to create/assemble/machine desire. These extrinsic elements could
include the history of education and teachers, educational systems/institutions,
micropolitical or societal expectations, and/or visual culture representations. These
extrinsic elements combine to create desire, as opposed to any (Lacanian) internal drives
that might prompt desire.

To build on this notion, Zembylas (2007a) states that there are three general
practices that may evolve from a pedagogy of desire:

First, teachers with their students learn to love critical questions
(Martusewicz, 1997). Second, teachers and students are motivated by the
creative energy of desire to share the force of wondering in learning and
the potential consequences of alternative assemblages of subjectivities that
they may embrace or pursue (Zembylas, 2005). Finally, pedagogy of
desire problematizes the role of the body in teaching and learning; a
pedagogical practice along these lines, then, would be to provide multiple
opportunities for both teachers and students to enact passionate and
embodied forms of teaching and learning. (p. 343)
However, in an attempt to not sound overly idealistic with regard to a Deleuzo-Guattarian inspired *pedagogy of desire*, there is the potential that combining the desires of the student teachers and students into a productive, transformative force could be negative (in the sense of ‘not good’, not negative as ‘lack’, as with Lacan). The student teacher could be overly authoritarian in her manners and potentially instigate an active resistance from her students. Likewise, anger or resentment toward students could potentially lead the student teacher to malevolent behaviors and teaching practices. Combining any of these negative forces together would not result in a pedagogic encounter that would necessarily be construed as overtly positive (good) or as a productive, transformative pleasure (although in some instances, a pedagogic encounter may be considered negative, yet be productive). I keep these potentially negative occurrences in consideration as I examine my data through the lens of psychoanalytic/philosophic theories, including that of *pedagogy of desire*. My main goal in exploring this concept is to compare and intermingle the perspectives of ‘desire as lack’ as theorized by Lacan in an earlier subsection, with that of Deleuze & Guattari, to produce a more richly layered, heterogeneous approach to considering the concept of desire.

### 2.12 Conclusion:

All of the aforementioned research has contributed to the theoretical framework upon which I built my research, which explores how (art) teacher representations in popular visual culture may be used as a catalyst to help unfold the perceptions and desires art student teachers have of their emergent teaching identities and future roles within art education. The main theoretical concepts that are foundational to the following chapters
are Lacanian and Deleuzo-Guattarian desire and identity, the Lacanian concept of fantasy, and the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of *becoming*. Now that I have examined teacher culture, visual culture in art education, and several concepts in psychoanalytic theory put forth by both Lacan and several concepts in philosophic theory put forth by Deleuze & Guattari, and how they overlap and inform one another, I move on to the next section of this dissertation—the methodology chapter—which outlines the design of the study. There I introduce the three research participants (art student teachers), discuss the data collected (individual and group interview transcripts), as well as create and describe three categories of pedagogical fantasies that (student) teachers may employ.
CHAPTER 3- METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I fully outline the methodology of the study which includes individual interviews with three student teachers and a group interview with the same three participants that took place after watching several pre-selected DVD clips featuring arts educators. I have included these methods of data collection in the design of this study in order to investigate and answer my main research question and my three supporting subquestions: How can popular visual culture representations of arts educators be used as a catalyst to unfold student teachers’ unconscious pedagogical desires and fantasies about teaching art? 1) What affective investments might art student teachers develop/employ in their individual and collective teacher identities? 2) How do art student teachers (re)negotiate their teacher identities in accordance to possible dis-identifications with mediated images of teachers/teacher culture? 3) What might happen in those moments when art student teachers begin to realize their pedagogical fantasies about teaching (art) are merely (deceptive) illusions? First, I describe the population in which the interviewees were situated and how those participants were chosen. Then I briefly introduce each study participant individually before fully delineating the exact procedures and sequence of events that I used to collect my data. Next, I provide a short synopsis of each movie or TV episode that was shown, as well as a brief description of...
each DVD clip. Last, I indicate how the data will be analyzed through a content analysis approach that created meaning through identifying patterns in the interviews and the subsequent construction of three categories of pedagogical fantasies.

Utilizing qualitative inquiry methods, a purposeful sample of three student teachers were selected from the larger seminar group of approximately twenty-five students from the academic year 2008-2009. I used an illustrative, evocative sampling method in selecting three participants to take part in the individual and group interviews. “[T]his approach to sampling seeks only to provide a flavour—sometimes a very vivid or illuminating one” (Mason, 2002, p. 126) about the relationship between the contexts and individuals sampled. This sampling of art student teachers can be said to provide an example or an illustration of what it is like in the wider universe of art education, but no definitive claims will be made as to “how well it represents that universe” (Mason, 2002, p. 126). The interview samples were formed using the following criteria: they were art student teachers that had received their undergraduate degrees from the same preservice program at The Ohio State University; they had a similar background in foundational classes of visual culture in order to eliminate possible confusion or misconception when the term was referenced in questions or during the course of the interview(s); participants completed their student teaching practicum during the 2008-2009 academic school year; and participants had to be available for individual and group interviews during the months of June and July 2009. Once these criteria were set up, I sent out an IRB-approved blanket email asking for participants that met the specified criteria for inclusion in the study. Only three student teachers electronically responded expressing interest in participating in the study, and then I scheduled individual on-site visits of their choice.
and at their convenience (due to their busy summer work schedules). At the initial interviews, I provided each participant with (1) a letter that explained the research and invited their participation (Appendix B), and (2) a copy of the informed consent document (Appendix C). I then asked the participants to review and sign the consent form, make a copy of the form, and return the original to me for secure filing in a locked cabinet.

3.01 Interview Participants:

The three interview participants in this study were student teachers in art education at The Ohio State University during the 2008-2009 academic year and met all of the other criteria listed above. All of them had been under my immediate supervision during their teaching practicum at various central Ohio elementary and secondary school placements. However, similar to Unrath’s (2009) study of student teachers, the three individual interviews and one group interview “took place during the summer following completion of their student teaching practicum and prior to entry into the profession” (p. 274). Therefore, the three participants were no longer in a position of subordination to me as their former supervisor because all three had completed their educational program, and thus, the dialogue was one more akin to art teacher allies as opposed to teacher and students. While it was not my intention to have three of my former students as the research participants, the foregrounded relationship of trust and respect that had been built through our working relationship(s) seemingly attributed to comfort and candor during the interview process. The announcement of the study and blanket email were not sent out to the student teachers until after they had completed their final seminar, final
teaching placement, and all paperwork relating to grades and licensure were turned in and
finalized, thus relinquishing any of my official academic power over them.

The first participant, Olivia\textsuperscript{18}, is a young woman in her early twenties who
identifies as Caucasian, but has a parent that was the last generation on that side of the
family which qualified for government recognition as Native American, specifically
Cherokee. She was born in West Virginia and when she was five years old moved to
Ohio into “a real small town… [with] a lot of farm community people there” (Olivia, 7-2-
09, p. 20). Her father is a Pentecostal pastor and she related that growing up around the
church as a pastor’s daughter who went to a private Baptist school until high school was a
huge part of her background. Olivia started out taking her general education courses at a
local state college while on a scholarship for soccer before transferring to The Ohio State
University where she took all of her art education courses. Originally considering
industrial design, she never declared that as her major; art education being the first and
only major she officially declared.

I didn’t go too far off the board [of an art-related field]. But I knew I
wanted to be something with art but… and I just kind of gave up and
decided that I was meant to be an art teacher all along. And I kind of
fought it for awhile ‘cause like everyone told me [whispers] ‘you should
be an art teacher, you should be an art teacher’. I fought it for so long
‘cause that’s just the way I am…I’m stubborn and I don’t want to- you
know, I didn’t want to be… what people thought I should be. And then I
came to the conclusion eventually that they were probably right. (Olivia,
7-2-09, p. 4)

\textsuperscript{18} For the sake of confidentiality, each participant chose their own pseudonym by which they were known
and referenced throughout the study.
Olivia and I first met during the 2007-2008 academic year when I was assigned to be her university supervisor for student teaching. After deciding she needed a year-long hiatus before completing her practicum, Olivia disenrolled from student teaching in the fall of 2007 and returned a year later in the fall of 2008 to finish her requirements. Like the year before, once again she was assigned to be under my supervision as an art student teacher for the entire academic year. The individual interview with Olivia was conducted in two afternoons on June 15 and July 2, 2009 (due to technical difficulties), at her boyfriend’s parents’ home in a nearby suburb of Columbus.

The second participant, Jean, is a young woman in her early twenties who did not explicitly identify her ethnicity, but would be one that through physical signifiers would be identified as White/Caucasian. She was born and raised in a middle/upper middle class suburb of Columbus all of her life, moving houses once when she was in the second grade, but staying in the same city and elementary school. “Our parents wanted us [siblings] to stay with our friends. And I grew up very, you know… relatively privileged. Yeah, it was a good childhood” (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 21). Jean was involved in a lot of creative/performing arts activities during her childhood and attributed this to her decision to become a visual arts teacher.

I knew that I was a creative person and I knew that I enjoyed the arts and I think what it came down to in the end was- I liked music. And I was a dancer. I did theater and I did musical theater, choir, and all that jazz. I was involved in a lot of different aspects of the arts, not necessarily the visual arts. But I knew that the visual arts would be more all encompassing of, you know, all of the performing arts as well… and so that was kind of what made me decide it. It wasn’t necessarily that I knew I wanted to teach visual art, it was just like, well I think this is going to be the best
Jean and I first met during the 2006-2007 academic year when I was enrolled as a graduate student in her undergraduate visual culture course. Initially acknowledging each other as classmates, Jean and I met again during the 2008-2009 academic year when she was an art student teacher and I was a supervisor. Originally assigned to a different supervisor, a month into the first quarter, Jean asked the student teaching program manager if she could be put under my supervision for the remainder of her teaching practicum. The individual interview with Jean was conducted in one afternoon on June 18, 2009, at her apartment in a nearby suburb of Columbus.

The third participant, Marissa, is a young woman in her early twenties who identifies as middle class, Caucasian, and female, but has a grandparent on one side of the family that was the last generation which qualified for government recognition as Native American. Growing up in a small city in western Ohio, where she has spent her whole life except for college, Marissa attended private Catholic schools throughout her K-12 experience. Originally enrolling in interior design, Marissa changed her major to art education.

I just kept feeling like I wasn’t helping anyone and I kept thinking like ‘if I’m an interior designer, am I going to decorate for corporations? How am I going to help these people?’ Like it just- I couldn’t see where- there was a conflict for me because I couldn’t see where I was helping someone where it would kind of be immediate almost, so… and that’s just when teaching, you know it was always in the back of my mind. (Marissa, 6-25-09, pp. 2-3)
Marissa and I first met during the 2008-2009 academic year when I was assigned to be her university supervisor for student teaching. The individual interview with Marissa was conducted in one evening on June 25, 2009, in a classroom of the art education building on The Ohio State University (OSU) campus in Columbus.

As illustrated above, all of my participants were White, Midwestern women. Though I am aware this potentially has consequences for the results of my research, this socially-inscribed subject position, which is seemingly a descriptor(s) of many US teachers (pre-K, elementary, art, etc), is not the main focus of the study. While in constant consideration of this subjectivity as the signifiers stare back at me personally with an intimate and unavoidable invoking, through conducting this research and constantly reflecting on different aspects pertinent to the study, I recognize that the pedagogical fantasies and desires that I explore in this document are applicable to all genders, races, nationalities, subjects taught, etc. In other words, the fantasies and desires that are about to be delineated in the following chapter(s) are ones that any and all teachers may have/employ at various points in their pedagogical lives. This is to say that the pedagogical fantasies and desires explicated in this study are not solely confined/contained to White, Midwestern women. Though the manifestation of these desires through particular performances (of socially-interpellated gender, race, etc responses and actions) may appear different in the Imaginary, through images of teachers, and the Symbolic, through particular signifiers of teacherness, the (un)conscious desires of non-White, non-female, non-Midwestern teachers may potentially be more similar to White, Midwestern women teachers than disparate. Additionally, as there have been many books and articles written addressing White and/or Midwestern women as teachers.
(Grumet, 1988; Robertson, 1994, 1997), and with a conscious attempt to not replicate these studies, I recognize and acknowledge this subject positioning, but do not make it a (de)limitation to the unfolding of (art) teacher identity explored throughout.

3.02 Data Collected & Methods for Collection:

There are three major facets of my study from which I collected data to answer my research question(s): 1) personal illustrations, 2) personal interviews, and 3) a small group interview after watching several DVD clips [re]presenting arts educators. I used these three as a form of “triangulation, which involves the use of multiple methods—each representing a different perspective or lens—to assess a given phenomenon in order to enhance confidence in the validity of the findings” (Greene, Kreider, & Mayer, 2005, p. 274). For example, when data from the personal illustrations and data from the group interview converge, “the overall results are more likely to be valid, credible and warranted,” (Greene, et al, 2005, p. 274).

Before conducting any of the data collection, I created systematic scripted protocols, with estimated timeframes, that I could read to each participant before beginning her session. This was done to ensure that the same procedural order, directions, and explanations were given to each interviewee. At each interview, including the group interview, the protocol was read and the order of events followed as outlined. For example, the protocol for conducting the individual interviews started with me stating, “for the sake of confidentiality, please choose a pseudonym by which you will be known and referenced throughout the study.” After the participant selected her pseudonym, this name was used as her identifier on all data, files, and information pertaining to her to help
maintain confidentiality and anonymization. The individual interview protocol continued with scripted directions for completing and interpreting their personal illustrations, what the interview itself would consist of, and what to expect the next time during the group interview, including expected duration of the session. After choosing her pseudonym, each participant immediately continued by creating her personal illustration.

3.03 Personal Illustrations:

The first step in gathering usable data was asking the student teachers to draw a picture of themselves as art teacher. I asked for drawings as opposed to other forms of art (such as performance, video, or sculpture) for the sake of convenience of my providing the materials and in cognizance of the student teachers’ busy schedules (not asking for a time-consuming product/production ahead of time). These illustrations were done with several artistic media provided/available (e.g. crayons, colored pencils, markers, papers, pencils, inks, etc) and also on a one-to-one basis. I conducted this session individually so the student teachers felt more comfortable expressing themselves fully because of reduced levels of self-consciousness of artistic ability or competition than would presumably have occurred in a group setting. Before beginning, I read the following directions to each participant.

Draw yourself as an art teacher. You may use any or all of the supplies provided. In your drawing, you should also consider where you are when you are teaching. We will spend no more than 10-15 minutes on the drawing. Once you are finished, I will have you explain the drawing to me. This will be audio-recorded.
In each case, the participant and I sat facing each other with the drawings on our laps (utilizing a hard surface such as a book or folder) and neither of us saw what the other was creating until the end when we both shared our illustrations with each other, the participant always speaking first. I chose to draw myself as art teacher at the same time as each participant so I would not make her nervous by appearing to watch her draw and/or analyze her artistic abilities. I purposefully took the same amount of time on my illustration as each participant, i.e. I kept adding details or coloring until she alerted me that she was finished, typically within 10-20 minutes of beginning.

I asked for personal illustrations because often it is difficult to verbally articulate and interrogate one’s self identity, while a drawing/illustration provides an external referent to point to while explaining the visual symbols included/excluded. Seen as a window into the three psychic registers, the student teachers’ “art becomes a way to explore what is unsayable, unthinkable, and invisible” (Jagodzinski, 2008, p. 154). Furthermore, the self-revelations of self-as-teacher identity that were uncovered through this initial activity provided an ice breaker and sense of direction for the personal interview that directly followed in this same meeting with the individual student teacher.

Immediately after each student teacher individually drew herself as teacher, I asked her to talk about and interpret the drawing and indicate any ideas about why she drew [included/excluded] what she did in hopes of discovering/uncovering certain signifiers or images.

Because a picture can communicate simultaneously on many levels, drawings are useful…as layered paintings that hide or combine other social, cultural, and personal images… [A personal interpretation] of drawings can thus reveal aspects of our personal and social knowledge—
how we see the world, how we feel, and what we can imagine—that have largely been ignored. (Weber & Mitchell, 1995, p. 19, emphasis added)

I did not attempt to personally interpret the drawings, but rather I considered the verbal statements that the student teachers made about their own illustrations. The addition of the student teachers’ “interpretation[s] to the analysis [of the illustrations] complicates the reading and enables a researcher to explore the various ways [they] resist and/or appropriate images,” (Freedman, 2003, p. 87). In some cases I made probing statements such as, ‘tell me what is going on here’ if the participants neglected to explain a particular part of their illustration. I also tried to remain cognizant of not offering any judgmental statements of their illustrations such as, ‘that’s really good’ or ‘what is this supposed to be?’ Though I mention the personal illustrations here as part of the interview and data collection process, I have decided not to use them as data, as I have deemed them tangential to my main focus and therefore fall outside the scope of this study.

3.04 Personal Interviews:

Immediately upon completing the personal illustrations and listening to their interpretations, I conducted individual interviews with the three student teachers in regards to their ideas, reasons, or desires for becoming an art teacher and what persons and/or representations may have mediated them. Because these interviews were conducted with three student teachers who were under my immediate authority this last academic year through my position as University supervisor, I tried to remain reflexively aware of any potential power relations that could be reactivated in these situations. Consequently, I attempted to “adopt the pose of the listener in a way that parallels the
language and manners of the interviewee and [did] not impose or objectivize the person who is invited to speak,” (Barbour & Schostak, 2005, p. 43). In a further attempt to assuage the former hierarchal power relationship between myself and the student teachers, I had the participants choose the time and place for their personal interviews, anticipating that it would add another level of comfort due to being a familiar setting. As mentioned above where I initially introduced the study participants, the interviews took place at a boyfriend’s parents’ house in a nearby suburb, a personal apartment, also in a nearby suburb, and on campus in a classroom in the art education building.

With each student teacher’s summertime work schedule, stresses over finding teaching positions, and other general time constraints in mind, the successful generation of interview questions was paramount to this study. The questions asked were developed through the discovery and analysis of theoretical and ideological threads woven throughout the literature of visual culture, teacher culture, psychoanalytic theory, and media studies. It was through the asking of these questions that I attempted to understand what people/instances had (in)formed student art educators’ personal and professional identities and ideas of their educational roles espoused within the framework of pedagogical fantasies and desires. Before asking the participants the following ten questions, which were adapted from Stout (2001), I read from the scripted protocol about having as much time as they needed to answer each question and that they could return to a question at the end if they desired.

1. When looking back, talk to me about what persons or circumstances motivated you to become a teacher. What about becoming an art teacher?
2. Did you consider other professions? Which ones? Why?
3. Before you began student teaching, what image(s) did you have of an art teacher?  
   a. Who/what do you think may have helped form those images?  
   b. What did you expect to be like when you started student teaching?  
   c. What general image do you have of (art) teachers now?  
   d. What specific image do you have of yourself as an art teacher now?  
   e. How is this image part of your personal or professional identity?  
4. What does it mean to you to be identified as an art teacher and/or committed to teaching?  
5. Do you like teaching? What do you like best? What about it satisfies you?  
6. Give me an example of something that you really get excited about and/or are really proud of.  
7. Have your thoughts and feelings about teaching, and specifically teaching art, stayed pretty consistent over the course of your preservice training or have they changed?  
8. If they have changed, how have they changed and what may have made them change?  
9. What would you change about your identity as an art teacher?  
10. What is your background?  

I recorded the interviews with a digital voice recorder (Olympus VN-5200PC) which had separate folders (e.g. A, B, C) which I had correspond to the file folders that housed all of their hard copy data (e.g. Olivia was digital folder A on the recorder, her paper file folder was labeled A, and she had file A in my computer folder labeled ‘research’). I then personally transcribed and typed the interviews so that the spoken words were then “usable data,” (Lather, 2008, personal communication). Once the interview transcriptions had been typed, I gave each participant a hard copy of their personal transcript to attempt to ensure validity by having them perform member checks.

All approved transcripts were received from the participants and any specified changes to
grammar and/or unwanted utterances [such as *um, like, you know,* etc] were changed/omitted before I analyzed any of the data contained within.

3.05 DVD clips and Group Interview:

Once the individual interviews were completed and member checked, I gathered the same three student teachers together to watch several pre-determined clips of various films on DVD that involve art educators, including, *Mona Lisa Smile* (2003, Columbia Pictures); *Art School Confidential* (2006, United Artists); *Speak* (2004, Showtime Independent Films); and *Ghost World* (2001, United Artists); as well as clips of the TV series, *Strangers With Candy* (1999, Comedy Central). I did this because “films of the ‘teacher movie’ genre [often] provide dramatic evidence of the elusive but ubiquitous workings of desire in the classroom and the often unintended outcome that a teacher’s desire may have for students” (Zook & Schlender, 2003, p. 72). Thus the movie clips were shown as a catalyst to help discover/unfold the unconscious workings of desire that the student teachers may employ in regard to their conceptualization(s) of teaching, learning, and their students. The group interview was completed in one five-hour session on the evening of July 13, 2009, in a technologically smart classroom of the art education building on the OSU campus. A space that was common to all involved, including the researcher, was chosen to provide a familiarity and comfort that did not privilege any one participant over the other. The location was also equally accessible to all.

---

19 A ‘smart’ classroom in this case refers to one that is permanently equipped with a DVD player, computer controls, ceiling-mounted LCD projector, and large projection screen.
3.06 Pre-selected DVD clips:

Because of the combined length of all of these movies, I only showed between 4-8 clips from each movie selected and one entire 17 minute episode of the TV series *Strangers with Candy*. I selected some of the clips because they were similar to narratives/situations that the participants mentioned in the individual interviews and I chose some of the other clips because they personally resonated with me as an art educator during their initial/subsequent viewings. I also selected clips I believed would elicit rich discussion due to seemingly realistic happenings (in the classroom, with students) and also due to seemingly stereotypical situations (clothing, behaviors). These visual culture referents create a type of fantasy screen of which to point to and in turn, avoid pointing directly at the self and expressing what may otherwise be difficult or troubling to admit. The act of self-incrimination and admission of guilt or pleasure can be difficult to share with the self, let alone contemporaries in a group or an authority figure such as a teacher educator. Before showing each DVD, I provided a summary of the movie and then prior to each clip, as I was forwarding to the next selection, I shared a very short lead-in to each clip in order to set the scene.

The first selection I shared with the participants was *Strangers with Candy’s* Season 2, Episode 3 entitled *Yes You Can’t!* (2000, Comedy Central). I began with the following summary of the series.

Geoffrey Jellineck, the art teacher, is an emotionally fragile and narcissistic man who is engaged in a secret homosexual relationship with Chuck Noblet, the history teacher at the same high school. This TV series from Comedy Central [which lasted for three seasons in 1999-2000] is about a 46 year old ex-convict, runaway, and high school drop out, Jerri
Blank, who returns as a high school freshman to finish her subject credits after living a life of crime and drug abuse. Every episode features a theme or moral lesson although the lessons are often the exact opposite of what a high school student should ideally learn [e.g. eating disorders are good because you’ll get attention]. The art teacher is an integral character that is featured in 29 of the 30 episodes.

Immediately after sharing this summary, we viewed the entire episode which began by depicting a morning assembly where a beautiful model, who was also a former student from the high school, talked about pursuing one’s dreams and future careers. Another lady, from the ‘Artificial Flower Factory’ talked about giving up on dreams and illuminated the wonders of working a repetitive job in a factory for life. Both Jerri and Jellineck were inspired by the model’s speech, prompting Jerri to search for her future occupational calling and for Jellineck to quit his job as an art teacher and pursue his dream of being a professional artist.

The second movie from which I shared various selections with the participants was *Ghost World* (2001, United Artists). I began with the following summary of the movie.

This movie “presents a postsenior-year portrait of two teen-age malcontents, Enid (Thora Birch) and Rebecca (Scarlett Johansson), who are working out of a combination of adolescent angst and resentment that informs both their resistance to a phony middle-class world and their attempts to adjust to it without losing their self-ascribed marginal status…[they] negotiate the complex territory between high school graduation and the plunge into adulthood” (Giroux, 2002a, p. 293). Enid, who failed her senior art class, must attend summer school to make up her art credit in
order to officially graduate. This is where she meets Roberta Allsworth, the art teacher.

Immediately after sharing this summary, I showed six individual clips from *Ghost World*, which included scenes depicting: Enid’s first art class during summer school and her first encounter with the art teacher; a critique of their first project where the students were expected to create something that they had strong feelings about; their second critique as a class where Enid shares a caricature she has done of a nerdy older man- Seymour- that she has met and befriended, but does not reveal the drawing as being him; their third class critique where Enid, having been over to Seymour’s house earlier, borrowed some posters from the restaurant chain where he works and turned in a poster as ‘found art’; the last day of summer school where the teacher says her goodbyes; and finally, the last scene was when the class was selected to have a ‘gallery showing’ of their work from the summer at a local community gallery. Enid had submitted her found art ‘Coon Chicken’ poster as her entry in the show and it caused a stir with the members of the community who viewed it as inappropriate racist material.

The third movie from which I shared various selections with the participants was *Speak* (2004, Showtime Independent Films). I began with the following summary of the movie.

Filmed in Columbus, Melinda Sordino, a high school outcast has been stunned into silence by a traumatic event that occurred over the summer. Shunned by her former peer group and with a great feeling of rejection, Melinda becomes selectively mute. She doesn’t seem to fit anywhere as her grades slip and her parents and teachers misunderstand her so she tries to become invisible, often hiding in a custodial closet during the school
day. Her school mates and friends call her "squealer", because she called the police during a summer party. Melinda finds a great support with her art teacher Mr. Freeman and her school friend as she recalls her traumatic experience when she was raped.

Immediately after sharing this summary, we viewed four individual clips from Speak, which included scenes depicting: Melinda’s first day of school and her first art class where she meets the art teacher, Mr Freeman; a few days later when a bad experience in the lunch room prompted Melinda to go to the art room where Mr Freeman allowed her to stay as long as she drew while eating; months later when Melinda brought the bones of the Thanksgiving turkey in to class to use in her art project where Mr Freeman pushed her conceptual abilities; and finally, the last day of school, Mr Freeman decided to leave his job, but not before Melinda showed him all the progress she made throughout the year with her tree-themed art projects.

The fourth movie from which I shared various selections with the participants was Mona Lisa Smile (2003, Columbia Pictures). I began with the following summary of the movie.

This movie is about Katherine Watson, a free-spirited UCLA graduate that has accepted a position teaching art history at the prestigious New England all-girls Wellesley College in the year 1953. “Watson is a very [post] modern woman, particularly for the 1950s, and has a passion not only for art but for her students. … [Her] students all seem to be biding their time, waiting to find the right man to marry. The students are all very bright and Watson feels they are not reaching their potential. Although a strong bond is formed between teacher and student[s], Watson's views are incompatible with the dominant culture of the college.” (www.imbd.com)
Immediately after sharing this summary, I showed eight individual clips from *Mona Lisa Smile*, which included scenes depicting: the initial classroom meeting where Katherine met her art history students and found out that they were more advanced than her syllabus; the second class meeting where Katherine shows contemporary art that is not on the syllabus hoping that it would challenge her pedigreed students’ preconceived notions of art; weeks later when Katherine met with one of her students who comes in to her office/studio to contest her recent low grade on an essay; months later when Katherine took the students to a rundown art warehouse to view a new ‘Pollack’ that had just arrived; weeks later, through a discussion of van Gogh, Katherine talks about the mass distribution of art by sharing a paint-by-numbers box set of van Gogh’s *Sunflowers*; days later, an art history lecture involving contemporary advertisements of women [in the 1950s] to enlighten students to their patriarchal oppression; weeks later, Katherine walks into her office to find many paint-by-numbers *Sunflowers* done by the students as going-away gifts; and the final scene at the end of the academic year where Katherine has quit her job and the students [who have all turned around on their feelings toward Katherine] ride their bikes following after her taxi as she vacates the premises.

The final movie from which I shared various selections with the participants was *Art School Confidential* (2006, United Artists). I began with the following summary of the movie.

**Main character, Jerome Platz, is an artistically skilled new freshman at an East Coast Art School. Able to render rather realistic portraiture, Jerome’s talent is not appreciated in his Drawing Class. Rather disillusioned by his classmates’ work, Jerome sets out to win the attention of one of the life drawing models. Jerome’s main art instructor is Professor Sandiford.**
clips involve interactions with this professor. For further information, contextually, there have been several murders near campus that have the students on edge.

Immediately after sharing this summary, I showed four individual clips from *Art School Confidential*, which included scenes depicting: the first critique where they discussed the self-portraits that the students had drawn; another critique where Professor Sandiford discusses assignments and deadlines; one of the final assignment critiques where the students bring in their best piece of work, old or new; and lastly, toward the end of the semester, where Jerome meets with Professor Sandiford at the professor’s home to figure out what he’s doing wrong and what he should do differently in order to improve his artistic style (and likeability by his peers).

After watching the various pre-selected DVDs, with emphasis only on the 23 specific clips delineated above, I facilitated a small group interview about the film clips pertaining to whether the student teachers related to the characters, whether the characters fit within their concept of art teacher culture, and other questions that were constructed with close consideration of the literature on identity and desire. Before sharing any of the extended movie clips, I read from the protocol I had written for conducting the group interview session, noting that after we watched the clips, we would talk together about the films by answering 10 questions that I had formulated to facilitate the discussion and that they were encouraged to comment/build off of each others’ ideas and responses. I also asked the participants to view the clips while keeping these instructions in mind:

While watching, please “focus on one or more moments of intense feeling for you in these movie clips. Describe the image, character, scene, or event
that evoked this feeling. Try to relate your feeling to either an event you remember or a desire or pleasure aroused in you by watching this film clip” (Robertson, 1997, p. 77). Also consider moments that did not resonate with you and why. I will give you paper and a pen. Feel free to jot down some ideas or notes that will help you when we are discussing the interview questions. Your paper does not have to be turned in. It is for your benefit of remembering particular screen instances. Keep in mind how the art teacher is portrayed, clothing, mannerisms, and what the art room[s] look like.

The following are the ten questions I asked in order to facilitate the small group discussion/interview with the student teachers directly after watching all 23 movie clips.

1. What specific screen instances resonated with you? Why?
2. Can you describe any desires or pleasures aroused in you by watching this film clip(s)?
3. Did you relate to any of the characters depicted in these movie clips? If so, which ones? Why?
4. Can you describe any strong dis-identifications you may have had with a character(s)? Why don’t you identify with this representation(s)?
5. Did you feel any of these representations of arts educators were stereotypical? If so, what were the stereotypes being portrayed? Where do you think this stereotype may have come from?
6. Now that you have completed student teaching, how would your personal experiences mirror or nullify those experienced by the characters in these clips?
7. What is your understanding of the term ‘art teacher culture’?
8. Did the characters fit within your concept of art teacher culture? How? Why not?
9. Do you think these screen representations of arts educators affect how you imagine what it is to be an art teacher? How so? Do you think it affects society’s view of what it is you do as an art teacher? How so?
10. Did any of the signifiers from your personal illustration appear as patterns in the representations of arts educators that we just viewed? What does that mean to you?

I conducted a small group interview because I did not plan on sitting back and merely collecting data from them. Instead as a researcher, I “actively engage[d] with them, often thinking on [my] feet as [I] invite[d] them to explore with [me] the limitations they might place around their responses and how they would contextualize their views,” (Barbour & Schostak, 2005, p. 45). I did this by sharing some of my own responses to the clips after they had spoken and also by asking probing questions that helped them clarify what they meant by particular statements.

Furthermore, the small group setting allowed the student teachers to “formulate and modify their views and make sense of their experiences” (Barbour & Schostak, 2005, p. 43), by listening to and being influenced by members of their same social group. However, in conducting the small group interview, I had to remain aware of unknown/hidden hierarchical orders amongst the three participants involved because in “bringing even a pre-existing group together for research purposes, [I might have] ask[ed] people to cross boundaries which they do not normally do in the contexts in which they usually meet,” (Barbour & Schostak, 2005, p. 43). When the group interview first began, each participant gave the others full privilege to speak uninterrupted, and they politely took turns, one always apologizing if two started to speak at the same time. By the end of the 1.5 hour interview, there were instances when the participants were talking at the same time and interjecting at random to comment on or add to another’s statement. However, at all times the participants were very respectful to each other and would often
piggyback on one another’s comments, as well as change their own ideas based on what someone else had said or referenced from a movie clip. This occurrence is common as group interviews are “a social process through which participants co-produce an account of themselves and their ideas which is specific to that time and place” (Barbour & Schostak, 2005, p. 43). After the group interview, I emailed copies of the typed transcripts and had the three participants peruse them and edit/change or okay the documents with regard to what they said or how it was said (syntax and/or concept).

3.07 Content Analysis:

After performing the member checks, I used a content analysis approach to investigate the parts of the whole to create meanings through identifying patterns, categories, etc that surfaced within the three individual interviews and one group interview. One reason I chose to utilize content analysis in my study is because “it can be conducted without disturbing the setting in any way. The researcher determines where the emphasis lies after the data have been gathered,” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 108). It is through this process I “assess[ed] local causality, and derive[d] fruitful explanations” (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 15), about the student art educators’ professional identities and ideas of their educational roles within art education. Once I discuss the creation of the categories below, I use various aspects of Lacanian psychoanalytic theory (Lacan, 1977, 2006; Todd, 1997; jagodzinski, 2002) and Deleuzo-Guattarian philosophy (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, 1987; May, 2003; Zembylas, 2007; Watkins, 2008) as the lenses through which I examine the interview answers in Chapter 5.
One of the first and most important steps in conducting any type of data analysis is constructing a coding system derived from searching “through the data for significant events (statements, actions, interactions) which must be identified with a code” (Walker, 2006, p.4). In order to code data, there must be a coding system which involves categories that will identify relationships of semblance, difference, and/or grounded significance within/amongst the data sets. Categories can be both *internal*, derived from themes and the repetition of key words and phrases in the data, and also *external*, derived from theories and research drawn out of a review of related literature (Walker, 2006). The categories created for this research study are derived from both internal and external sources. In this subsection I describe the categories I constructed that are used for the content analysis of collected data from the personal and group interviews conducted with the three art student teachers.

The extensive reading of related literature on psychoanalytic theory (Žižek, 1989; Fink, 1998; jagodzinski, 2002; Hyldgaard, 2006; Lacan, 2006), teacher culture (Markgraf & Pavlik, 1998; McCullick, et al, 2003) and art education (Efland, 1990; Wachowiak & Clements, 1997; Unrath & Kerridge, 2009) prior to analysis helped approach the data with some pre-determined areas of import, but essentially it was the various themes and repetitions that revealed themselves while the collected data was initially and consecutively examined that led to the construction of the categories. The categories that I have created to identify relationships within/amongst the data are classifications of pedagogical fantasies that art student teachers may possess and/or employ with partial regard to the type of teacher they are *becoming* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) or desire to become/be recognized as. These pedagogical fantasies support their desires and exist as...
necessary vehicles for turning their teaching realities into seemingly (deceptively) coherent wholes. The categories that I created for this study are: 1) subject-supposed-to-know, 2) student enchantment, and 3) ego-identification. As I discuss these categories separately, subtle blends and overlaps with other categories may become evident in the descriptions and examples used to elucidate them. Instead of being considered detrimental to singular, air-tight category constructions, the overlap and slipperiness of the irresolute borders of these categories highlight and complement the complexity and inability of ever fully containing or defining any signifiers.

3.07.01 Category 1) Subject-Supposed-to-Know:

The first classification of data, representing student teachers’ pedagogical fantasies, that I have named through a review of related literature and through identifying patterns which surfaced in the individual and group interviews is that of ‘subject-supposed-to-know,’ also a concept briefly discussed earlier in this study’s prologue. When utilized as an umbrella term, the subject-supposed-to-know subsumes the concepts of both teacher as pedagogue and teacher as reformer/philanthropist. The concept of subject-supposed-to-know as pedagogue, as I have envisioned it and named it within this study includes the characteristics of: being a knowledgeable leader in the classroom, as well as a guide or mentor; being the expert, the respected purveyor of arts knowledge (history, movements, artists, policies, techniques, etc); and demonstrating skillful/technical abilities in a variety of artistic procedures as well as classroom management. Illustrative of this are excerpts from the participants’ interview transcripts which exemplify the subject-supposed-to-know as pedagogue.
I see myself more as a leader, as a mentor, as an example of... successful adulthood, you know. And that I’m an example- if I want my students to be a part of a bigger community, if I want them to be creative citizens, then I need to be that. And that’s a huge responsibility, that’s a huge role that you have to play. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 11, emphasis added)

I expected to be a teacher that could pretty much do anything, so [laughs] you know that type— that do any project or I guess I expected to kind of be invincible— I think I expected, too, to come into the classroom and that everyone to listen to me... I expected that; I expected respect immediately. (Marissa, 6-25-09, p. 4, emphasis added)

There is a need, a strong need to... keep art educators up to date on new research and the things that are going on because I think that my idea of art teachers now is that the material and the techniques and the theories that are being utilized and implemented in schools are extremely dated. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 7, emphasis added)

These thoughts about being/need to be the leader who is respected and up-to-date on arts research that were expressed by the participants are reinforced by literature from art education (Barrett, 2003; Gnezda, 2009; NAEA, 2009; Stewart & Katter, 2009) and correspond with ideas of the subject-supposed-to-know in psychoanalytic theory (Finke, 1997).

Illustrative of the desire for a knowledgeable arts pedagogue is Gnezda’s (2009) article in Art Education that ends with a list of nine suggested guidelines for teaching meaningful artmaking, including such suggestions as having “a thematically designed curriculum; open-ended, issue based assignments; presentations of exemplars; facilitation
of students’ creative processes; criteria for assessment; and intervention” (p. 51). It is implied that through the implementation of any or all of these guidelines, the knowledgeable art educator will be teaching meaningful artmaking using knowledge tried and tested from the field of art education. Another example of the importance or necessity of being a knowledgeable art pedagogue is Barrett’s (2003) book, *Interpreting Art: Reflecting, Wondering, and Responding* which is geared toward college-aged art [education] students as much as it is toward practicing arts educators. Having an entire text devoted to telling one how to interpret art suggests that a knowledgeable art pedagoge should be well-trained in this skill. Similarly, Stewart & Katter’s (2009) *A Global Pursuit*, an art curriculum text for elementary-aged students, is accompanied by a teacher’s edition [as are many textbooks], which by its very existence presupposes that the art teacher needs to be knowledgeable, or at least *more* knowledgeable than her students, in talking about, presenting, and understanding art and its various concepts. This expectation for art teachers to be the *subject-supposed-to-know* is supported and encouraged by national art teacher organizations (e.g. NAEA) as well, especially within their written standards for art teacher competency.

For example, the National Art Education Association’s (2009) “*Professional Standards for Visual Arts Educators* represents the knowledge, skills, and attitudes art educators should possess to provide high-quality art instruction for all students” (NAEA, 2009, p. 1). Four of the first nine standards regarding the content of art begin with the phrase, “visual arts educators are *knowledgeable about*,” and then list a series of skills, such as knowing about the cultural and historical contexts surrounding works of art, that the art teacher must have in order to be considered competent. On this three-page
document there are 67 separate standards which support the idea that the art teacher should embody the subject-supposed-to-know. These professional standards are then passed down to the preservice program managers as necessary attributes their student teacher candidates must employ in order to pass their practicum and receive their licenses. It is understandable that a national teaching organization of any academic discipline would require their members to be knowledgeable in their content area since most students “attribute knowledge and mastery to their teachers whether the teachers accept or relinquish this authority. Students enter the classroom believing that the teacher knows the ‘right’ answer” (Finke, 1997, p. 129); hence, the pedagogue as subject-supposed-to-know.

Next, the concept of subject-supposed-to-know as reformer/philanthropist includes the characteristics of: being the teacher as hero who denies herself her basic needs in life so that she can in effect save or rescue her students (from danger and [self] destruction); being the proponent of social justice who enlightens students about overcoming personal/societal woes; desires the improvement and/or betterment of educational/societal wrongs through changes in consciousness or policy; and a teacher that desires to do good to/for Others with(out) expectation of immediate personal reward. This second delineation presents the teacher as “acting sincerely as a role model and a leader (often leading a group of iconoclasts), rescuing others from danger, and denying oneself for a larger good” (Markgraf & Pavlik, 1998, p. 278). The teacher as reformer/philanthropist is part of the subject-supposed-to-know because being a hero or rescuer or proponent of social justice implies the teacher knowing more than the students do about their own situations or best interests and how to remedy the students’ situations.
I think that’s it just really consists of helping… helping students find themselves and find what their talents are, and what their passions are. Because I think that when you’re passionate about what you do that’s when you’re the most- you can be a beneficial- not that you can’t otherwise, but- be a productive member of society where you’re contributing in ways and when you’re happy with what you’re doing. I think that comes naturally and I think it’s important for kids to know… to find that peace in themselves to where they feel content. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 2, emphasis added)

I think you learn so much about problem solving and trouble shooting ability from the art room and that’s the satisfaction I get is just knowing that no matter where they [students] go and no matter what path they choose that there’s no way they can walk out of my class without bettering their abilities to make decisions and think through things. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p.14, emphasis added)

These thoughts, about being/need to be the teacher who helps students find themselves and their talents and/or bettering students’ abilities to make decisions, which were expressed by the participants, are reinforced by literature from art education (Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996; Wilson, 1997) and correspond with ideas of the subject-supposed-to-know as reformer/philanthropist.

Illustrative of the desire for an arts reformer/philanthropist to increase student awareness and ability is a statement in Wilson’s (1997) keynote address presented at the International Symposium in Art Education in Taipei, Taiwan. Speaking about the then-recent shifts in art education paradigms, Wilson compared the differences between discipline-based art education and visual cultural education, suggesting a switch to the
latter. “If art education were to become visual cultural education—I believe we [arts educators] could provide our students with opportunities to know themselves and their worlds more fully and deeply than they do through today’s versions [sic] art education” (Wilson, 1997, p. 10). Wilson’s remark about arts teachers providing students with opportunities to know themselves resounds clearly in Jean’s comment that arts teachers can ‘help students find themselves.’ Another example of the importance or necessity of being an arts reformer/philanthropist is in Efland, Freedman, and Stuhr’s (1996) book, *Postmodern Art Education: An Approach to Curriculum*, which is geared toward higher education faculty and students as much as it is toward practicing arts educators. Outlining five multicultural approaches found in general education and explaining them in relation to the field of art education, the authors verbalize their desire for the improvement and/or betterment of educational/societal wrongs through changes in consciousness or policy. Reinforcing the need for the reformer/philanthropist to be knowledgeable about the needs of the students, the authors emphasize that “with the help of the teacher, students can analyze the information, discuss their feelings and attitudes toward it [any chosen topic], and challenge existing views and preconceptions” (Efland, et al, 1996, p. 84). Their statement resembles Olivia’s hope that her future students will walk out of her art classroom having bettered their abilities to make life decisions and think through things before acting.

Though both subsidiaries of subject-supposed-to-know require a heightened level of knowledge/awareness, the reformer/philanthropist was bifurcated from the first because it seemingly exudes more concern, care, and altruism than does the teacher as pedagogue. This is evident in the student teachers’ excerpts with phrases such as *helping*
students find themselves and bettering their abilities to make decisions and think through things. The requirement for being a knowledgeable pedagogue is still persistent in order for a teacher to help a student find himself or to better her problem solving abilities, but the reformer/philanthropist also has an aura and expectation of a resultant positive change. The purpose with my discussion about being a subject-supposed-to-know within art education is not to imply that I take issue with it, or that as arts educators we are not to talk about artistic knowledge or be knowledgeable in the fundamentals of our field, have a knowledge of the elements and principles of design, the fundamentals of classroom management techniques, or suggest that we should not instruct our students with such information. Rather it is my intention to acknowledge it as a continuous discourse within the field of art education, though one that has considered the concept of being a subject-supposed-to-know in ways differently than how I am approaching it within this study. It is my intention to go beyond the continuous discussion around the expectation of having an intimate and working knowledge of art (education, history, critique, techniques, etc) and explore the possible reasons for desiring that Imaginary positioning/displaying of ourselves as a subject-supposed-to-know of our field’s knowledge. I want to consider what is it that may lead us to desire to be (be seen as) an informed pedagogue, a leader, or a reformer/philanthropist—besides being implored to do so by the scholarship in our field. In other words, is there a personal fantasy that we are fulfilling from being knowledgeable or from being recognized as knowledgeable? Likewise, what happens when we recognize that we have not saved or rescued our students from societal danger and (self) destruction? In Chapter 5- Interpretations of the Data, I also theorize about what happens in those moments when we realize we are not the knowledgeable leader our
art students think we are. As will become evident in the following subsection, the subject-supposed-to-know as reformer/philanthropist overlaps and intermingles with the concept of student enchantment, e.g. in the situations when one denies herself her basic needs in life so that she can save/rescue her students.

3.07.02 Category 2) Student Enchantment:

The second classification of data that I have named through identifying patterns within the interview utterances of the participants is that of student enchantment. I have used the term enchantment to represent the spell-like, magical quality of the relationship(s) that can exist between teachers and students and which often elicits feelings of love, attraction, captivation, and fascination (with the teacher, student, relationships, knowledge, subject, etc). In psychoanalytic terms, the feelings (e.g. captivation or fascination) felt by the students toward the teacher is referred to as transference (Lacan, 1977; Evans, 1996; jagodzinski, 2002). Conversely, the feelings felt by the teacher toward her student(s) is referred to as counter-transference (Evans, 1996; Fink, 1997; jagodzinski, 2002).

Teaching is not a purely cognitive, informative experience, it is also an emotional, erotic experience. “I deemed it necessary,” insists Lacan, “to support the idea of transference, as indistinguishable from love, with the formula of the subject presumed to know. I cannot fail to underline the new resonance with which this notion of knowledge is endowed. The person in whom I presume knowledge to exist, thereby acquires my love” (S-XX, 64). (Felman, 1997, p. 31)
In other words, the concept of student enchantment, existing as teacher and student (counter)transference, is indistinguishable from love and is intimately tied to the first category’s concept of the subject-supposed-to-know, or the person in whom a student presumes knowledge to exist. “As soon as the subject who is supposed to know exists somewhere… there is transference” (Lacan, 1977, p. 232). On the other side of the transference relationship is the teacher and her feelings of counter-transference which are “‘the sum total of the [teacher’s] biases, passions, difficulties, and even inadequate information’ (Ecrits, 225)” (Fink, 1997, p. 232) toward/about her student(s). In other words, the feelings that a teacher may have toward her student(s) might be based on her personal assumptions about where that student is from, what that student might be thinking, and/or why a student behaves in a certain manner, etc. Therefore, the concept of student enchantment, as I have envisioned it and named it within this study includes the concept of the tug of war and/or reciprocal inter/intra play between the student’s transference toward the teacher as the subject-supposed-to-know and the teacher’s counter-transference toward the student(s). I have recognized enchantment as a type of play because the teacher’s feelings and actions toward the student often enable and encourage the students’ captivation-through-transference beyond the initial recognition of their teacher as subject-supposed-to-know (i.e. the teacher will favorably change her behaviors or set up situations that purposely elicit feelings of transference from her students). The concept of student enchantment can be recognized by the following characteristics of being a teacher that: forms connections with her students which can result in friendships; creates a community amongst her classroom; shares/expresses a love for her students; recognizes the students’ points of view and what they have to offer;
and/or exhibits a personal charm, charisma, and/or appeal toward the student(s),
sometimes with unconscious expectations of reciprocity and sometimes with(out) any
conscious expectation of immediate personal satisfaction. These expressions of love,
from the teachers toward the students, are highly evident in the interview excerpts below.

There’s a lot *more passion there* than there is otherwise- than there is with
anything else [other careers]... I *like* my students; I *love* my students. They are *very special to me*... because they’re people you know... they have a very different world view. And *one that I think is important* to be
...that *needs to be recognized* and that isn’t necessarily recognized and I
think that *we can all learn from it* in a way that we can’t learn from adults.
(Jean, 6-18-09, p. 4; italics added, bold in original)

I wanted to be *their friend* and I wanted to be *loving* and I wanted to be... *encouraging*, you know. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 6, emphasis added)

*I love, love, love* working with the kids and working with the students and
just being able to get *involved with their personal lives* and that’s one of the reasons that I chose art. Is ‘cause in math or science you hardly ever
get to *hear about their family or issues that they’re facing* and that often
comes out in the arts. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 13; italics added, bold in original)

I like just being able to *affect someone’s learning* and *affect someone’s life positively*. Um, and I think one of the things I love best, I *love, love, love*
this. Is when I’m teaching something and kids are looking at me and you
know you’re like ‘are they getting it, are they not getting it’ and then
they’ll talk about something or see something [relating to what she
taught]. (Marissa, 6-25-09, p. 8; italics added, bold in original)
The distinct use of the word *love* in all three of the participants’ answers and the implication of their being and/or wanting to be involved in students’ personal lives is highly characteristic of the *student enchantment* category. The teachers loving their students or loving the act of working with them is an example of counter-transference. Going forward in Chapter 5, I consider why it is that we desire close relationships and connections with our students. Similarly, I contemplate how it affects us when we do not form those desired amicable/loving relationships with our students. The categorical concepts of the *subject-supposed-to-know* and *student enchantment* also share close affinities with the third category outlined in this study, that of *ego-identification*. These connections and intermingleings will be explored in more detail in the subsection below.

3.07.03 Category 3) Ego-Identification:

The final classification of data, representing student teachers’ pedagogical fantasies, which I have named through identifying patterns is that of *ego-identification*. This delineation includes ideas from the Lacanian concepts of the *ideal-ego* (imaginary identification) and *ego-ideal* (symbolic identification) discussed earlier in Chapter 2. As Žižek (1989) explains, “imaginary identification is identification with the image in which we appear likeable to ourselves, with the image representing ‘what we would like to be’” (p. 105). In other words, the ideal-ego is a collection of images or conglomeration of traits of others, such as former and/or current teachers, that student teachers may wish to emulate in their professional lives. Likewise, as Žižek (1989) also explains, symbolic identification is “identification with the very place *from where* we are being observed, *from where* we look at ourselves so that we appear to ourselves likeable, worthy of love”
(p. 105, emphasis in original). In other words, instead of identifying with the image of perfection representing what the student teachers would like to be, the ego-ideal is symbolic identification from the point of view of the perfect Others who they believe are observing them or from the point of view of that perfect representation they hold of themselves. Therefore, the concept of ego-identification, as I have envisioned it and named it within this study includes the characteristics of: physically adopting certain attire and/or teacherly stances in and out of the classroom; displaying/performing certain behaviors that embody desirable signifiers; admiration and love for a former/current teacher; aspiration to be like or similar to someone else perceived as good; disinclination to be like someone else perceived as bad; and/or seeing themselves [actions, beliefs, behaviors] reflected in someone else. Illustrative of this are excerpts from the participants’ interview transcripts which exemplify ego-identification with former teachers perceived as good.

Maybe it’s because of that’s kind of the image that you’re supposed to be when you’re an art teacher [wearing ‘artsy’ clothes]. But it’s a lot of it because I wanted to be that- I thought it was cool when I always looked at those people like my teacher in high school, Mrs. Ripple. I was like, you know I want to be that- I want to be fun. I want to be excited. I want to have a little bit of quirkiness to me so I think I’ve become that as I look back to what I wanted to be. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 9; emphasis in original)

So when I look back on it I want to be the type of teacher that she was [elementary teacher]. So I want to be the person that’s like the turning point that where I could have done this or this and I chose to do this because of the role model that I had… she was a fabulous teacher. (Marissa, 6-25-09, p.1; emphasis added)
When I was younger, it made me feel more comfortable in my classroom that my art teacher was very- you know she played the Enya music and I always felt like I was *just like she was*—just like a hippie and this open person and… I know that *she was a fabulous art teacher*. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 6; emphasis added)

With *ego-identification*, there is not always the proclamation of wanting to be a certain type of *good* teacher, as exemplified above, but there is also an aversion to being a type of *bad* teacher. Some student teachers may be constructing/renegotiating their own professional teaching identities in opposition to (disidentification with) teachers they have had in the past and take measures to avoid replicating the behaviors and actions of these particular individuals. This opposition may also affect the physical representation/manifestation of what they believe a *good* teacher looks like and may modify the student teachers’ appearances to present/embody positive teacher signifieds (images). An example of renegotiating professional teaching identity in opposition to a former art teacher, Marissa mentioned in her individual interview that:

*I never wanted to be an art teacher because I didn’t want to be the stereotypical hippie, druggie, um, lazy [laughs]. So I didn’t want to be that kind of teacher so it took me a while to actually come to the fact that I was going to be an art teacher, but I wasn’t going to be that type of art teacher.* (Marissa, 6-25-09, p. 3; italics added, bold in original)

So, in Marissa’s case she renegotiated her emergent professional identity, who she was going to be/desired to be as an art teacher, based on a strong disidentification with her high school art teacher which, to her, embodied particular negative signifiers (hippie, druggie, and lazy). With direct consideration of the student teachers’ responses, I wonder
what satisfaction they might get from emulating those teachers they desire to be more like? Conversely, what happens to them psychically when they become exactly like those teachers they have/had strong aversions to?

As I briefly alluded to in the discussion of category 2, the concepts of the subject-supposed-to-know and student enchantment share close affinities with ego-identification. For example, the term subject-supposed-to-know is a signifier used in the symbolic register that dominates and determines the image, the imaginary form, in which the student teachers appear to themselves likeable [or knowledgeable] in the imaginary register. The subject-supposed-to-know is symbolic identification from the point of view of the perfect Others [teachers, administrators, field of art education] who the student teachers believe are observing them or from the point of view of that perfect representation they hold of themselves as all-knowing pedagogues. Similarly, the concept of student enchantment rests on the actions, appearances, and behaviors of being or seeming to be a caring, concerned, and loving teacher that is presented to/for the students.

These three categories, when considered individually and in combination, assist the exploration of the personal and professional identity (re)formation of art student teachers as they are becoming-teacher.

3.08 Conclusion to Methodology Chapter:

It is with questions such as those mentioned at the end of each category subsection that I transition into the next chapter where I unfold the data from the three student teachers’ individual and group interviews which are intermixed with selected dialogue from various DVD clips. I will be indirectly answering those essential questions
as the concepts unfold throughout the discussion in Chapter 4, and it is hoped that their possible explanations will become more apparent. Following my situating of the data in Chapter 4, I will be utilizing the three categories that I constructed above to examine the data and interpret it through the lenses of Lacanian psychoanalytic theory (Lacan, 1977, 2006; Todd, 1997; jagodzinski, 2002) and Deleuzo-Guattarian philosophy (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, 1987; May, 2003; Zembylas, 2007; Watkins, 2008) in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4- UNFOLDING OF DATA

This chapter is an unfolding of the data collected through the individual interviews and one small group interview with the three student teacher participants who were introduced in the preceding methodology chapter. The purpose of Chapter 4 is to provide a textured narrative of the participants’ feelings and ideas about what they imagine it is to teach art, including their personal understandings of their emergent teaching identities and individual roles situated within art education. Through the viewing of 23 popular visual culture DVD clips of arts educators, each student teacher engaged in a meaningful, multi-layered, and shared experience with two fellow classmates. Through their group participation, they potentially assisted each other in their individual processes of (re)constructing and (re)negotiating their own teaching identities and psychic conceptualizations of art teacher culture. The story each student teacher “tells of her life shapes her actual experience by providing a framework against which she understands what she is doing” (Brown & Heggs, 2005, p. 295). Therefore, this chapter is loosely structured in narrative form that unfolds with actual participant utterances presented as interview excerpts, very selective dialogue from various DVD clips that inspired affective viewer responses, and a further building-up of the three categories of pedagogical
fantasies delineated in Chapter 3- *Methodology*. In the following chapter, Chapter 5- *Interpretations of the Data*, interpretations of the desires supported by the student teachers’ possible pedagogical fantasies (subject-supposed-to-know, student enchantment, and ego-identification), which are employed by both the movie characters and student teachers to help manage/veil the chaos that often occurs in the continual process of *becoming-teacher*, are more fully explored.

This chapter is organized around the individual and group interview excerpts, which were the most information-rich in exploring the possible individual and collective imaginings of art teacher culture and professional identity, and are exhibited and illuminated through the three constructed categories of pedagogical fantasies. Very brief and selective dialogue from specific DVD clips that were shown during the group session are intermixed with various interview excerpts, because the movie characters’ specific verbiage and interactions with students in the scenes offer the reader another dimension of understanding the psychoanalytic/philosophic theoretical concepts they (re)present as well as getting a glimpse of what the participants viewed and responded to. Sharing the DVD clips with the student teachers as a catalyst for discussion was important to data collection because “readers use the film (images, scenes, behaviors of the screen teacher) as an object or host through which to symbolize desires about teaching” (Robertson, 1994, p. 96). In what follows, my unfolding of data attempts to go beyond the DVD clips themselves to take account of how student teachers imagine teaching art through the elucidation of three of their possible pedagogical fantasies. Because 23 separate DVD clips of varying length were shown to the participants, it is reasonable to note that there is not enough time or space to discuss them all within the context of this study. Only the
strongest and most representative (of the other clips in the designated category) visual
culture examples will be shared with the reader as a way of providing a flavor of what
transpired. I now offer the participants’ stories as they fit within each of the three
constructed categories of pedagogical fantasies.

4.01 Unfolding Subject-supposed-to-know as Pedagogical Fantasy:

“Students come to rely on their teachers for help with important choices in
resolving perplexing problems, and they become skeptical of those who
confuse them with vague generalizations or place all the responsibility for
decision making in their hands.” (Wachowiak & Clements, 1997, p. 80)

Many students come to rely on teachers to have answers, not only answers, but
“students enter the classroom believing that the teacher knows the ‘right’ answer” (Finke,
1997, p. 129). Beginning as early as preschool or kindergarten, teachers have instructed
students with various judgments such as, ‘no, that’s not the correct pronunciation of that
word; yes, that’s the best solution to your math problem; or, adding more colors to your
painting will make the foreground pop.’ This early experience of looking to the teacher
for what is right and what is wrong sets the precedent for students to become skeptical of
those teachers who do not instruct or inform them with specific facts or techniques
because “school, by definition, conditions us to believe that there are others who know
better than we do; it encourages and often forces us to give up our own judgment in favor
of the judgment of those in authority” (Tompkins, 1996, p. xix). The teacher as the
authority, the knowledgeable leader in the classroom, “the self-sufficient, self-possessed
proprietor of knowledge” (Felman, 1997, p. 30), can be recognized in psychoanalytic
terms as the subject-supposed-to-know.

All of the movies from which I pulled clips to share with the participants had
scenes that were chosen specifically due to instances of the art educators embodying the
subject-supposed-to-know which was manifested as knowledgeable teachers that helped
with important (art) choices. Some of the movies, such as Mona Lisa Smile and Speak,
seemingly had more occurrences of this characterization perhaps due to the more serious
handling of the their content and dramatic screenwriting, as opposed to the more satirical
portrayals in Art School Confidential, Ghost World and Strangers with Candy. In the
more parodic representations, the art teachers were sometimes seen as silly or moronic
and/or as individuals that could be easily replaced precisely because they were not valued
(by administrators, colleagues, parents, etc) as subjects-supposed-to-know. However,
even in those movies/TV series where those depictions occurred, the art teacher still
harbored aspects of the subject-supposed-to-know, such as when they judged ‘good’ art,
i.e. high versus low art, or when they were dictating procedures, whether technical or
classroom managerial, reinforcing both the prevalence and high esteem this subject
position has within US society.

Though the constructed category of the subject-supposed-to-know did not pre-
exist the group interview or the participants’ viewing of the various DVD clips, the
consistent theme of the teacher as a masterful pedagogue (of technique, lesson plans,
classroom management, etc) and as a reformer/philanthropist (knowing the best ways to
save students from oppressive societal norms) in the articulations from the three
individual interviews provided the impetus for inclusion of the popular visual culture
scenes. For example, Olivia and Marissa both alluded to the amount of work that was required to be a competent teacher as well as the need for rules and classroom management, both tasks of the *subject-supposed-to-know*.

I have a whole new respect for teachers for sure. The amount of work that it takes to develop a lesson and to write a plan and to cut paper and have materials and order materials and then when it comes down to it, you get ready to present the lesson. The kids are all over the place, you have to have the classroom management, you have to have the rules set and in place, I mean it is *a lot* to keep track of and I never knew that it was like that. (Olivia, 7-2-09, pp. 8-9)

Similarly, in addition to the amount of work it takes to pull a lesson together and get ready for the students to be in class, Olivia also talked about the need for the art teacher to be an organized leader in the classroom in order to gain the students’ respect. She emphasized that respect is not something that is handed to a teacher upon walking into the classroom, but it is the result of planning well and being organized, also two recognizable and necessary traits of the knowledgeable pedagogue.

It’s a lot of work to gain their respect and you don’t just gain their respect from being their friend. You gain their respect from being a leader, from creating fair rules and… maintaining that environment of fairness and equality um… it’s not just handed to you. You don’t walk into a room and a student goes ‘oh she looks like a fun, nice person, I bet I could go talk to her about my issues I just had this morning with my boyfriend.’ You know, it doesn’t work that way. And it starts from planning and being organized on paper to walking into the classroom and knowing what you’re saying but also having the improv skills to deal with situations as they arise, and especially in high school. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 17)
Additionally, Olivia extended her argument on the need for planning and organization by talking about how she plans for her lessons by researching for hours and hours about artists that she can integrate into her lessons and unit plans. She reasoned that having more knowledge from the field of art education would make her job as a teacher a lot easier. In fact Olivia judged herself as not having as much art knowledge (about contemporary artists and art history) as she should though she never mentions how she judged this or by what academic standards she is assessing her own (lack of) knowledge.

I would really like to expand my knowledge of the arts itself. I think I have pretty good abilities to communicate and… interact with students but when it comes down to it, I am supposed to be teaching art too you know and I do. I mean by all means I do, but I need more knowledge in the arts themselves like as far as history and contemporary artists. I’m always having to research for hours and hours to find artists that I can use that relate to what I want to teach them. And if I just had that knowledge base my job would be a lot easier, so I would love to expand that and even take some continuing education courses on… even just contemporary artists and who these people are and what they did. I don’t know as much as I should. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 17)

Similar to Olivia, Marissa also mentioned the attributes of the subject-supposed-to-know, such as being adept at organization, creating interesting project ideas, classroom management, and problem solving. Also akin to Olivia, Marissa has discerned that she, too, needs to improve on all of her skills as an art teacher.

I’m constantly seeing myself as I need to do this better I need to figure this out; I’m just always wanting to solve things so I see myself as constantly improving on everything… about being a teacher like organization or
ideas about projects, classroom management, how to relate to kids. But also when I try something different like with relating to kids or classroom management, I feel excited if it works. So I’m kind of seeing myself as this question/answer type person where this presents itself so what am I going to do. (Marissa, 6-25-09, p. 6)

Because of Olivia and Marissa’s responses with regard to the desire and necessity of them as art teachers to need to be the subjects-supposed-to-know in order to be good teachers or to make their jobs easier, I very selectively chose specific clips from Mona Lisa Smile, Speak, and Ghost World that (in)directly mirrored their thoughts and sentiments. I used these various clips as a catalyst to get the student teachers to potentially expand their initial thoughts about teachers’ needs to be subjects-supposed-to-know and to potentially unfold the unconscious desires that may support such a fantasy. As mentioned previously, there were many more DVD clips shown during the group interview session that adequately illustrated the concept of the arts educator as a subject-supposed-to-know; however, I only mention three very strong examples to help provide a flavor of what constitutes this pedagogical fantasy. These clips are intertwined with the verbalizations of the student teacher participants. With each clip, I briefly set the scene and then provide a selective (abbreviated) section of the dialogue to illustrate the meta-concept of the actions and speakings of a knowledgeable arts pedagogue.

4.01.01 Mona Lisa Smile’s Katherine as Subject-Supposed-to-Know:

The first clip from Mona Lisa Smile (2003, Columbia Pictures) depicts Katherine’s pedagogical response to a disastrous first day of class the week before. In
that opening scene which sequentially leads into the happenings in this clip, Katherine had shown slides of art historical artifacts in her History of Art 100 class to students who were already very knowledgeable about all the pieces she shared with them. Every time she brought up an image on the projection screen, the students instantly answered with the title, artist, time period, and specific details (that they had read and memorized from the text and supplemental materials for the class) that she felt she was supposed to provide to the students as the art historical expert with a Master’s Degree. The following text is selected dialogue from the 2:44 minute scene.

Female Student 1: What is that?
Katherine-Teacher: You tell me… Carcass by Soutine. 1925.
Susan: It’s not on the syllabus.
Katherine: No, it’s not… Is it any good? Hmm? Come on, ladies. There’s no wrong answer. There’s also no textbook telling you what to think. It’s not that easy, is it?

As evidenced by the excerpt above, Katherine’s need to change her approach to her class through reworking her syllabus was done to challenge her students’ preconceived notions of art and to trump their memorized answers, which is indicative of the behavior expected from a subject-supposed-to-know who always (assumes she) has more access to arts knowledge than her already well-informed students. Reminiscent of Mona Lisa Smile’s Katherine, Marissa had both a desire for continuous professional development and saw herself as a sort of problem solver in the classroom that could and should figure out how best to accommodate her students. Similar to Katherine’s desire to be the subject-supposed-to-know in front of her classroom of students that ultimately lead to her
changing the presented content, Marissa is also cognizant of her presumed responsibility of being the answer-person within her classroom.

The second clip from *Mona Lisa Smile* depicts Katherine showing several slides on the projection screen, of then-current 1950s magazine advertisements featuring women, which similar to the Soutine, was not on the students’ syllabus (that included the typical Western canon of art *masters*). Her actions in this classroom scene are a response to student Betty’s scathing and accusatory article in the school newspaper that rebukes Katherine for “declaring war on the holy sacrament of marriage” through her “liberal” teaching—which includes encouraging a female student (Joan) to forego marriage and consider attending Yale law school. The following text is selected dialogue from the 3:15 minute scene.

**Katherine:** Slide… Contemporary art.
**Connie:** *[interrupts]* now that’s just an advertisement.
**Katherine:** Quiet!… *[yells, obviously upset]* Today you just listen… What will the future scholars see when they study us? A portrait of women today? *[Slide shows black and white advertisement of Old Dutch Cleaner. Ad text reads “Could you get a job as a Housewife? Use Old Dutch Cleaner!”]* There you are, ladies. The perfect likeness of a Wellesley graduate. Magna cum laude, doing exactly what she was trained to do.

This particular scene elicited quite a bit of conversation amongst the student teachers when I asked them to describe any desires or pleasures aroused in them by watching the various clips or if there was anything that when they watched it, they thought it was something they would want or if it was something they really enjoyed watching. Marissa began talking about the scene and Jean added her thoughts as she continued on. What Marissa applauded was the way that Katherine, as a knowledgeable leader, had tried to
get her students to think in a different manner than they were accustomed and how she offered her students more (life) options as young women in the 1950s, such as imploring Joan to attend law school and get married, instead of just getting married and being a housewife.

Just being able to get them to think in a different way from what they you know were thinking about before- like the girls in Mona Lisa Smile how they would graduate and they would get married. There was no other option and she actually provided them with options, things that weren’t completely hopeless, you know things that actually were I think good for them so, I don’t know if I’m explaining that, but yeah [LH: okay] just kind of giving them more options. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 5)20

Jean agreed with Marissa’s sentiments but added that she identified with the frustration felt by Katherine when the students were complacent with their oppressive societal expectations. Jean mentioned that Katherine knew what the female students needed to hear and presented it in a way that captured the students’ attention.

She didn’t keep her cool during the scene when she came in and showed the slides of popular culture you know in the 50s and she just basically handed it to them and said this isn’t good enough, ‘you’re the smartest women in the country’ and that’s the way they needed it. She was able to present the information to them in a way that they were going to respond to it and they weren’t happy about it and they didn’t necessarily feel good about it, but it was so powerful. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 5)

20 Bold-bracketed text is participant interjections in the midst of a main speaker’s dialogue. The participant is identified by her first initial in bold type. My interjections are identified by my initials of ‘LH’. When a participant’s interjection became longer than a quick comment, she was given her own paragraph of dialogue. Bold, bracketed ellipses designate removed text, regular ellipses designate participant pauses.
[Katherine asked] ‘what am I going to do’ and she found a way to actually get to know her students, to relate to them. So I think that was also something very important that you know we’ve also all been told again, again, and again. You have to know your students. Like this may work with a different population; but it may not work with this one, and she had to change it up. So it was just kind of like going by the seat of her pants or something. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 6)

Marissa’s stated that a teacher must know her students well enough so that she can present the appropriate material in the appropriate ways to elicit the most learning. Her articulations here resound with her statement earlier that as an art teacher, she personally felt she needed to be a problem-solver and ‘constantly improving on everything’.

Katherine, as the teacher-who-knows, recognized that the syllabus wasn’t challenging and ‘changed it up’, in order to show her students that there was more to art than they knew.

4.01.02 Ghost World’s Roberta as Subject-Supposed-to-Know:

This clip from Ghost World (2001, United Artists) depicts Roberta leading one of the summer school art class’ first class critiques. She gave the students a theme and they were expected to create something that they had strong feelings about—the viewer was given no other specifics of the assignment. The following text is selected dialogue from the 2:19 minute scene

Roberta: [Holds up Enid’s sketchbook, turns pages and opens it up to show the class] Oh. I think that Phillip and Enid can help us to see that there are many different ways we can express ourselves. We can do things like these cartoons that are amusing as a sort of a light entertainment or we can do work that is more serious in scope, in feeling, and that deals with
issues—emotional, spiritual, political, of great importance. [She points to another student's work] Who is responsible for this?

**Margaret-Student:** [confidently] I am.

**Roberta:** Talk to us about it...

**Margaret:** [matter-of-factly] It's my response to the issue of a woman's right to choose... it's something I feel super-strongly about.

**Roberta:** Hmm. {Shaking her head in pleased wonderment} Isn’t this a wonderful piece, class? This definitely falls into that *higher* category of art I was speaking of earlier [gestures with hand].

Though a seemingly more parodic representation of an art educator than that of Katherine in *Mona Lisa Smile*, Roberta is still shown as a *subject-supposed-to-know* who judges high versus low art, and hence good versus bad art (in her opinion), in this scenario. This is denoted by her concluding statement that Margaret’s abstract, issue-based sculpture ‘falls into that *higher* category of art’ that she was talking about. Roberta puts this in contrast to Phillip and Enid’s ‘cartoons that are amusing as a sort of a light entertainment’, thereby assuming her position as the respected purveyor of arts judgments.

Unlike the representation of Katherine in *Mona Lisa Smile*, the participants had a less favorable reaction to Roberta, though they did recognize her as the *subject-supposed-to-know*, and as an arts pedagogue. Marissa responded to Roberta trying to get the students to think deeper about social and/or personal issues, she also mentioned Roberta’s tendency to champion students that thought similarly to her or that had merely created controversial artwork in the eyes of the teacher.

She [Roberta] just seemed like someone that wanted to be shocking... Like she was probing deep with the students but I think she just wanted to
maybe show like she was above or she understood or something like that. (Marissa, 7-13-09, pp. 3-4)

She [Roberta] kind of wants them to explore themselves, explore feelings or emotions that they have… but she just seemed more about controversy over the skill of the student. So no matter what the artwork was, it wasn’t ‘value each individual student artwork for what they’ve started with to what it is now’, but it was ‘oh this could stir controversy, I like this the most’. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 11)

Jean agreed with Marissa in that she also mentioned Roberta’s desire to have students explore themselves and social issues deeper, but expanded her observation when she denounced Roberta’s tendency to coerce students into thinking similarly to her. Jean became self-reflexive as she was speaking, mentioning that she did not want to become a teacher like Roberta.

I would agree with that I felt like she did and I did relate to this desire to have students explore themselves and the creative process being about more than just creating, but thinking. [M: mm hmm] And I want to be that, but she was like- she’s that teacher that I am terrified of becoming you know because in your effort to promote self-exploration, it becomes very cliché and very almost- I don’t know what the word I’m looking for is- but superficial almost, you know. Because the questions you’re asking are more about- getting students to see what you see the way you see it- as opposed to the way they see it. So I thought that she was well-intentioned almost [M: yeah] but fell pretty short of her goal because maybe it’s self-absorption, you know [M: mm hmm]. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 11)
Olivia also commented on Roberta, mentioning several of her attributes as a teacher, including her energy, excitement, and efforts, but reacted rather harshly to Roberta’s portrayal of an overly disciplinary *subject-supposed-to-know* who seemed disconnected from her students’ needs.

I was very disgusted with how pushy and [M: mm hmm] how completely un-student-based…. She didn’t read her students and change as they kind of changed or she didn’t notice any emotions in her students, she just kept going [LH: Right, she had her ideas] with her paths and yeah, she was [J: her syllabus and her lesson plans] …very narrow-minded, right, it felt like she had a syllabus and a lesson plan to be weird, to be artsy, you know to be- think out of the box- but she was really trying to narrow them into a certain place. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 12)

Olivia addresses Roberta’s proclivity toward acting as an austere pedagogue that had one way of teaching, according to her pre-constructed lesson plans, and not changing and flowing according to her students’ changes, needs and/or emotions.

4.01.03 *Speak’s Mr Freeman as Subject-Supposed-to-Know*:

This clip from *Speak* (2004, Showtime Independent Films) depicts the initial day of school when the students show up for class and meet the art teacher Mr Freeman. The depiction of this art teacher is similar to that of Katherine in *Mona Lisa Smile* because his character is seemingly more seriously handled, i.e. he is not represented as a buffoon, but rather as an eccentric, yet knowledgeable and skillful, artist-teacher that genuinely cares about his students and their work. Therefore, Mr Freeman appears to be a balanced mixture of the *subject-supposed-to-know* as both the respected pedagogue and as the
reformer/philanthropist. I quote the scene at great length because all three of the participants responded to Mr Freeman with great admiration. The following text is selected dialogue from the 3:27 minute scene.

**Mr Freeman-art teacher:** Hi everybody. Welcome to art. The only class that will teach you how to survive. This is where you can find your soul- *if you dare*. Don’t ask me to show you how to draw a face. Ask me to help you find the wind. [*male student rolls his eyes*] good. Right, that’s good. Can you tell me what you’re feeling? Right now? [*male student 1 seems baffled; teacher gestures for answer*] okay, can anybody tell me what they’re actually feeling right now? Does algebra move you to tears? [*male student 2 raises his hand*] are numbers and words more important than images? [*students stare blankly; teacher picks up a globe*] can anybody tell me what this is?

**Female student:** a globe?

**Mr Freeman:** globe, gah. What are you guys, 13, 14, and you’ve already let them beat the creativity out of you? It’s okay. [...] I mean you could, you could, um paint a wet muzzled dog chewing Alaska, right? Grrr [growls] I mean the possibilities are endless. It’s almost too much, but you all are important enough to give it to. All right so um here you go. In here [*inside the broken globe*] is a piece of paper, great, and on that piece of paper is a word. And you’re going to spend the rest of the year turning that object into art. [...]  

**Mr Freeman:** Oh yeah, well fear is a great place to begin art… [*playfully taps Melinda on the head with globe to get her attention*] bonk… [*Melinda carelessly reaches into globe to pull out a word and tries to put it back*]. Hey, whoa, you just chose your destiny, you can’t change that.

**Melinda:** [*looks at word*] I learned how to draw a tree in like the second grade.

**Mr Freeman:** Oh really? Oh well you gonna show me? [*he hands Melinda a piece of chalk; nods toward chalkboard at front of the room*] It’s okay, I won’t grade you. [*Melinda goes to the board; student oinks*] like a pig when Melinda walks by]

**Mr Freeman:** No commentary please. [*Mr Freeman glares at two male students; Melinda hesitantly draws a lollipop/stick-figure tree*]

**Mr Freeman:** [*sincerely*] That’s a pretty good start; let’s see what it looks like at the end of year, huh?
This delineation of Mr Freeman as a mix of the subject-supposed-to-know as both the respected pedagogue and as the reformer/philanthropist becomes apparent above in his second large paragraph of dialogue where he playfully chided the students for allowing society to ‘beat the creativity out of them’. Not only is he intelligent enough to know that the sphere he is holding is more than a globe conceptually-speaking, he is also attempting to reform or save his students from a societal grinding-away at their ability to think outside the norm, i.e. non-conformist or creatively/artistically.

The representation illustrated above of Mr Freeman garnered the most positive responses from all of the candidates on several levels. First, they saw it as one of the most genuine (not satirical) portrayals of an art teacher of all the DVD clips that were shown. Though they did not outright state why this was so, their responses implied that it was because they had experienced similar moments in their student teaching and/or because the teacher’s actions inspired future teaching techniques that could imagine themselves using in their future classrooms.

When she [Melinda] said ‘I learned how to draw a tree in the second grade’, how many times have like you been told by a student that are like ‘what’s the point, I’ve done this before.’ [O: I’ve done this before.] I don’t need to do this. [O: it was a lollipop tree] He looked at her and he goes ‘oh really?’ like he [M: laughs] and he was like ‘show me, show me’. And then I think when she drew it, it kind of clicked- like you could kind of see it. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 16)

Jean mentioned this representation of an art teacher because it mirrored a situation she had faced in her student teaching placement(s). Marissa agreed with Jean and furthered her thoughts of what she liked about Mr Freeman as being:
just kind of the hope. When he just said ‘the possibilities are endless’. They are; they are endless. So just kind of, you know, just having trust in the students and just being fresh. I really identified with that. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 15)

The statement of Mr Freeman’s that Marissa is referencing is when he said, “I mean the possibilities are endless. It’s almost too much, but you all are important enough to give it to”. This statement renders Mr Freeman as the expert pedagogue that has such a grasp of his arts knowledge that he can see possibilities in his subject matter beyond what may have already been written (in art textbooks) and perhaps attempted before (in other art classes), as well as the ability to judge that this may be an overwhelming amount of information for his students to comprehend. However, due to his capacity as purveyor of arts truth, he will share the knowledge with them in just the right amounts with the appropriate pedagogical techniques. Similarly, Olivia mentioned Mr Freeman’s creativity in teaching (as an expert pedagogue able to take concepts beyond the obvious or literal) stating that

the part where he said ‘you can find your soul, it’s not just drawing; you can find your soul’. That was really cool and just the creativity in teaching, too with the globe and ‘here paint this word; this is going to stick with you for the whole quarter’. That was really cool, I thought- just different ways to think about it [the concept of teaching art for a quarter or school year]. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 15)

4.01.04 Conclusion to Unfolding the Subject-Supposed-to-Know:

The concept of the subject-supposed-to-know, with the teacher as pedagogue and teacher as reformer/philanthropist that are the knowledgeable leaders in the classroom,
was of considerable importance to the student teachers’ investments with the screen instances that were shown. All of the participants acknowledged this set of traits: as being a knowledgeable leader in the classroom; being the expert, the respected purveyor of arts knowledge (history, movements, artists, policies, techniques, etc); and demonstrating skillful/technical abilities in a variety of artistic procedures and classroom management, as what they expect from (themselves as) a ‘good art teacher’. Ironically, during the very process of watching the 23 pre-selected DVD clips, Jean recognized a pattern in the Hollywood representations of arts educators as being portrayed as slightly art-authoritarian with very specific judgments on good and bad, high and low, art.

I noticed that actually was a trend in most of them [the DVD clips viewed], was the teacher kind of telling them what to think you know or even like this teacher even seemed almost well-intentioned but you know she wanted them to dig deep and wanted them to you know explore but in that became too focused on guiding them in her way of exploring or in her own way of defining this creative process. [M: mm hmm; O: yeah]. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 4)

As was noted at the beginning of the subject-supposed-to-know as pedagogical fantasy subsection, even in those movies/TV series where silly or moronic depictions of arts educators occurred, the art teacher still maintained aspects of the subject-supposed-to-know, reinforcing both the prevalence and high esteem this subject position has within US society.
4.02 Unfolding Student Enchantment as Pedagogical Fantasy:

Certainly there are many giving teachers who care for their students. Many of us have heard good people, who happen also to be teachers, speak of their love for their young charges… this notion of giving care is only half of the necessary equation. In order to balance the equation, care must also be reciprocated. (Heid & Kelehear, 2007, p. 413)

“Children want to believe in their teachers” (Wachowiak & Clements, 1997, p. 80). Children desire to have teachers who are sympathetic to their situations and who give them attendant love, acknowledgement, and recognition. Most teachers desire for their students to listen to them and look up to them. Many teachers desire to be treated with loving respect, to make connections with their students, and to develop a sense of community in their classrooms. These desires for reciprocal love, care and concern can be discerned as the fantasy for student enchantment, be it the enchanting of the student by the teacher (through statements and/or actions eliciting love) or the students’ enchantment with the teacher (as the respected purveyor of arts knowledge, or the subject-supposed-to-know). In this sense, “caring is primarily defined as those emotions, actions and reflections that result from a teacher’s desire to motivate, help or inspire their [sic] students” (O’Connor, 2006, p. 117; emphasis in original). All of the movies from which I pulled clips to share with the participants had scenes that were chosen specifically due to instances of the art educators or students employing student enchantment, whether the student toward the teacher as an act of transference (Lacan, 1977), the teacher toward the student in an act of counter-transference (Fink, 1997), or where the classroom, in a Deleuzo-Guattarian sense, “becomes a space in which desire
and knowledge converge, a space in which the teacher and the student ‘seduce’ each other and capture each other’s desire,” (Zembylas, 2007, p. 333). Similar to the pedagogical fantasy category of the subject-supposed-to-know, some of the movies, such as Mona Lisa Smile and Speak, seemingly had more occurrences of this affectionate (seductive) characterization perhaps due to the more serious handling of the their content and dramatic screenwriting, as opposed to the more satirical portrayals in Art School Confidential, Ghost World and Strangers with Candy. However, even in those movies/TV series where those satirical depictions occurred, the art teachers still had seemingly sincere instances of student enchantment, both toward and from the student(s), positioning it as a popular storyline within Hollywood portrayals of teachers and students and their pedagogical relationships.

The consistent theme of teacher-student loving and/or understanding relationships that manifested in the transcripts from the three individual interviews provided the impetus for inclusion of the following popular visual culture scenes, once again being used as catalysts to inspire deeper access to the unconscious. All of the participants had a considerable amount to say about their feelings toward their students and how much they valued the interaction with students, whether they had actually experienced this in their student teaching or whether they fantasized about it and desired it in their future classrooms. For example, much of Jean’s individual interview focused on amiable and empowering teacher-student relationships as well as asserted their overall importance in education- at times implying that those relationships are what education is all about and/or what education should be structured around. Perhaps this is because “teachers are
passionate beings (Hargreaves, 1998, pp. 835-836), and an individual’s professional philosophy is mediated by their personal belief system” (O’Connor, 2006, p. 118).

Why else would teachers exist? [to recognize what students have to offer] I understand that there’s this need to… educate them so they can go to middle school, so they can go to high school, so they can go to college, so they can all get jobs. But if we’re not teaching them to feel at all fulfilled, that’s just all kind of empty and leads to a dull life and that sounds terrible just to be completely void of passion… there’s a lot of hate and I think that that can be redirected… by recognizing their talents. And again helping them find out what they’re passionate about and what they love to do… and where they feel good. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 5)

Jean, while stating that she understands the societal need for children to attend school (to attain jobs), mentioned that education and the teaching-learning process should also be about teaching students to feel fulfilled and to be passionate about their life so they can feel good about themselves. She continued by iterating how much she loved the concept of teaching and the resultant (desired) relationships.

I don’t know what it is that I love about it [teaching], but I know that I love it. Like I know that I love the relationships between… teachers and students and teachers as students, with students you know, I know that I love… having the time with them and getting to know them and working with them and exploring and experimenting and discovering things. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 12)

Jean also stated that she thought the connections between teachers and students were “the most pure love that exists”. As Jean explained, her students sometimes acted disrespectfully toward her and idiomatically ‘drive her up the wall,’ yet she still loves
them, even if there is not an apparent reason (she just does) for her to do so. Even with Jean’s intense dream of love, she mentions the likelihood that she feels more love toward her students than they feel toward her.

I think that it’s just the most pure love that exists [the relationship between teachers and students]. Um, and even when kids drive me up the wall or even when I’m like, ‘oh for crying out loud’, like, stop hitting each other or stop disrupting class or stop sharpening your pencil while I’m talking. I hate that… even in those situations I think that it’s just um… I just love them and for absolutely you know… and there’s no reason and there’s no reason not to, um, I just do. And… and you know granted most of them don’t love me. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 14)

Because of Jean’s responses (and similar responses from Olivia and Marissa) with regard to the desire and necessity of herself as an art teacher to have aspects of the loving, devoted educator in order to be a good teacher or to make her students’ lives more fulfilling, I chose several clips that contained scenarios where the teacher and/or students expressed notions of student enchantment (transference and counter-transference) that mirrored or cinematically illustrated her thoughts and sentiments. Realistic or fantastic, the following clips helped unfold how the student teachers and their care and concern for students affects how they imagine teaching art.

4.02.01 Mona Lisa Smile’s Katherine and Student Enchantment:

This first scene from Mona Lisa Smile (2003, Columbia Pictures), that I showed as an example of student enchantment, occurred near the end of the movie when Katherine walked into her office on campus where she noticed more than 20 hand-
painted van Gogh *Sunflowers* paint-by-number canvases that were done by the students in her class. The paintings were positioned all over her office, on the desk, on filing cabinets, on her bookshelves, etc. Each one was done a little differently (different colors, slight variation in painting styles) but all were distinguishable as the paint-by-number replicas of *Sunflowers* that were shown in a previous scene of the movie. The following two lines of text is selected dialogue from the 1:45 minute scene.

**Connie:** [noticing Katherine’s emotional response] it was Joan’s idea.  
**Joan:** How else will you remember us?  

*Students gather around Katherine in the office as she smiles and holds back tears. She touches them on the shoulders as she quickly exits the room, very obviously emotionally touched.*

This scene’s happenings (and the students’ actions) are a result of a clip that was shown during the group interview session, illustrating the *subject-supposed-to-know*, where Katherine was showing the students how van Gogh’s artwork was now a part of their popular culture, such as the paint-by-number box sets in which “everyone can be van Gogh”. This unexpected tribute to Katherine came as they found out that she was leaving Wellesley and would not be teaching them after this school year. This screen instance in which “students demonstrate explicit love for their cherished teacher” (Robertson, 1997, p. 77), was specifically mentioned by Olivia.

The teacher in *Mona Lisa Smile* was just wonderful at the end of the movie when they were giving her those paintings and she was just like, ‘thank you, thank you’ and touching them all on the shoulder and just kind of like appreciating what they did for her and realizing that they caught on to you know what she was saying. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 1)
4.02.02 Speak’s Mr Freeman and Student Enchantment:

In this scene from *Speak* (2004, Showtime Independent Films), which is situated near the end of the movie, Melinda had found out about Mr Freeman’s decision to resign from his job due to administrative restrictions put on his favored teaching style (swearing, playing music, not giving grades, etc). As Melinda walked in, other students finished their conversation with Mr Freeman and he beckoned to Melinda to come in, having told her he was glad she was there. Acknowledging his decision to resign, Melinda was hesitant and awkward in her actions, but seemed as if she wanted to say more to Mr Freeman. Sensing her hesitancy, Mr Freeman affectionately reassured Melinda that he would be there for her even if he wasn’t *there* in the same school.

Recognizing his integrity, Melinda asked if she could show him something. He obliged and she led him to her secret space in the back of the custodial closet where she spent a lot of her time during the school day, hiding out and skipping class. Mr Freeman, who was overcome with intense emotion when he realized that Melinda had continually been working on her chosen theme ‘trees’ throughout the year, and without his knowledge, looked around the space, deeply affected. Overtaken by the realization that his project, which was assigned over eight months ago, had inspired Melinda so greatly, he began to cry. Barely audible, he whispered through tears that she had done a great job. Pleased and obviously looking to him for approval, Melinda smiled brightly—unlike she had done all school year. The following text is selected dialogue from the 2:22 minute scene.

**Melinda:** You’re leaving?

**Mr. Freeman:** um… *[shrugs]* I like to— I like to swear, play music. I hate giving grades.
Melinda: [awkwardly] So… have a nice life.
Mr. Freeman: I’m here if you wanna talk… Even if I’m not… here.
Melinda: [hesitates] can I show you something? [they walk to the custodial closet where she has been hiding out during the school year; it is decorated with many renderings of trees in various media; Mr Freeman walks in and his mouth drops in disbelief. She looks to him for approval]
Mr. Freeman: [tearing and barely audible] it’s really good. [they continue to look at the artifacts, both smile]

This particular screen instance from *Speak* really evoked intense feelings in all three of the participants as evidenced by their collective recollection of the scene through various parts of the group interview (they mentioned it as an answer to more than one of the ten questions). Of all of the 23 clips that were shown during our time together as a group, this one, depicting Melinda showing Mr Freeman her secret hiding place in the custodial closet, was the one that garnered the most emotive responses. Both Jean and Olivia fondly referred to Mr Freeman’s seeming integrity and affective investment in the wellbeing of his students, as well as ‘his ability to nurture and to be there for her [Melinda]’.

I really appreciated the art teacher in ‘Speak’. I don’t know what it was about him; he just seemed to be genuinely invested in the wellbeing of his students. Like the part where she took him into the custodial closet and showed him everything she’d been doing and he was like crying. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 1)

Jean and Olivia both mentioned Mr Freeman’s reaction of crying when he saw all of Melinda’s artwork depicting trees, and both confided that they attempted to hold back their real tears so that they didn’t ‘feel silly for crying’ in front of me and the other interview participants.
When he was crying in the closet, I literally had to fight back the tears ‘cause [J: me, too] I didn’t want to feel silly for crying. [all laugh; J: I know I was too, I was like-] yeah, so when he was crying ‘cause that was really a touching moment I think from watching his ability to nurture and to be there for her and you know to get out things in her that she hadn’t really felt or knew was there and for him to just be open- or for her to open up to him and just show him all of these things in just like one full swoop, just opened up and let him see like into this little room, but it was almost like into her [J: world] yeah into her world, into her personality. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 4)

Olivia further explained that Melinda had shown Mr Freeman this little room but ‘it was almost like into her world, into her personality’. Olivia went on to add that his intense emotional reaction was not so much about the paintings, as much as it was about her gift of trust.

It was just like opening the door to like trust and all this other stuff too. It wasn’t just like ‘oh these are really cool paintings’ it was like [M: mm hmm] here I am entrusting you with all this. So it was pretty cool to look at that… [LH: yeah; M: mm hmm]. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 5)

What is brought to mind instantly with Olivia’s reaction to this scene is her recollection about why she became an art teacher in the first place (mentioned in Chapter 3-methodology), which was “working with the kids and working with the students and just being able to get involved with their personal lives… hearing about their family or issues that they’re facing.”
4.02.03 Conclusion to Unfolding of Student Enchantment:

The concept of student enchantment, the spell-like, magical quality of the relationship(s) that can exist between teachers and students and which often elicits feelings of love, attraction, captivation, and fascination, was of considerable importance to the student teachers’ investments with the screen instances that were shown. The importance they imparted to this particular concept was evidenced not only by the frequency and physical number of times the topic was discussed, but also by the emotive and passionate qualities of the student teachers’ thoughts and vocal inflections when discussing teacher-student relationships. All of the student teachers, especially Jean, had much to say about the concepts surrounding student enchantment in both their individual interviews before watching the DVD clips and later as a result of watching the screen instances. The following excerpt from Jean’s individual interview succinctly illustrates the tug-of-war that can occur between students and teacher(s) enchantment in the classroom.

I think that it’s mutual. I think that I want it to be mutual. I don’t know that it necessarily is. Like I don’t know that kids put as much thought into it as I do. You know I don’t think they come in and they think ‘wow, this is such a peaceful, loving, kind classroom like I would feel at peace with my soul here.’ But I think that it is mutual in the sense that I look for it. And they don’t have to say thank you and they don’t have to give hugs and they don’t have to do those things in order for me to feel that it’s mutual, but I do feel that it’s mutual. I think that it’s more like a… a connection between people you know as humans where I feel like… I just feel connected to them, in that I feel that those relationships have developed into caring, loving, genuine relationships, again I don’t think that they think of us being connected souls or anything like that but… and
that’s fine but I have a lot of peace in… in the relationships, I guess. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 20)

It is with considerations, such as these mentioned by Jean about desire, connections, and reciprocity in teaching, that I will further explore in the following chapter (interpretations of the data). The concept of student enchantment as a pedagogical fantasy shares close affinities with ego-identification as a pedagogical fantasy and this notion is explored in more detail in the following subsection.

4.03 Unfolding Ego-Identification as Pedagogical Fantasy:

When student teachers step into the teacher’s role they are confronted not only with the traditions associated with those of past teachers and those of past and present classroom lives, but with the personal desire to carve out one’s own territory, develop one’s own style, and make a difference in the education of students. (Britzman, 2003, p. 41)

“Some teachers impress us deeply” (Danielewicz, 2001, p. 1), so deeply in fact that we spend our entire teaching lives trying to become just like them, gathering images of good teachers here and good teachers there—good teachers everywhere—in an effort to construct our ideal-ego, our perfect likeable image of ourselves. Those teachers, that we held and still hold in high esteem, look back at us in our minds from the point of perfection, from the position of the ego-ideal, “from where we look at ourselves so that we appear to ourselves likeable, worthy of love” (Žižek, 1989, p. 105). We are forever searching for our perfect selves, our perfect teaching selves; we are constantly maneuvering through the dynamism of change in our chaotic movement of becoming-
The student teachers who participated in this study are no different than the teachers I just described; they too are gathering images of teachers in order to compose the ideal teaching self they would like to become. They hold up certain teachers as a mirror of themselves (in actions, beliefs, and/or behaviors) and they deny and disinvest in images of teachers that cause them to (re)negotiate who they are at any given time.

As I briefly alluded to in the methodology chapter, the concepts of the subject-supposed-to-know and student enchantment share close affinities with ego-identification. For example, the term subject-supposed-to-know is a signifier used in the symbolic register that dominates and determines the image, the imaginary form, in which the student teachers appear to themselves likeable (or knowledgeable) in the imaginary register. The subject-supposed-to-know is symbolic identification from the point of view of the perfect Others (teachers, administrators, field of art education) who the student teachers believe are observing them or from the point of view of that perfect representation they hold of themselves as all-knowing pedagogues. Similarly, the concept of student enchantment rests on the actions, appearances, and behaviors of being or seeming to be a caring, concerned, and loving teacher that is presented to/for the students. These three categories, when considered individually and in combination, assist the exploration of the personal and professional identity (re)formation of art student teachers as they are becoming-teacher. All of the movies from which I pulled clips to share with the participants had scenes that were chosen due to screen instances of the two previous pedagogical fantasy categories, the subject-supposed-to-know and student enchantment. Through the enactment of those two characterizations of art teachers, I envisioned that the student teachers would have strong identifications or dis-identifications with the
teacher representations that were shown and which would open up conversations about what they imagine it to be *art teacher*.

**4.03.01 *Strangers with Candy*’s Mr Jellineck and Ego-Identifcation:**

The first scene from *Strangers with Candy* (2000, Comedy Central) depicts Mr Jellineck wrapping up the end of one of his art classes by collecting the clay sculptures that students created during studio time that day. The following text is dialogue from the very short 17 second scene.

*Jellineck- art teacher:* [As students are walking out the classroom door] Okay, make sure you drop off your projects. I’m going to fire them this afternoon! [laughs] Good work everyone. [Opens top of kiln, begins taking students’ clay pieces off the tray in his hand, one by one, and placing them in the kiln. He speaks facetiously as he checks out each one] Great, ashtray… [throws in kiln] Oh look, an ashtray… [throws in kiln] got an ashtray here… [throws in kiln]

Though this scene was very short and inconsequential to the overall plot of the episode, both Olivia and Marissa had identifications with Jellineck’s action of naming all the projects as ‘ashtrays’ and haphazardly throwing them in the kiln. Olivia, an accomplished ceramicist that student taught in a specialized high school ceramics program, said she could “definitely understand what he’s going through at that point because I’ve been there too” (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 2), when he was disappointed with the final project results. Marissa reacted to this scene in a different way than Olivia, thinking about the dilemma of what to do with students’ artwork that is left in the art room and never claimed (a concern she also talked about during my supervisory observations at her middle school
placement). Marissa said she could not bear the thought of throwing artwork away, but admitted she doesn’t quite know what to do with it all either.

I really thought about that because when you become an art teacher you have all this [student] work- and if kids don’t pick it up or if they leave the school, or there’s so much to do with it that you’re throwing away work and so it almost was like it just had become routine to him like it was just another this, another that. I still am at that point where I’m just like I can’t throw this away, what do I do with it? …So it’s like internal conflict; I don’t know what to do with this artwork because you don’t want to throw something like that away. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 3)

As she continued speaking, Marissa also correlated the action of throwing clay projects away as worthless ashtrays (that all looked the same) with Strangers with Candy’s Principal Blackman and his action of throwing away Jellineck as the worthless art teacher (delineated in a screen instance directly following this scene).

And it was also kind of funny how Olivia was talking about the principal and how he just seemed like the art teacher was an unwanted person in the building so the art teachers can also be thrown away as well. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 3)

This comment by Marissa, about overlaying the action of throwing away student artwork with throwing away an art teacher as an unwanted person in a school building, provides an appropriate segue into the next scene from Strangers with Candy that she is actually referencing above.

The second scene from Strangers with Candy depicts Mr Jellineck going to see the principal, Mr Blackman, in his office, to resign from his teaching position in order to
follow his dreams of being a full-time artist. Walking in, he noticed that Dr Rachel
Williams, the supermodel guest speaker from the career assembly earlier that morning in
this episode, was giving Mr Blackman, the principal, a facial. The following text is
selected dialogue from the 1:02 minute scene.

_Jellineck:_ I know it’s usually customary to give a two weeks notice, but I-
_Principal Blackman:_ [interrupts] No need to worry ‘bout that.
_Jellineck:_ Oh. [sullenly starts to walk away, turns back] I did pay for the
kiln with my own money and I assume that the school would like to
reimburse me
_Principal Blackman:_ Take it with, okay?
_Jellineck:_ Maybe I should stay around until you hire a new art teacher?
_Principal Blackman:_ Nonsense, I’ll have the driver’s ed instructor teach
your class. How hard could it be? Even monkeys can fingerpaint. [*laughs*]

In this scene, which generated a lot of discussion from all three of the student teachers,
Jellineck was determined to quit his job in order to fulfill his dream of being a
professional artist. Once he tendered his resignation, he was quite dismayed by the lack
of care or support from Principal Blackman in regard to him having given notice.
Recognizing the principal’s apathy toward him, Jellineck offered to stay on until another
qualified art teacher could be hired to take his place. The principal, not considering
Jellineck as a viable part of the staff, told him that anyone could do his job, noting that
even ‘monkeys can fingerpaint.’ Similar to Jellineck, the student teachers mentioned that
they were very upset (and admittedly angry) about the principal not valuing art teachers
by saying that the driver’s ed instructor could do it, or even an animal could fingerpaint.

yeah, and it made me really mad, too, when the- was it the principal or the
superintendent or whoever it was- [LH: it was the principal] okay, was
like we’ll just get the driver’s ed instructor [J: {at same time} driver’s ed
teacher] ‘cause even monkeys can finger paint and I was like ‘ooh buddy, you have no idea’ [all laugh]. (Olivia, 7-13-09, pp. 2-3)

Similarly, Jean said she was upset that Jellineck had to pay for the kiln with his own money, identifying with him because of a comparable situation where she spent her own money on supplies during student teaching.

Or like when he paid for the kiln with his own money and said [M: yes, yes] I think the school may want to reimburse me. They don’t give a shit, you know! [all laugh] No one cares! And I mean even in student teaching I paid for copies [M: oh, yes!] with my own money and all kinds of things and you know I’m happy to do it, but nobody sees that, nobody gives a shit you know. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 8)

Adding to the conversation about what upset the participants so much about this scene, Marissa noted that fellow staff members at the school didn’t understand the subject being taught—art.

The staff is kinda like unknowledgeable about art- ‘we can just get a driver’s ed teacher to do it.’ Like they don’t get it you know, so it’s just how do you work in a space where people don’t really understand- [O: un uh] your subject? (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 8)

Once Marissa shared her thoughts, Jean continued to talk about Jellineck being underappreciated in the school and the community.

Well again, like I said with the- those that can’t do- teach thing, yeah. But I mean that was- and again I could identify with paying for things with your own money and feeling underappreciated and feeling like you know you’re the relief or you’re disposable. [M: yeah] -nobody cares. Nobody cares. [M: or that you have to grovel to get your job back, you know
because you’re starving [M: yeah] and because there’s nothing else that you can do. There’s nothing else that you can do in this world to [M: yeah] satisfy those you know the needs that you have like to pay your bills and things like that. You’re not a valued individual… in the school community or the greater community. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 9)

Olivia admitted that she both identified with Jellineck and dis-identified with him in this scene. She identified with him not being appreciated for being an art teacher, but she did not identify with him being happy all the time and being too positive when referring to student work.

I can kinda understand the frustration with that [‘giving up on teaching because nobody cares’] but I don’t really identify with the whole ‘happy-go-lucky’ thing, everything’s great, you know, positive good guy kind of thing [all laugh] like I really don’t… Sometimes… teachers are too ‘oh this is so wonderful, this is beautiful’ all that, it doesn’t get anywhere but if you can actually tell a student ‘yeah, this is not your best work, I’ve seen better you know’ [J: yeah] ‘you can really push yourself.’ I didn’t really identify with that like I’m not that kind of person that’s just like ‘great job guys!’ [all laugh] ‘cause all of those were not you know- they could have totally pushed themselves farther. So I identified with him in the fact that art teachers are often underappreciated and I didn’t really identify with the ‘great job, this is awesome, everything’s perfect.’ (Olivia, 7-13-09, pp. 9-10)

The third scene from Strangers with Candy depicts Jellineck at home in his apartment, after he had talked to Principal Blackman, and quit his teaching job at school because he had decided to follow his dreams and be an artist full time. In his apartment, the scene is set in his art studio, as evidenced by the paintings and canvases strewn about
the room, leaning against the walls, and sitting on his easel. Dressed in a button-down smock and wearing a beret, Jellineck held a paint-laden paintbrush near to the canvas on the easel, but hesitated to make a mark. Thinking it would inspire him, he readjusted the still-life fruit in the bowl next to him and tried to paint once again. Still hesitating, he carelessly tapped his paintbrush back and forth by his shoulder and accidentally got red paint on his clean smock, clearly upsetting him. I have not included any of the dialogue from the scene, as the points are made visually and the accompanying text does not add to the understanding of the screen instance. Though this is a very short scene within the movie, all of the participants admitted a strong reaction to this screen instance, particularly Jean and Marissa. One sentiment that was expressed by the two student teachers was ‘those who can’t do, teach’, a scathing adage that seems to have no identifiable source, but one that all three of the participants referenced at some point during the interview. Jean began by talking about how she personally identified with being unable to create art at times.

Like I’ve had that, you know where you’re so focused on learning how to teach, that like I have a hard time making art sometimes. [O & M: mm hmm] I have a hard time you know finding inspiration and being self-motivated in my own art making. So I think that that was something that I could really relate to, too. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 2)

Continuing on later in the interview, Jean once again referred back to this clip and iterates the difficulty Jellineck had with painting on the canvas.

Going back to his difficulty with actually making a mark on the canvas; it kind of spoke to the idea of ‘those who can’t do, teach’ [M: mm hmm] especially I think it’s really prevalent in- or that mentality is prevalent
in… performing or visual arts disciplines in school. It’s like I didn’t cut it as a real artist so you got to teach art. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 3)

Marissa, agreeing with Jean about the disparaging expression (those who can’t do, teach) being befitting of Jellineck, said that she didn’t really personally identify with the statement because she was able to accomplish creating art in the context of teaching art.

It just seemed like there was a lot of desperation [in Jellineck’s character and portrayal as an art teacher]. I don’t know maybe I’m just waiting for that. I don’t know I guess that ‘those who can’t do- teach’. I think I can make art and I do, so that was something that I didn’t really relate to. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 8)

Jean, returning to the adage, ‘those who can’t do, teach,’ took her personal identification with the statement beyond her inability to create art while she’s teaching and considered it in relation to her career choice of being a visual arts teacher.

I would agree with that to the ‘those who can’t do- teach’ mentality you know, I didn’t go into teaching art because I wanted to be a visual artist. [M: mm hmm] I went into teaching art because I wanted to be a teacher… you know. It’s not because I’m like biding my time until I can get my work in a gallery somewhere. And… the part at the beginning where he was going through and as the kids were leaving and putting their stuff on the tray, he was like ‘great work, great work, [all laugh] I’m going to fire these this afternoon… I mean how many times has that happened where you’re just trying so hard to keep them motivated [M: yes] and trying so hard to really validate and value the work that is being created and it doesn’t turn out to be quite what- and maybe it’s wrong for us to hope for it to be something- but when you put on this happy face and you try to encourage students and somehow, someway, there is someone who
doesn’t take it seriously or whatever and you end up getting 12 million of the same thing [M: mm hmm]. (Jean, 7-13-09, pp. 8-9)

Beginning with her conversation about Jellineck and his inability to create artwork dictating his choice to be an art teacher, Jean switched to talking about his trying ‘hard to really validate and value the work that is being created’ even though it may not look like what he anticipated. She considered this in the context of art teacher culture and how it may be wrong for art teachers to ‘hope for it to be something’.

4.03.02 Ghost World’s Roberta and Ego-Identification:

In this scene from Ghost World (2001, United Artists), the very first summer school class that Enid must attend is shown which began with Roberta showing a black and white film that she herself had created. The following text is selected dialogue from the 1:54 minute scene.

**Roberta-art teacher:** That piece is entitled “Mirror, Father, Mirror”. I like to show it to people that I’m meeting for the first time because I think it says so much about who I am and what it feels like to inhabit my specific skin [laughs]. And this is exactly what I’m hoping to get from each of you over the course of this summer- a picture of your own self-exploration. Now my own background is in video and performance art but I’m hoping that doesn’t influence you too much [touches boy on shoulder as talking] and you’ll find your own ways of externalizing the internal.

This scene, which is not overly important to the development of the film, or to the several clips that feature the art teacher Roberta, was mentioned specifically by Marissa.

I related with her when she just kind of wants the students to think deeper. She kind of wants them to explore themselves, kind of explore you know feelings or you know emotions that they have. Then it just seems like she
kept trying to pull [in] serious family issues… sometimes I do find myself you know looking at their artwork and going like ‘who’s this?’ ‘what are they doing?’ [all laugh] I want to know what it is, so I guess kind of getting to know your students better, you kind of want them to explore themselves. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 11)

Marissa admitted that she identified with Roberta’s instructions, as the subject-supposed-to-know, that she directed toward the students to ‘explore themselves and to think deeper.’ Folding in references to other clips featuring Roberta in Ghost World, Marissa added that she identified with Roberta’s tendency to guess who did what artwork (simply by looking at it), while she did not identify with how Roberta tried to interpret all of the students’ art as being about serious family issues.

4.03.03 Mona Lisa Smile’s Katherine and Ego-Identification:

In this first scene from Mona Lisa Smile (2003, Columbia Pictures), Joan, a student in the History of Art 100 class, walks into Katherine’s on-campus office to respectfully, but firmly protest a recent grade that she thought was too low on a term paper that she had written. Having seen her academic file sitting on Katherine’s desk, Joan asked what it said. Katherine picked up the file and read the long list of accomplishments, also noticing that Joan was a pre-law student. She pressed Joan about where she would like to go to law school and Joan replied that she hadn’t thought about it because she had planned to get married and forego law school. Katherine seemed rather dismayed by that thought. The following text is selected dialogue from the 2:17 minute scene.
Joan: You gave me a C.
Katherine: I was kind.
Joan: The assignment was to write about Bruegel. That’s what I did.
Katherine: No, what you did was copy Strauss.
Joan: I was referencing an expert.
Katherine: If I wanted to know what he thought, I’d buy his book
Joan: Miss Watson, with all due respect…
Katherine: [handing her a book] Bruegel was a storyteller. Find the stories; break them down into smaller pieces. You might actually enjoy it.
Joan: You’re giving me another chance?
Katherine: So it seems. […]
Katherine: And it says here that you’re pre-law. What law school are you gonna go to?
Joan: I hadn’t really thought about that. I mean, after I graduate, I plan on getting married.
Katherine: and then?
Joan: and then I’ll be married.
Katherine: You could do both…

In this scene, Katherine began as the subject-supposed-to-know as pedagogue and continued to maintain that subject position throughout the duration of her meeting with Joan. When Joan began by protesting her grade, which she deemed unfair (too low), Katherine stood firm that it was the grade that Joan deserved and that she had been kind in giving it to her. Continuing through their exchange of words, Katherine remained the one in charge, as the expert on art and Bruegel and Strauss, and she did not acquiesce from Joan’s encroachment. Jean mentioned the representation of Katherine and had a strong identification with her position as expert in the classroom who was well-read enough to know that Joan had copied the work of an expert and not written the paper of her own accord.

I also really appreciated… when Julia Stiles’ character [Joan] came in and had turned in a paper and was upset about getting a C, and she said ‘well I
was referencing an expert’ and she said um- and the response by Julia Roberts’ character was ‘if I wanted to know what he thought, I’d buy his book’. (Jean, 7-13-09, pp. 1-2)

Congruent, to Jean, Marissa also mentioned this particular scene, with Katherine giving Joan another chance to rewrite her paper, because she had done similar things in her classroom.

When she gave Julia Stiles [Joan] the chance; I think tend to give chances [laughs] give out chances for students, especially when it’s one on one, when you have the chance to talk with them and kinda figure out like where you know they’re going or where you want them to go or where they need to go, so I definitely identified with that. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 16)

In this second scene from Mona Lisa Smile, Katherine had scheduled for the students to meet at a large, multiple-storied warehouse off campus. As Katherine walked in, workers carried a large, thin, rectangle crate and maneuvered the box into the middle of the warehouse floor and using crowbars, pried off the front of the crate. When the front fell, it revealed a very large (at least a size of 6’ by 8’) painting by then-contemporary artist Jackson Pollock. Katherine was immediately enraptured and walked up to it, looking intently. The students stood back at first, whispering amongst themselves. They came over to the painting, and stood in front of it, being implored to do so by a firmly-speaking Katherine. The following text is dialogue from the 2:15 minute scene.

Female student 1: That’s Jackson Pollock. […]
Female student 2: Please don’t tell me we have to write a paper about it.
Katherine: [slightly irritated at first] Do me a favor. Do yourselves a favor. Stop talking and look… you’re not required to write a paper. You’re
not even required to like it. You are required to consider it… that’s your only assignment today. When you’re done, you may leave.

**Connie:** [whispering to Katherine] Thank God Betty isn’t here. [Katherine lightly touches Connie’s face, smiles. Students get really close to large Pollock painting and look intently].

This screen instance was directly referenced by one participant, Olivia, as one that had personally resonated with her and in which she directly identified with the arts educator that was presented. She talked at length about why she found this particular scene so powerful.

I really liked when they were standing in front of the Jackson Pollock painting [M: mm hmm] and they were saying ‘oh man I hope we don’t have to write a paper on this.’ [J: ohhh; laughs] You know what is going to [happen] and she’s like ‘no, you don’t have to write a paper, you don’t have to do anything, I just ask that you consider it and then you can leave.’ Which I thought was a really cool concept to just put all those girls that were so built into this box, put them in front of a painting and say ‘I’m just asking you to merely consider this’ nothing else but consider it. [J: yeah]

That was a really powerful moment for me ‘cause I think as I become an art teacher I feel like I want to do the same type of things- [M: yeah] to just lay something out in front of somebody and not try to box them in or not try to shock them with anything or not try to- overdo it, but just say ‘hey, this is what it is, you can choose to consider it, you can choose not to.’ [M: mm hmm] So I thought that was a really cool moment. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 5)

Olivia’s identification with this scene, or desire to identify with this screen representation of Katherine, conceptually harkened back to a comment she made in her individual interview about planning to move out of state after she received her teaching license.
going far away… yeah and I don’t- I just- ‘cause I want to start my own life without all those preconceptions of what I’m supposed to be and maybe I’ll end up back here and do exactly that, but I want to have the opportunity to see what else is out there before I choose. That’s really the best thing, instead of deciding that that’s the best thing based on people’s opinions. That’s the best thing; I want to find out for myself. (Olivia, 7-2-09, pp. 20-21)

4.03.04 Speak’s Mr Freeman and Ego-Identification:

In this scene from *Speak* (2004, Showtime Independent Films), Melinda had had a bad experience in the lunchroom and became progressively agitated until she finally grabbed her lunch bag and ran out of the cafeteria. The next screen shot showed her walk to the art room doorway and stop. Mr Freeman was inside the art room, listening to music and painting on a large canvas. He turned around and noticed her by the door, pointed at her, and acknowledged her as the term she chose out of the globe (tree). She walked in and sat down at the end of one of the art tables. The following text is selected dialogue from the 3:30 minute scene.

**Mr. Freeman:** Hey, you’re the tree. You can eat lunch in here if you want. It’s against school rules but I’m kind of a rebel, so- [Melinda walks in and sits down] Here you go [he puts a piece of brown butcher paper on the table; she plunks her lunch bag down on top of it] Uh, oh, da- that’s not a placemat. The rule is if you’re going to be in here you gotta be working so [he puts a box of charcoals in front of her] choose your weapon, do something. Anything. Hey does this inspire you? [referring to the music playing softly in background] […]

**Mr. Freeman:** [crumples up drawing she was working on] What are you doing? No, no. You gotta- you gotta give things a chance. [he uncrumpled paper, looks at it, gives her a new piece, and kneels down at the table by her] okay, close your eyes. [she looks at him quizzingly] just do it, I’m the teacher. [Melinda closes her eyes] can you picture a tree, any tree? [she
contorts her face] there it is; it’s burned in your retina. [she opens her eyes; he gives her a charcoal stick] you got it, do it.

In the excerpt below, Marissa began by explaining that she did not identify with Mr Freeman, when he was working on his own artwork during the school day while at work. Then she finished her statement with what characteristics she did identify with in him, specifically his hopefulness and inspirational nature toward students.

When he’s doing his own work like during lunchtime, I would have never done that. [O: with the lights off; LH: and the music on] yeah, I think I would have to be somewhere else for my own artwork so that I definitely didn’t identify with… yeah I’d be doing something completely different. I just identified with his hope, and him being very inspiring, but still trying to you know be a rebel, trying to be bad, but he’s not really. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 15)

As evidenced by Marissa’s statements, as well as the other two participants’ declarations, it was possible for the student teachers to both identify and dis-identify with the same art educator in a single scene.

4.03.05 Conclusion to Unfolding of Ego-Identification:

The concept of ego-identification including the characteristics of: physically adopting certain attire and/or teacherly stances in and out of the classroom; displaying/performing certain behaviors that embody desirable signifiers; aspiration to be like or similar to someone else perceived as good; disinclination to be like someone else perceived as bad; and/or seeing themselves (actions, beliefs, behaviors) reflected in someone else, were discussed by the participants in the small group interview session as a result of viewing the DVD clips. The concepts of the subject-supposed-to-know and...
student enchantment share close affinities with ego-identification, and these three categories, when considered individually and in combination, assist the exploration of the personal and professional identity (re)formation of art student teachers as they are becoming-teacher.

4.04 Conclusion:

This chapter was an unfolding of the data collected through the individual interviews and one small group interview with the three student teacher participants. I attempted to provide a textured narrative of the participants’ feelings and ideas about what they imagine it is to teach art, including their personal understandings of their emergent teaching identities and individual roles situated within art education to provide a flavor of what transpired during the interviews. It was through the viewing of 23 popular visual culture DVD clips of arts educators that each student teacher engaged in a meaningful shared experience with two fellow classmates. Their group participation potentially assisted each other in their individual processes of (re)constructing and (re)negotiating their own teaching identities and psychic conceptualizations of art teacher culture. In the following chapter, Chapter 5- Interpretations of the Data, interpretations of the desires supported by the student teachers’ possible pedagogical fantasies (subject-supposed-to-know, student enchantment, and ego-identification), which may be employed by the student teachers to help manage/veil the chaos that often occurs in the continual process of becoming-teacher, are more fully explored using the various Lacanian and Deleuzo-Guattarian concepts of desire and identity that were outlined in Chapter 2.
CHAPTER 5- INTERPRETATIONS OF THE DATA

Re-presenting the voices of others means more than recording their words. An interpretive effort is necessary because words always express relationships, span contexts larger than the immediate situation from which they arise, and hold tensions between what is intended and what is signified. (Britzman, 2003, p. 35)

While Chapter 4 presented an unfolding of the data collected, Chapter 5 offers interpretations of that data in an attempt to explore the tensions between what was intended and what was signified in the utterances of the participants, and between what was fantasized and what was desired in a pedagogical context. The interpretations are supported by literature from psychoanalytic theory (Fink, 1995, 1997; Nobus, 1998; Žižek, 1999; jagodzinski, 2002; Britzman, 2003) and Deleuzo-Guattarian philosophy (Deleuze & Guattari, 1984, 1987; May, 2003, etc) as outlined in Chapter 2. The interpretative statements presented are not meant to reflect an individual student teacher nor diagnose her with any psychoanalytic symptoms; rather, it is my intention to focus on the structure(s) these student teachers are embedded in, specifically the field of art education as Other, and not on the teachers themselves. This chapter is arranged around three main desires—power/recognition, love/connections, and salvation/social justice—that the student teachers employ in their pedagogical encounters. Though there may be many more (un)conscious desires motivating particular actions within the classroom (and
beyond), through analyzing and re-analyzing the data, I have determined that the majority of the student teachers’ pedagogical fantasies supported three main desires which are initially explored in a broad sense and then in relation to each of the pedagogical fantasies delineated in Chapters 3 and 4, subject-supposed-to-know, student enchantment, and ego-identification.

First, because it is the main impetus for this study, I begin by answering part of my primary research question with a short discussion about how visual culture representations can be used as a catalyst to unfold student teachers’ unconscious pedagogical desires and fantasies about teaching art. The remaining parts of the primary research question are answered through exploring the three subquestions which are situated at the end of this chapter. Second, I recapitulate the concept of Lacanian desire and Deleuzo-Guattarian desire before briefly outlining the three main pedagogical desires that may be possessed by the student teachers on their individual classroom planes of immanence. Next, I consider each of the desires through the pedagogical fantasy structures that support them; for example, the desire for power/recognition will be theorized about using interview excerpts and visual cultural examples from Chapter 4-Unfolding of Data, all within the context of art education. Last, I answer the three remaining supporting research questions outlined in Chapter 1-Introduction which will provide further delineation of my primary research question.

5.01 Addressing Main Research Question: Visual Culture as Catalyst

The main research question that I am attempting to answer in this study is: How can popular visual culture representations of arts educators be used as a catalyst to
unfold student teachers’ unconscious pedagogical desires and fantasies about teaching art? The 23 popular visual culture representations of arts educators that I shared with the participants during our group interview session were chosen based on conceptual affinities with what the student teachers stated during their individual interviews. In other words, I consciously chose specific clips because the screen characters’ actions and/or scripted utterances closely resembled or mirrored thoughts spoken by Olivia, Jean, and Marissa when we individually met and talked about their reasons for becoming art teachers, what constitutes art teacher culture, and who/what had influenced those choices. I did this with the intention of having the screen instances purposefully resonate (as much as possible) with the participants, supporting my ideation that they would feel more compelled to expand and expound on their initial interview responses to my questions through a visual (re)presentation of their musings. This is because I recognized through my own (pre)viewing of the popular visual culture scenarios that “even the choice of media could set its own agenda into the types of affective response and dialogue that could occur” (Daspit & Weaver, 1999, p. 41) within our group endeavor.

Though a couple of the DVD clips were chosen because of situations I considered stereotypical or highly exaggerated (both positively and negatively) with regard to art teachers and/or the teaching experience, I included these scenes as impetus to further inspire affectively-rich conversation amongst the four of us involved in the viewing. Besides being impelled to identify with particular screen arts educators, I wanted to set up visual encounters that I believed would also cause a dis-identification with the portrayed teacher(s). I did this to instigate more divulgement into the potentially unconscious pedagogical fantasies and desires that the student teachers may be both
secretly entertaining and/or psychically suppressing or guarding. By verbally talking through their disengagements, they were also revealing their actual affective investments in what it is to be an art teacher. Put another way, through disclosing what they did not identify with or particularly like about a movie clip informed and reinforced what they actually conceptualized as both a proper molar and molecular art-teacherness.

As an example, I reference a clip of *Ghost World*’s Roberta exemplifying a *subject-supposed-to-know* who in this scenario delineated in Chapter 4, judges high versus low art, and hence good versus bad art (in her opinion). This is denoted by Roberta’s concluding statement that Margaret’s abstract, issue-based wire sculpture ‘falls into that *higher* category of art’ that she was talking about. Roberta puts this in contrast to Phillip and Enid’s ‘cartoons that are amusing as a sort of a light entertainment’, thereby assuming her position as the respected purveyor of arts judgments. When responding to this clip, Olivia commented on Roberta, personally identifying with several of her attributes as a teacher, including her energy, excitement, and efforts, but reacted rather harshly to Roberta’s portrayal of an overly disciplinary *subject-supposed-to-know* who seemed disconnected from her students’ needs.

I was very disgusted with how pushy and [M: mm hmm] how completely un-student-based…. She didn’t read her students and change as they kind of changed or she didn’t notice any emotions in her students, she just kept going [LH: Right, she had her ideas] with her paths and yeah, she was [J: her syllabus and her lesson plans] …very narrow-minded, right, it felt like she had a syllabus and a lesson plan to be weird, to be artsy, you know to be- think out of the box- but she was really trying to narrow them into a certain place. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 12)
Olivia’s *disgust* (or offense of her *good* taste and *moral* sense) for Roberta’s perceived emotional distance from her students reveals and illuminates Olivia’s personal affinity to the pedagogical fantasy of *student enchantment*, with its student-centeredness and emotional *closeness* or connectivity. However, she also addresses Roberta’s proclivity toward acting as an austere pedagogue that had one way of teaching, according to her pre-constructed lesson plans, and not changing and flowing according to her students’ changes, needs and/or emotions. What is left unsaid in Olivia’s response—but what unfolded as a result of the clip being used as a catalyst—was that though she herself holds a strong sense of obligation toward lesson plans and other managerial tasks—she favors *student enchantment* as her pedagogical fantasy of choice (to make life whole) even though she deeply respects

> [t]he amount of work that it takes to develop a lesson and to write a plan and to cut paper and have materials and order materials and then when it comes down to it, you get ready to present the lesson. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 8)

It’s a lot of work to gain their respect and you don’t just gain their respect from being their friend. You gain their respect from being a leader, from creating fair rules and... maintaining that environment of fairness and equality. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 17)

What Olivia regards as something that she must do, i.e. be a knowledgeable leader in the classroom to be a ‘good art teacher’, is a trait that when not handled in the same manner as she is imagining, such as with Roberta, it is discerned as negative, authoritarian, and undesirable. This assertion connotes both a belief in Olivia’s personal conceptualization
of a good art teacher as a caring and emotionally-involved individual, but it also reveals an inner conflict with what she feels she herself needs to be (subject-supposed-to-know as knowledgeable leader) in order to be an effective teacher and how she reacts to a visual manifestation of this very attribute on screen.

As evidenced by the brief example of Olivia’s response to Roberta, popular visual culture representations of arts educators can be used as a catalyst to unfold student teachers’ unconscious pedagogical desires and fantasies about teaching art by beseeching them to verbally acknowledge their psychic Imaginary perceptions through utterances in the Symbolic. One of the intentions is “to co-create dialogues around the readings of teachers in the media and their own life. This dialogue could open a space for critical awareness towards both life in schools and life in popular culture,” (Daspit & Weaver, 1999, p. 42). In other words, showing the DVD clips to the student teachers is not meant to remedy their fantasies or alleviate all their desires that may seem detrimental to a successful, symptom-free life of teaching. First, this is an impossible task, and second, pedagogical fantasies are necessary to support their teaching realities, or else the student teachers might fall apart psychically. Using the visual culture representations of arts educators as a catalyst is meant to instigate new ways of looking at things, to move/think in directions/ways that the student teachers may not have considered prior, to explore new kinds of pedagogical thoughts and teacher-student relations.

Another way that visual culture can be used as a catalyst is to provide an external referent on which to project their affective investments or abreact\(^2\) psychic tensions by

\(^2\) Abreact is a psychoanalytic term that means releasing (repressed emotions) by acting out, as in words, behavior, or the imagination, the situation causing the conflict.
talking about their own thoughts and feelings as channeled by the film character. Similar to the personal illustrations that we drew at the beginning of the individual interviews, the DVD clips of arts educators provided an external referent to point to while explaining the verbal and visual symbols (re)presenting their fantasies and desires around teaching art. Also viewed as a window into the three psychic registers, the popular visual culture characters’ actions and utterances became “a way to explore what is unsayable, unthinkable, and invisible,” (Jagodzinski, 2008, p. 154) in the unconscious of the student teachers. It is assumed, as it became apparent when I was previewing the clips, that it is easier to point to an art education character on the screen and articulate what “I like about her” or why “I don’t identify with him” as opposed to verbalizing that “I do that in the classroom” or “I hate when I notice myself doing that”.

In summation, popular visual culture representations of arts educators can be used as a catalyst to unfold student teachers’ unconscious pedagogical desires and fantasies about teaching art by having the screen instances purposefully resonate (as much as possible) with the participants, so they would feel more compelled to expand and expound on their initial thoughts about teaching (art) through a visual (re)presentation of their musings. It is in those moments that teacher educators can begin to facilitate a dialogue that assists the student teachers in literally coming to terms, by way of the Symbolic, with what they imagine teaching and art teacher culture to be. Whereas fantasies are necessary for a psychically stable reality, harnessing the power of the fantasy structure while understanding its provision of the coordinates for our desires may aid in constructing a more balanced approach to teaching and creating a realistic sense of self and personal expectations. Further suggestions for how popular visual culture
representations of arts educators can be used will be explored through the answers to the three supporting subquestions situated near the end of this chapter.

5.02 Unfolding Three Main Desires in Pedagogical Encounters:

Desire, within the context of this dissertation, is considered as both a probable Lacanian “desire of… [and] lack in the Other” (Stavrakakis, 2007, p. 47), and also as a Deleuzo-Guattarian productive, transformative force that “runs in a flow that is continuous and is always becoming” (Zembylas, 2007, p. 336). In Lacanian terms, desire is usually associated with lack, with an acquisitive longing for what one cannot have. This is caused by a separation from the Real, where initially all needs are met, to an emergence in the Symbolic, where there is a disrupting realization that our needs will ultimately never be completely met. This realization stirs up a desire for what we lack; for what we can no longer have since our traversing into the Symbolic realm of language and representation. For Deleuze & Guattari, unlike Lacan, “desire does not begin from lack—desiring what we do not have. Desire begins from connection; life strives to preserve and enhance itself and does so by connecting with other desires” (Colebrook, 2002, p. 91). In other words, whereas Lacan’s concept of desire is instigated by lack, Deleuze & Guattari’s concept of desire is the exact opposite, as its impetus is forming connections; forming connections with other individuals and/or with other desires. Deleuzo-Guattarian desire can be thought of as a flow that combines with extrinsic elements to create/assemble/machine desire.

This section is arranged around three main desires—power/recognition, love/connections, and salvation/social justice—that the student teachers (and perhaps
most teaching individuals) may possess as motivation in their pedagogical encounters on their individual planes of immanence, such as the art classroom. These three desires are initially explored in a broad sense and then in relation to each of the pedagogical fantasies delineated in Chapters 3 and 4, subject-supposed-to-know, student enchantment, and ego-identification. As a brief reminder with regard to fantasy, “the objet a [the object cause of desire] supports the fantasy which in turn supports desire” (Jagodzinski, 2004, p. 40). In fact, fantasy does not “simply realize a desire in a hallucinatory way… a fantasy constitutes our desire, provides its coordinates, i.e. it literally ‘teaches us how to desire’” (Žižek, 1999, p. 191). Fantasy is the attempt to recapture the lost completeness or fullness that was experienced in the Real, when all needs were met. The pleasure of fantasy is created by the thought, the hope, or the promise of receiving what ones desires, not through the actuality of receiving the object(s) of desire. The paradox is that one can only experience enjoyment from what s/he desires if it is lacking or unavailable to her/him. With consideration of this concept of fantasies constituting their desires, I transition into the three main desires that may have motivated the student teacher participants in the process of becoming-teacher.

5.02.01 Desire for Power/Recognition in Pedagogical Fantasies:

The first desire that I delineate in the context of becoming-teacher in the field of art education is that for power/recognition. “The dominant discourse in the world today is no doubt the discourse of power: power as a means to achieve x, y, and z, but ultimately power for power’s sake” (Fink, 1998, p. 29). The desire for power, while in some is a conscious desire, and in others is an unconscious desire, is present in the educational
system and even in the art classroom. This is not only the desire for power as a means of achievement and control, but also the desire for recognition (as powerful) and as a being that matters in the world.

In addition to desiring recognition for possessing our identity components, we also desire recognition of the value of these components. Hence we take pains not only to embody these components but also to protect and enhance their status. The desire to protect the master signifier “teacher,” for example, can be seen in teachers’ objections to statements or policies that denigrate or devalue teachers, as well as in their efforts to attain greater economic rewards for themselves and for education in general. (Bracher, 2002, p. 97)

The desire for power/recognition, especially in relation to identity and subjectivity, can exist in the Symbolic as signifiers, such as ‘powerful, brilliant, art teacher, etc’; in the Imaginary as a particular appearance or bodily agency; and in the Real as embodying the objet a—or the object cause of the Other’s desire. This is also true with student teachers in the art classroom.

Teachers and students, then, have a constant impetus to maintain their identity, and a constant, though widely varying (from one person to another and also within each individual), desire for recognition. Some teachers and students need frequent, explicit recognition from the Other in order to feel secure, while others can do without explicit recognition from the Other and can proceed with only the promise or hope of a recognition deferred far into the future. The desire for recognition, however, is constant, and it permeates teaching and learning. (Bracher, 2002, p. 100)
To further explicate the desire for power/recognition within the three psychic registers, on the Symbolic level as ego-ideal, the student teachers are enacting a certain signifier (such as subject-supposed-to-know) in identification of the administrative gaze, student gaze, or professorial gaze to which they want to appear perfect and likeable. On the Imaginary level as ideal-ego, this is the image that is visible to others, how they act and how they appear. For example, Olivia stated that art teachers can be recognized as people in big wavy skirts that are just these really cool floral prints or these you know these crazy patterns and they’re in the material and it’s always matched with either a plain colored T-shirt or one that’s just as nutty and doesn’t match. And you know the big, big jewelry like the big turquoise, um… medallions that hang from their neck and a lot of rings. (7-2-09, p. 6)

Jean also described her psychic images of art teachers as constituting partly what my mom always refers to like, you know, like the big flowy skirts, like the crinkle ones, she calls them ‘art teacher skirts’. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 5)

Teachers often “manifest this desire in the often arduous, expensive, or time-consuming activities through which [they] attempt to shape [their] body image and agency” (Bracher, 2002, p. 94). In order to receive power/recognition from the students as an art teacher or subject-supposed-to-know, the student teachers may buy art teacher-ish looking clothes like those ‘crinkly, flowy art-teacher skirts’ mentioned above and also practice and rehearse various highly-technical arts skills. Student teachers may spend a lot of time and money to appear to themselves likeable, to be the image or physical
representation/manifestation of what they believe an art teacher should look and act like or be recognized as.

Similarly, the pedagogical fantasy of *student enchantment* supports the desire for power/recognition when the teacher desires to be the *objet a*, the object cause of desire, of the student(s). This can be recognized as a teacher who desires to be perceived by the students “as having charm, charisma, sex appeal, or animal magnetism” (Bracher, 2002, p. 96). However, being sexually alluring to the students and having power over them as a result of pedagogical seduction is not the only way for a teacher to be the *objet a*. This is also possible by having the maternal or paternal power and/or love that the student(s) desires and as a result lures students toward her/him with the deceptive illusion that they might fill that gap for the students. Likewise, the pedagogical fantasy of *ego-identification* supports the desire for power/recognition in at least two ways that are common in (art) education. First, the desire for power/recognition can be perceived as an art teacher who “wish[es] to be recognized by students or peers as countercultural, resistant, rebellious, or revolutionary in relation to their role, school, or discipline” (Bracher, 2002, p. 96). Many times within a school (district) the art teacher is the one that as Olivia states is “something just far out… pretty eclectic and pretty weird and nutty” (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 5). She also noted that “well they’re [art teachers] out there- in left field you know. They’re just kind of- everyone else is hanging in the infield and they’re out there,” (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 6). As exemplified by Olivia, there is a power and recognition in being the one that is resistant or excluded from the dominant rule-bearing system of the school or Symbolic Order. As Olivia visualized using a sports analogy, art teachers are always in the ‘outfield,’ off by themselves, while the rest of the teachers in a
dominant rule-bearing system of the school are in the ‘infield’, denoting either a resistance to conformity or exclusion (self or other imposed). Second, the desire for power/recognition can be perceived as an art teacher who, while desiring to be outside the system, also desires to be recognized as “an element that, while excluded by the system, is nonetheless extremely valuable for the system, or that is the core around which a new system can be constructed” (Bracher, 2002, p. 96). As Marissa stated, often it is thought that with arts educators “anything that they d[o] would be intense. Whether it was they were intensely like dramatic or you know something like that… they’re very philosophical, you know like, ‘let’s go here’”(Marissa, 6-25-09, p. 3). Marissa is implying that art teachers think differently than most teachers and as a result can be the core around which a new system (of philosophical thinking, curriculum construction, administering assessments, assignment production, etc.) can be constructed. In fact, Olivia and Marissa both believe art teachers are often regarded as ‘thinking outside the box’ and some arts educators seem to take pride in that notion and as a result fulfill a sense of power over other teachers who are more conformist or ignorant of their conformity.

An example of the desire for power/recognition manifesting as a pedagogical fantasy is best illustrated by statements made by Olivia and Marissa.

I see myself more as a leader, as a mentor, as an example of… successful adulthood, you know. And that I’m an example- if I want my students to be a part of a bigger community, if I want them to be creative citizens, then I need to be that. And that’s a huge responsibility, that’s a huge role that you have to play. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 11, emphasis added)
I expected to be a teacher that could pretty much do anything, so [laughs] you know that type… that do any project or I guess I expected to kind of be invincible… I think I expected, too, to come into the classroom and that everyone to listen to me… I expected that; I expected respect immediately. (Marissa, 6-25-09, p. 4, emphasis added)

As is exemplified by the utterances of the research participants, both of them imagined themselves as being teachers that would be leaders with huge responsibilities who would automatically be listened to by their students. Their imaginings and fantasies of teaching art involved the desire for power by embodying the subject position of ‘a leader and mentor’ that was an ‘example of successful adulthood’ that would get recognition and ‘respect immediately’. These (un)conscious desires for power/recognition can lead to internal conflict when they compete with their other desires for love/connections which were also very important to the student teachers.

5.02.02 Desire for Love/Connections in Pedagogical Fantasies:

The second desire that I delineate in the context of becoming-teacher in the field of art education is that for love/connections. The desire for love as noted by jagodzinski (2002) is an expected occurrence in pedagogical situations. “As teachers we love and hate our students for precisely what ‘shows’ itself, what ‘stands out,’ what ‘vibrates’ in them,” (p. xv). Put another way, teachers love their students for what is more in them than in themselves (objet a). In relation to love, the concept of connection is very important to the work of Deleuze & Guattari, being the foundational underpinning of desire. “Desire begins from connection; life strives to preserve and enhance itself and
does so by connecting with other desires,” (Colebrook, 2002, p. 91). In other words, Deleuze & Guattari’s concept of desire has forming connections as its impetus; forming connections with other individuals and/or with other desires. Their concept of desire can also be understood as “freely flowing connections or associations… [i]t is qualitative connectivity and not a desire for something in particular” (Olkowski, 2002, p. 19). Likewise, as previously mentioned in Chapter 2, and as Zembylas (2007a) suggests, Deleuze & Guattari’s “pedagogy of desire can be theorized in ways that mobilize creative, transgressive and pleasurable forces within teaching and learning environments,” (p. 331).

The pedagogical fantasy of *subject-supposed-to-know* supports the desire for love/connections because as soon as there is a person presumed to know, there is transference (Lacan, 1977). Therefore an art teacher as a *subject-supposed-to-know* expects love from students precisely because she is in a position of knowledgeable authority. The students are supposed to love, respect, connect, and look up to the teacher as the leader, mentor, and guide in the classroom. Similarly, the pedagogical fantasy of *student enchantment* supports the desire for love/connections by being the very epitome of love through (counter)transference and receiving student adulation. Jeffers (2009) supports this notion by stating “[i]f art is about connecting, we all would do well to better understand how and why empathy can flourish in the classroom and beyond” (p. 22). Jean strongly believes that some educators teach precisely because of the validation and empathy they can provide for their students through forming connections with them in their everyday lives.
There was just this realization that the reason that you teach is because there are kids like that [a rather troubled student who received a cookie for doing well and talked about it for 20 minutes] who have these—just joys or fears or excitement or anxieties and things who just really want to talk about it or really need to talk about it. Maybe they don’t want to, but *need* to. And being that outlet and being that kind of support structure… for them… and I could kind of validate that for him I think, um not that I felt I needed to validate it for him, but I think that it made him feel good to be feel validated by that [her demonstration of interest in his story]. (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 17)

Jean felt that listening to a young student, who usually had a pretty hard time completing his tasks successfully and paying attention for any extended amount of time, helped make a connection with him as a human and provided a love for him that perhaps he didn’t want, but needed. Being there for this student and others like him was to her, the very reason that people decide to become educators, for the fulfillment of love/connections with students.

[A] caring and dedicated teacher helps students to reimagine/reconstruct their lives and sometimes their identities in positive ways. What we [teachers and teacher educators] do not often recognize is that this power to influence the course of a student’s life, although a teacher may well be operating with the most apparently pure and altruistic motives, is inevitably fuelled by and dependent on the teacher’s own needs and desires. (Zook & Schlender, 2003, p. 74)

To further interpret Jean’s recollection, what she may be overlooking is that teachers’ *“[f]antasies of love may provide legitimacy for feelings of omnipotence over and against those who need ‘raising up’ or ‘salvation’”* (Robertson, 1997, p. 88). As evidenced in
Jean’s statement above, she feels that she can be there as an outlet for this student to talk to, implying that others don’t usually listen to him, and she can also serve as a support structure and validate him. Perhaps what she has neglected to consider is that while she believes she is connecting with this student and showing him love by listening to him, her very use of the words support and validate connotes her unconscious positioning of herself as omnipotent to the student who needs to be saved from an uncaring, invalidating society (of which she is not part, denoted by her very actions). Her fantasy that her act of talking to him ‘made him feel good to be feel validated’ by her presence and listening ear overshadows the actual power she knows she has over him as his teacher. This might also support the idea that the desire for love/connections between any teacher and student is acceptable and even encouraged, but only if the power dynamic (teacher over student) remains intact and the teacher is the one offering the love and validation. If the student is the one offering love/connections to the teacher it implies that the teacher has fallen from the positioning of the subject-supposed-to-know and is not the Imaginary heroine she projects herself to be. The teacher is now considered weak and therefore in need of student love and validation to be whole—which puts the student in the position of power.

To look at Jean’s ideas of forming connections with students from a different perspective, her scenario recalled above harkens back to a clip from Strangers with Candy where Jellineck was in his art room talking to his student Jerri about her future dreams. Mirroring Jean’s own sentiments in her previous excerpt, she has specific ideas about what teachers should do for students, which is helping them find what it means to dream and what it means to have an expectation for yourself and what it means to even to not have an
expectation for yourself, to not set a standard and just keep trying harder and harder and harder to do something more. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 16)

In this excerpt, Jean’s belief that teachers should be helping students ‘find what it means to dream and what it means to have an expectation’ for themselves neatly fits within the conversation on the pedagogy of desire in Deleuze-Guattarian terms that was discussed earlier in Chapter 2. A teacher, such as Jean, enabling pedagogy of desire would be creating and transforming knowledge and relational encounters along with her students in the classroom. Therefore, desire in the pedagogic process would emphasize “the potential productive union of teacher and student desire as an intersubjective dynamic rather than as competing forces” (Watkins, 2008, p. 114). Instead of the student teacher looking to her students to fulfill certain desires (e.g. for love), and in turn, her students looking to her to fulfill their various desires (e.g. recognition and validation), the force of their desires could be put together in a dynamic force that ideally created a transformative pleasure such as finding what it means to dream and set expectations. In this case, helping students realize their potential does not seem to be fulfilling any personal desires for Jean, but rather forms connections with her students and their desires, transforming their lives and self-worth for the better.

A clip of Katherine receiving the many van Gogh *Sunflowers* paintings done by her students in *Mona Lisa Smile*, (outlined in Chapter 4) is reminiscent of a fantastic daydream Olivia recounted during her individual interview about her imagined future in teaching which exemplifies the pedagogical fantasy of student enchantment supported by the desire for love/connections. The daydream spoke of receiving recognition in the
future from past (imagined) students that had remembered and appreciated her impact on
them when she was their art teacher in elementary and/or high school.

Yeah, I mean that is- that satisfaction of knowing that you impacted
something or someone somewhere ‘cause any of those people that you
have in your class are all individuals and they are all going to take
individual paths but you know all of them can say ‘yeah I had Miss Olivia
in art back in 5th grade, back in 9th grade, back in 12th grade. And hey she
taught me to be a creative person so I can look at this current situation that
I’m in and I can look at this situation with my wife and on the verge of
divorce and think of a creative way to fix this- this situation from actually
happening. Or you know, I’m the president of the United States and I have
to come up with a creative way to keep another country from destroying
us, you know’. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p.14)

Directly harkening back to this dissertation’s introductory prologue and its mention of
Judith Robertson’s article *Fantasy’s Confines* (1997), which explored the concept of
receiving the love letter in teaching, it is evident that Olivia’s daydream of students
recounting ‘having Miss Olivia in art’ reproduces that very notion. What is unfortunate
about Olivia’s deep connection to the screen instance with Katherine is that “what the
scene makes ardently visible is not so much a lived reality as a desired, imagined reality
of classroom life: the promise of student-teacher devotion and the miraculous
transcendence of the trials and mistakes of teaching and learning” (Robertson, 1997, p.
78). In other words, this scene from *Mona Lisa Smile*, while showing the attendant love
and adulation from the students, which was not immediate upon their meeting Katherine,
overlooked and disregarded the personal trials that Katherine went through in the course
of the storyline. For example, Katherine broke up with her long-term partner of whom
proposed marriage, she had an illicit affair with another professor, she lost her position as
the *subject-supposed-to-know* in the very first lecture, she had a disparaging editorial
written about her by one her students, and she was told she could only continue teaching
if she submitted all lesson plans for pre-approval to teaching. In other words, this scene
“replay[ed] the wish that solutions to the tensions of teaching and learning can depend on
magical displays of student devotion” (Robertson, 1997, p. 78). Thinking ahead to the
recognition that imagined past students might have for her helped Olivia disavow the
trials and mistakes she may make in teaching those same students. Inconsequently, Olivia
became captivated by this scene precisely because it supported the fantasy that she
already entertained.

This concept of the love letter is also remindful of a statement that Jean made in
her individual interview, though not in reference to *Mona Lisa Smile* specifically, it was
about not giving up on students that were particularly trying on her patience.

I had one student who I just fought tooth and nail with *all* last quarter, um-
But I didn’t give up on him you know and I think that *someday, someday*
in the *far*, far, far future there is a possibility that *maybe* he’ll know that
*somebody* cared about him you know. And I don’t know that will
necessarily happen *ever*, but I know that the possibility is there. (Jean, 6-
18-09, pp. 14-15; emphasis in original)

Though Jean seemed to be providing herself a cushion for the potential unrequited love
from her troubling student (‘I don’t know that will necessarily happen *ever*’), she was
also adamant about holding onto the possibility of future recognition of love from this
particular student who she ‘fought tooth and nail with’. This seems to iterate the tight
grasp with which emerging teachers hold onto the fantasy of future love and recognition
for the trials they go through in the present (and past). Just the hint of a possibility of ‘getting through’ to the student and having him return the love she once gave was impetus enough for Jean to continue teaching and reaching out to him though by implication it would have been easier for her to ‘give up’. While Jean’s musings about the concept of teacher-student loving relationships may seem a bit overly fantastic and/or romantic, “fantasy that organizes teaching as a dream of love blocks some significant tensions from consciousness” (Robertson, 1997, p. 84). Similar to Olivia, Jean may use the desire for love/connections and the fantasy of student enchantment as a way to disregard the trials her disrespectful students put her through and overlook any mistakes she may have made in teaching those same students.

5.02.03 Desire for Salvation/Social Justice in Pedagogical Fantasies:

The third desire that I delineate in the context of becoming-teacher in the field of art education is that for salvation/social justice. A very popular concept within the current discipline, social justice, or the movement towards a socially-just world (egalitarian society), is the theme for the 2010 National Art Education Association’s Annual Convention. As the NAEA website states “[t]his year’s theme, Art Education and Social Justice, explores the role of visual arts and education as vehicles of social equity and agency in today’s increasingly visual culture” (www.naea-reston.org, 2010). Social justice is also the subject matter of an upcoming special September 2010 edition of Art Education, the journal of the National Art Education Association. With so much emphasis on the topic of social justice, it is understandable why it is a commonly employed desire within the field of art education and its (student) teachers. Directly in
line with the desire for social justice is the desire to be a savior, or the one implementing social justice on behalf of the students. To illustrate within an educational or pedagogical situation, a teacher’s pursuit of providing salvation/social justice through her students’ transformation and freedom from oppression supports the fantasy that by aiding in that productive/transformative process she will embody the subject position of the altruistic savior that she desires to be for her students, and her life will be whole as a result. Three current arts educators implicitly support the idea of the (art) teacher as advocate of social justice and suggest how addressing injustice might be accomplished in an art classroom.

Rather than ignoring the suffering that transpires in distant or nearby places, we can fill our art classrooms with artists’ images that connect us to past or present people suffering injustices and then create images with students. Finally, we can extend art curricula to address local injustices by, for example, making the faces of hungry people visible through images, text, and encounters with them. (Armon, Uhrmacher, & Ortega, 2009, p. 18)

As the authors suggested, art teachers can do their part by not ignoring injustices in the community or world and introduce these issues in the classroom, through images and art making, so that they can be addressed, made visible, and potentially erased or removed. In taking part in this socially just action—of erasing injustice—the arts educators are imagining themselves as advocates and/or saviors of the oppressed.

The pedagogical fantasy of subject-supposed-to-know supports the desire for salvation/social justice by the arts educator, knowing more than the students (about their own situations or best interests), provides the means to save the student(s) from oppression/oppressive circumstances or some real or perceived social injustice. As was
briefly alluded to, this can be done by an arts leader who creates, decides on, and/or implements a curriculum that is conducive to supporting the tenets of social justice. “A social justice lens can focus goals in required art courses at any level by examining the reasons and ways that artist create art, influence others, and actively engage social problems through art in communities,” (Armon, Uhrmacher, & Ortega, 2009, p. 13).

Similarly, the pedagogical fantasy of *student enchantment* supports the desire for salvation/social justice by loving, empathizing, and/or caring about the students enough to fight for their equality in the classroom, in their family, and/or in society. “The artistically engaged individual [teacher] couples intense awareness with a strong sense of agency, a belief that he or she can shape the world,” (Gude, 2009, p. 7). Olivia believes that arts educators are often the teachers that are perceived to be more involved with students’ personal lives.

*I love, love, love* working with the kids and working with the students and just being able to get *involved with their personal lives* and that’s one of the reasons that I chose art. Is ‘cause in math or science you hardly ever get to *hear about their family* or *issues that they’re facing* and that often comes out in the arts. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 13; italics added, bold in original)

Since Olivia believes that art teachers may be more involved with students’ personal lives, then she may also think they may be prone to know more about potentially harmful things that may be going on at home or in a student’s neighborhood. Knowing what might be happening in a student’s personal life provides opportunity for the arts educator to intervene in negative circumstances and be the savior/hero. Once the hero(ine) has rescued his/her student-victim from social injustice, the student might love the teacher as
the one who saved him, with probable heightened transference, because the teacher as the
*subject-supposed-to-know* is the one to whom the student believes he owes his (rescued)
life or (newly instated) social justice.

Likewise, the pedagogical fantasy of *ego-identification* supports the desire for
salvation/social justice by allowing the teachers to identify with the signifiers of ‘savior’,
‘hero’, ‘one who risked his/her life’, and/or ‘one who believes in social justice and
equality’. This is reminiscent of a narrative recollected by Olivia about one of her art
teachers in high school that initially inspired her to become an art teacher and currently
forms part of her teaching ego-ideal. Olivia spent quite a bit of time recounting this
personal story of her art teacher standing up for her personally (to the administration and
school board) when there was an incident at school that was particularly traumatic for
her.

[I] fell apart right at once when I got, when I got accused of that [stealing]
and I remember being in her office… um, that week, just sitting on the
floor and tears in my eyes and just telling her how unfair it was and she
went to the board. I mean she went to the athletic director and went to the
board and fought for me and I ended up only getting one week instead of
two weeks [punishment] because she fought for me. And you know that’s
my art teacher, she had nothing to do with anything. You know she had no
part of the athletics, but she knew me well enough ‘cause I’d had her for
the last three years to know that I wasn’t that type of kid and that they just
didn’t take the right steps to follow up on what actually happened. But I
remember that, I mean that was a significant part in my life and without
her you know I would have lost out on another week [of sports] and I had
a college scout coming to look at me that week and you know it could have been a lot, lot worse than what it was but because she stepped in.
You know and as an art teacher, she was amazing, but as a person and as honestly a friend to this day, even better. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 2)

Because of the art teacher’s support in a situation of which the teacher had no direct involvement or authority, Olivia was spared further academic and emotional inconvenience and still remembered that event as being a significant part of her life and the teacher ‘as a friend to this day’. When Olivia shared the story of her love for this teacher-as-savior, who essentially risked her own job and social position within the school when standing up for one of her art students, it was evident that Olivia wanted to be ‘that teacher’ for her future students.

5.03 Addressing Supporting Question One: Affective Investments

As was stated at the beginning of this chapter, suggestions for how popular visual culture representations of arts educators can be used are explored through the answers to the three following supporting subquestions. One way is by exploring student teachers’ affective investments in teaching to understand how they imagine teaching art; another way is by talking to student teachers about how they might (re)negotiate their teacher identities in accordance to possible (dis)identifications with mediated images of teachers/teacher culture. The third way is by having a conversation about what might happen in those moments when art student teachers begin to realize their pedagogical fantasies about teaching (art) are merely (deceptive) illusions.

The first supporting question that I attempt to answer in this dissertation is: What affective investments might art student teachers develop/employ in their individual and collective teacher identities? First, an affective investment is concerned with the arousing
of feelings or emotions in something, such as a job (teaching art) or particular identity (art teacher), that offers potential profitable returns when put to use or employed. Or considered another way, an affective investment is “the intensity or desire with which we invest [in] the world and our relations to it. We are placed into an apparently immediate relation to the world through our affective investments,” (Daspet & Weaver, 1999, p. 41).

After interviewing the three participants individually and then considering their answers collectively once the data was transcribed, I noticed various similarities and patterns in their responses pertaining to their conceptualizations of the act of teaching art. As their narratives unfolded, Olivia, Marissa, and Jean had answers and explanations that were congruous to one another in several aspects, signaling to me possible affective investments that they had developed and may employ in their individual and collective teacher identities, as well as about the overall discipline of teaching art.

For example, when asked what it meant to her to be an art teacher, Olivia first responded from the Other’s point of view, stating that “I think people think I’m nuts” and “when I tell them I’m an art teacher and that’s what I want to be, they’re like ‘really, so like you want to like finger paint with kids and stuff?’” (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 11). Upset, but at the same time almost making fun of the comment that she implied she heard all of the time, Olivia unfolded an affective investment that teaching art is more than various artistic activities like finger painting with kids.

Well, I mean the role is more than just teaching paints and colors. I feel like my role and my identity as an art teacher is to not only teach the arts but also- there’s so many life skills that can be learned from the arts too. And I feel like my responsibility in that position is to bring up creative citizens that are part of a community. And I take that role very seriously.
It’s not just about finger painting a picture of mom and dad, it’s about what part of that painting of mom and dad influences that child? And there’s so much more involved with it and I think that’s the part that people don’t understand when I tell them. [mockingly imitating the voices of others] ‘Oh that’d be fun. That’d be a fun career. You know you just get to paint with kids’. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 11)

Olivia’s idea of teaching art centers around the investment that it is about more than teaching the elements and principles of design or the primary and secondary colors on the color wheel. Instead she sees teaching art as a responsibility to teach life skills and bring up creative citizens that are to be part of a community. This excerpt intimately recalls a story she told about one of her art teachers in high school of who was also a motivating influence in her decision to become an arts educator.

She’s [high school art teacher] got so much energy and she was always spoutin’ off like random comments about you know ‘you should- when you get to college make sure that you don’t just- you know- go to college. Make sure it’s one that will help you get hired.’ And even as far as like etiquette and stuff, she would teach us before our homecoming dance- she taught a whole lesson where she sat out all the silverware and the dinner plates and the dessert plates and all that and like actually went through it with us and made us learn that because she was not okay with her students not knowing which fork to use if they went to a fancy dinner. Just that kind of thing, where it’s just beyond the norm… Not only did she teach me the basics of art and aesthetics and, but she was also another one that was pretty open to let you be what you wanted to be but give you the tools to be that. (Olivia, 7-2-09, p. 1)
Heavily invested in her former art teacher, Olivia overlays the psychic image she had of her own art teacher in high school with her affective investment of what she believes are her professional responsibilities today. Additionally, Olivia seems to relate her identity as an art teacher, as well as her commitment to teaching, to the seriousness with which she takes her role as a leader in creating a community.

It’s not just like you’re going in and hanging out with kids at school. This is the opportunity that they have to see different types of arts, see different types of thinking. Where they have a little more freedom to make choices, whether it’s- I mean even color choices, that’s fun but I don’t even see that as just like ‘oh it’s pretty’. You know there’s reasons behind a lot of that stuff too and the more I can get my students to understand what’s behind all the decisions that they make and what’s behind all the decisions their society makes and realize that every little bit and piece and cereal box has been designed and created by someone and if we accept it for what it is, it just will be what it is. But if we can learn in the art room how that can be changed and bettered in the real world- that’s pretty cool… it’s all related so I guess I see- yeah I do take it seriously. (7-2-09, p. 12)

Olivia’s affective investments, about teaching art and her individual and collective teacher identities, appear to have been developed through experiences with one of her former teachers and as a result she seems to currently employ these beliefs in her own approach to teaching art, as well as to her imagined position with the field of art education.

When asked about what it means to be identified as an art teacher and/or committed to teaching, Marissa replied that
it would depend on what crowd [she was talking to], like if I told people that I normally hang out with or go out to clubs or something like that—those people I think I would be more… like I always see myself kind of prefacing it [teaching art] or almost… kind of defending it because I don’t want to be seen as like too serious about it, like too crazy about teaching because I really enjoy it, so I don’t want to be like that person you know who’s just crazy. [laughs] But I also want to be a person who you know is serious and like that so I think sometimes when I’m with people that are just more fun and social I kind of don’t talk it down, but I wouldn’t say as much about teaching and I think it would just be because you want to be fun; you want to be able to separate those things. (Marissa, 6-25-09, pp. 7-8; emphasis in original)

Marissa unfolded an affective investment that teaching art is something that she really enjoys, but that she doesn’t want to be made fun of by her friends for taking it so seriously. Continuing on, Marissa spoke of a personal filter that she employs depending on whether she is talking to friends or other professionals because she has been teased before (about being a devoted teacher) and doesn’t enjoy the ridicule by friends.

Around people who are professionals and completely love education and things like that, then I would be ultra-excited to talk to them. And I think also some people that aren’t educators—just professional people—engineers, doctors or something, sometimes I feel a little inadequate because it’s- I don’t want to say that- but it’s not like as difficult or you know something that they did, but it’s something that I love. So sometimes I feel to other people that I may have taken the easy way out… So I think it’s kind of- I defend my choice a lot, I think. (Marissa, 6-25-09, p. 8)
Marissa stated that she frequently defended her choice to be an art teacher, not only because of her love of the career and identity, but also because of other professionals’ assumed disdain for her easy job of making art with kids. I then asked her what types of specific statements she made in her defense. She said that she typically tells people that this is what I love to do and I often talk a lot about how art’s educational too because a lot of the times when I talk about some of the topics I’m covering like the history things or something, they’re like ‘but it’s art, not history.’ So it’s hard because it’s like ‘well it’s all encompassing.’ It’s not just production; it can be criticism and it can be history and it can be a lot of different things. So I think I’m always worried that people think I’m a slacker- you know that they think I’m slacking because you know- because I choose art. (Marissa, 6-25-09, p. 8)

Marissa’s affective investments, about teaching art and her individual and collective teacher identities, appear to have been developed through experiences with her various groups of friends and through imagined judgments by other professionals. As a result of her psychic ideas of the Other, she seems to currently employ beliefs of having to defend art as educational and all-encompassing in her own approach to teaching art, as well as inform others (and herself?) that her imagined position within the field of art education is not as a slacker, but as a serious and competent educator.

When asked what it meant to be identified as an art teacher and committed to teaching, Jean responded similarly to Olivia and Marissa by considering the answer from the point of view of the imagined Other. “I think people think it’s fun and sometimes unnecessary and sometimes people are like ‘wow, that’s great like we need more art in schools’ and all those are fine, you know. I think people look at it as a neat career… and
that’s probably the best word, *neat*” (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 10; italics in original). When I asked her if she, too, thought teaching art was *neat*, Jean replied

No, no, not at all. I think that it’s, I think it is so much more vital and so much more important than that… teaching in general but definitely teaching art, um... Teaching itself gets a bad rap you know ‘those who can’t do teach’. And maybe that’s true. Maybe, that’s why I’m an art teacher because I couldn’t cut it as a photojournalist, you know. But regardless I think that it is *much* more involved and much more important than being a *neat* profession. (6-18-09, pp. 10-11)

Also similar to Olivia and Marissa, Jean has an affective investment in the idea that teaching art is so much more vital and more important than being neat or fun. She then expands this to include her conceptualization of teaching in general, as a profession that gets a ‘bad rap’ as something people do when they can’t perfect or ‘cut it’ with another skill. Jean reiterates that regardless of what others think or what she imagines them to think, she believes that teaching art is much more involved and important. She continues by talking about her affective investment in the idea of teaching itself.

I think that it’s [teaching] everything to me. It really is, it’s… again, the only thing I can picture myself doing, but it’s not even like an act like a physical act of doing something. Like, I’m not teaching in terms of the physical act of teaching… you know um, or going to school and getting-holding that license and like ‘I’m a teacher because I- because the state of Ohio says so, because I gave them $85 and I passed the classes’. Like, that’s not what it is; I think that it’s the only thing in this world that even makes sense to me. And really, I don’t understand how anybody would want to do anything else. (6-18-09, p. 11)
Jean, like Olivia and Marissa, had an affective investment in the idea of teaching art as something more than teaching elements or principles of design, or other arts techniques. Instead, they are all invested in the idea that teaching art is an all-encompassing, highly important profession that can inform students about life skills, history, and criticism. Likewise, the three participants had very strong investments in their commitment to teaching and in their individual and collective art teacher identities as something they passionately defend. Similarly, the three student teachers imagine teaching art as something they love doing and/or one of the only things that makes sense in life.

5.04 Addressing Supporting Question Two: (Re)negotiation of Teacher Identities

The second supporting question that I attempt to answer in this dissertation is: How do art student teachers (re)negotiate their teacher identities in accordance to possible (dis)identifications with mediated images of teachers/teacher culture? To clarify, negotiation is to arrange, deal, or bargain with another or others in order to bring about, through discussion, a settlement of terms, in this case about one’s teacher identity. By watching the 23 DVD clips of arts educators as mediated images of teachers/teacher culture, the students admitted moments of both close identification with a screen character and his/her actions and utterances, and also moments of strong dis-identification with a screen representation of an art teacher. Talking through their conceptualizations of their teacher identities, the student teachers would offer their thoughts on any particular screen educator by making statements such as “I like that about her because I do that, too” or “I don’t identify with him when he’s like that with students” or “I hope I’m not like that!” These comments revealed aspects of identification
and dis-identification with the characters in the films/TV series. During the group interview process, I specifically asked whether the student teachers had any strong identifications or dis-identifications with any of the characters and then asked them why or why not. As an example, Marissa mentioned that she initially thought she would physically look like Roberta (hair and jewelry) when she started teaching, an imaginary identification. However, now that she has student taught and graduated from the art education program, Marissa no longer believed she will resemble the physical appearance of Roberta, though she still admires that style of dress.

The crazy hair and jewelry I always thought that would be me. [LH: yeah, your illustration had that, you were like ‘I want the big jewelry’] yeah but I don’t think that’s me and I think that’s just what I wanted but I don’t know, but I admire that [all laugh]. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 11)

Quite passionately, Marissa continued returning to this and the other DVD clips that featured Roberta, unabashedly mixing her identifications and dis-identifications with the screen image. While she iterated that she identified with Roberta’s technique of student-exploration, Marissa expressed a very real fear of ‘what if I become that,’ referring to the screen representation of Roberta.

I’m relating to like you want to explore like you want the students to do that, but then there’s that fear like ‘what if I become that.’ Like I just kept thinking about that like- What if I become that? Sometimes I’d be like running around the room like a mad woman and kids are just looking at me like- [all laugh] you know, like what if I am now, and I don’t know? So I’m just like sitting there kind of scared like ‘turn it off’ [Ghost World]. [all laugh] I don’t know if I want to look at this [movie clip]! (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 12)
Overwhelmed by the possibility that she could already be like Roberta unawares, Marissa frantically fantasized about a future situation with imagined students who looked at her disapprovingly as she ran around the art room, out of control. Exasperated by this fantasy of losing the subject position as the *subject-supposed-to-know*, Marissa became quite upset and secretly wished for me to turn off the movie so she did not have to face her unbecoming likeness on screen. Turning off the physical screen on which her disparaging fantasy projected would veil Marissa from having to deal with a fear of who she might be/become.

As a result of her revealed plea for me to turn off the representation that she most feared becoming, a spontaneous (though perhaps admittedly pre-meditated in the unconscious) question I asked at that point of the group interview as a follow up/leading question was “do you ever renegotiate your own art teacher identity based on—things you see—like that [Roberta in Ghost World]?” Marissa, to whom the question was asked, responded immediately with, “yes!” (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 13). I followed by genuinely inquiring, “So how do you do that?”

I think it is always checking myself and it becomes very tiring I think sometimes. I don’t know, just to make sure that you’re not going over too much; you’re not doing this; you’re not doing that. So I think it is hard sometimes, but at the same time I do what’s comfortable, what I see comfortable for myself and what’s comfortable for students. So [LH: so now you’re going to go into your art room and be like ‘okay I can’t be like Roberta, I can’t be like Jellineck’] yeah, I know so I think it just really is what fits into your own portrayal of yourself… like what is it that I can take from this, what is it that I’m not going to, or do I not even want to look at that again? So I think that’s just it for me and I constantly am
always going back over and thinking, ‘okay I could have done it this way or maybe I could do it this way next time.’ I’m always reflecting on situations like that. I think it’s my curse and my gift at the same time so-

[LH: so you do renegotiate?] I do, yes. (Marissa, 7-13-09, p. 13)

Once Marissa had answered affirmatively about whether she renegotiated her teacher identity with acknowledgement of the mediated educators, I asked Jean and Olivia the same question, with two differing, but equally passionate responses to that of Marissa.

You know, I think I try to and then there’s always the snap back to reality. You know, like I see the satirical representation and I think ‘okay I don’t want to be like that’, but I know I’m not going to be like that. You know, and then I see the ones that inspire me that I want to be like and I remember that’s not freakin real. You know, that’s a movie [all laugh]. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 13)

Well, I wouldn’t say I go as far as to renegotiate my identity… there’s things that I definitely think about and like she was saying, that I don’t want to be. But in the same, I know who I am and I know what I want to be and what I am. So the more I look at them like, ‘well I’m not that’, ‘I am this’, ‘I’m not that’. Yeah, ‘I’m that’, but I don’t see it as ‘you know, I should be like that’ ‘cause I already kind of know who I am. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 14)

In accordance to what the student teachers answered when asked outright whether or not they (re)negotiate their identities based on possible (dis)identifications with mediated images of teachers/teacher culture, one was an astounding, ‘yes!’; one was a hopeful, ‘I try to’; and one was a firm, ‘no’. When first conceptualizing this question, I knew there were more extraneous factors (family, religion, society, etc) to negotiating a personal
identity than watching films or TV and identifying or dis-identifying with characters who are supposed to (re)present you and/or hypothetically be similar to you; however, I wanted to know if student teachers were consciously aware that mediated images could have an impact on their sense of (teaching) self. Though the three student teachers seem to be at different levels of interpretation and conscious awareness of the affects of teacher representations on their constructions of identity, their multiple readings of visual culture’s impact on their (re)negotiations still “allows for experience in the practice of reasonable argumentation, the respectful differing of opinions, and the value of debate,” (Schwoch, White, & Reilly, 1992, p. 121; as cited in Daspit & Weaver, 1999, p. 41). In other words, even though there was no single, overarching agreement on the possible affects of the media’s impact on identity (re)formation amongst the three participants, the meaningful experience of sharing opinionated dialogue did have an impact on (re)negotiating their identities within their small group. This was evidenced by the request to “change my answer” (Jean, 7-13-09), as Jean did after hearing her contemporaries talk through a scene of which she had just commented about in relation to her own (dis)identifications.

5.05 Addressing Supporting Question Three: Moments of Psychic Disruption

The third supporting question that I attempt to answer in this dissertation is: What might happen in those moments when art student teachers begin to realize their pedagogical fantasies about teaching (art) are merely (deceptive) illusions? Though the student teachers may never actually say, or be consciously aware, that their pedagogical fantasies about teaching (art) are merely deceptive illusions, the psychical affects/effects
of coming too close to those illusions began to emanate from their speech through the use of different terms that were repeated during the group interview session. Two of the main affects/effects that I noted when talking with the student teachers in both their individual and group interviews were frustration and anxiety. I briefly describe each concept which I contextualize with a quotation from at least one participant in order to elucidate some of the possible affects/effects involved in realizing one’s pedagogical fantasies are illusory deceptions.

First, the concept or feeling/affect of frustration—a feeling of dissatisfaction, often accompanied by anxiety or depression, resulting from unfulfilled needs or unresolved problems—was mentioned quite a bit in both the individual and group interviews. Within psychoanalysis, frustration “does not concern biological needs but the demand for love” (Evans, 1996, p. 69). Within a pedagogical context, this could be the teacher’s desire for student adulation or respect manifested in their completing of homework or paying attention in class. When these desired/demanded behaviors are not provided by the students, the teacher senses that she has been wronged, and becomes frustrated. However, the frustration may not be caused by the fact that the students didn’t complete their homework, but in actuality “the true frustration comes from the[ir] refusal of love” (Evans, 1996, p. 70). This can be evidenced in Jean’s acknowledgement that even those she loves her students, she is aware that they may not love her back. This refusal of student love may transfer to other frustrations in her teaching life.

As an example, Jean continually spoke of her frustration in regard to the lack of respect that arts educators receive (from society, administration, other educators, etc), as exemplified in a Strangers with Candy scene taking place in the principal’s office.
was upset that Jellineck had to pay for the kiln with his own money, identifying with him and his frustration of being undervalued because of a comparable situation where she spent her own money on supplies during student teaching. She was infuriated that Jellineck’s actions, which went unseen and unappreciated, were blatantly disregarded, just like hers.

Like when he paid for the kiln with his own money and said [M: yes, yes] I think the school may want to reimburse me. They don’t give a shit, you know! [all laugh] No one cares! And I mean even in student teaching I paid for copies [M: oh, yes!] with my own money and all kinds of things and you know I’m happy to do it, but nobody sees that, nobody gives a shit, you know. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 8)

Jean also spoke of her frustration with the (perceived) lack of freedom in teaching within the art classroom. Specifically, Jean felt that a clip of Katherine from *Mona Lisa Smile* resonated deeply with her frustration of turning in lesson plans ahead of time as a student teacher.

She had to follow her syllabus, but *not* doing that was what made her an impactful teacher… I understand as teachers entering the professional world, we have to turn in lesson plans, but I realized like I was so frustrated because… that’s the way it really is. We have to do those things and we’re almost constricted- you get reprimanded if you don’t do it the way they want you to do it, but not doing it that way can be *more* powerful and have a bigger impact on your students than if you plan everything out and say ‘this is what we’re going to look at’ and ‘this is what you’re [students] going to think’. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 6)
Besides the frustration she felt by having to turn in lesson plans that constricted her ability to be a powerful teacher (by being able to teach away from the syllabus when recognizing the usefulness of doing so), Jean also felt that art teachers face a lot of censorship and there’s “a lot of material that you can’t discuss in the classroom and a lot of material that needs to be discussed in the classroom,” (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 6).

In addition to being frustrated by the technicalities of lesson planning and acceptable art content, Jean as well as Olivia and Marissa, were frustrated by not being allowed to share as much of themselves-as-teachers (counter-transference) in front of their students as they feel they should be.

I’m not going to say names but we’ve been told that if you’re struggling with something, you leave it out of the classroom. Like that’s not human; that’s not real [M: no] like we’ve been trained- oh I feel so frustrated because we’ve been trained to put aside human nature and the things that help us relate to our students- the emotions. That’s what we’ve been told to do [M: mm hmm] in order to be effective teachers, [M: yeah; O: mm hmm] but it makes us less effective. [M: mm hmm] You know we’ve been told that you just you put on a happy face and you go in there and you bullshit your way through the day just to make your students think that your life is perfect. (Jean, 7-13-09, p. 10)

Jean began talking about the frustration she feels when being instructed by particular members of the staff in the art education program to leave her emotions ‘at the door’ and walk into her classroom as if everything is okay. Jean lamented that it is ‘not human’ to set aside one’s emotions as a teacher and fake his/her way though the school day so that the students think that the teacher is somehow super-human and never has real-life issues (such as death or divorce), projecting that ‘life is perfect’. She strongly believed that what
she has been taught—about hiding one’s emotions as a teacher in order to be an effective
teacher—actually leads one to be ineffective with one’s students because of the deception
involved. Marissa and Jean both recounted stories of teacher-emotion in the classroom,
whether as the teacher in the case of Marissa and her summer job, or as the student with
an emotional teacher throwing away books in a trashcan as in the case of Jean. Through
the telling of these stories, the student teachers co-constructed their conceptualizations of
the value, need, and natural occurrence of the pedagogical fantasy of student enchantment
in the classroom and were frustrated when those fantasies around the desire for
love/connections was not as they imagined it would/should be.

Second, the concept or feeling/affect of anxiety—a feeling of distress or
uneasiness of mind caused by fear of danger or misfortune and also a state of
apprehension and psychic tension—was not directly named, but implied in the group
interview excerpts by its symptoms. Within Lacanian psychoanalysis, anxiety has been
theorized as the threat of fragmentation of the body in the mirror stage (Evans, 1996), and
more recently as “the point where the subject is suspended between a moment where he
no longer knows where he is and a future where he will never again be able to refind
himself (S4, 226)” (Evans, 1996, p. 11). Thinking of this in the context of the Real- that
houses bodily affect, anxiety is something that lacks Symbolization, and therefore
becomes impossible to control or speak into existence. “Anxiety…is not like fantasy,
which can serve as a cover or veil; anxiety is never deceptive…it always indicates that
the object [objet a] is about to be lost. Anxiety never lies,” (Fink, 1997, p. 191).

Anxiety as a feeling of distress or uneasiness, a sense of loss of self with no future
reemergence, or a threat of fragmentation of the (perceived) whole (knowledgeable) body
in the Imaginary, is exemplified by one of the opening scenes of the movie *Mona Lisa Smile*, where Katherine is shown teaching to her new Art History 100 class for the first time. She projects slides of ancient art on the screen to soon find out that the students already have all of the text-book knowledge that she is trying to impart to them. The following dialogue is selected text from the 4:34 minute scene.

**Katherine:** [slide appears on screen] from the beginning, man has always had the impulse to create art. Can anyone tell me what this is?

**Joan-student:** *Wounded Bison*, Altamira, Spain about 15,000 B.C. Joan Brandwyn.

**Katherine:** very good, Joan. Despite the age of these paintings, they are technically very sophisticated because—

**Joan:** [interrupting] because of the shading and the thickness of the line as it moves over the hump of the bison. Is that right?

**Katherine:** yes, that’s exactly right… next slide. This one you are probably less familiar with. It was discovered by archeologists—

**Betty-student:** [interrupts] in 1879, Lascaux, France. Dates back to 10,000 B.C. Single out because of the flowing lines depicting the movement of the animal.

This scene continues with every slide that is projected on screen by Katherine being met with a student’s instant and correct response of the title, artist, location, date, movement, and defining characteristics. Through the continuation of the screen instance, Katherine’s anxiety and feelings of uneasiness become apparent in her facial expressions, body posture, and speechlessness toward the end of the scene. Olivia stated that she could identify with Katherine because of the anxiety she portrayed when losing her subject position as the *subject-supposed-to-know* and the *objet a* of the students’ recognition and respect.

I identified with her but also in the very beginning when she walks in and you can just tell she’s completely nervous, [M: mm hmm] scared to death
[J: terrified, yeah] and they literally just tear her apart and I see it in her eyes. I have felt that way so, [all laugh] yeah. (Olivia, 7-13-09, p. 16; emphasis added)

Being *completely nervous* and *scared to death* signify the anticipated loss of the objet a, or the students’ respect and adulation of the teacher as the *subject-supposed-to-know*, which may stir up an anxiety in Olivia, a bodily affect of which she has no control over and of which does not lie. In her intimate recollection, it was Olivia’s bodily/felt perception that the *objet a* that will make her life (deceptively) whole was about to be lost in front of the students. As a result, Olivia’s pedagogical fantasy of embodying the *subject-supposed-to-know* may break down when she gets too close and (un)consciously realizes that it is just an illusory image(s) of her own positing.

In those moments when art student teachers begin to realize their pedagogical fantasies about teaching (art) are merely (deceptive) illusions, two of the bodily affects/effects that can possibly transpire are that of frustration and anxiety. Frustration, a feeling of dissatisfaction, often accompanied by anxiety or depression of unmet needs, actually comes from the refusal of (student) love. Anxiety, a feeling of distress or uneasiness, a sense of loss of self with no future reemergence, or a threat of fragmentation of the body, never lies and always indicates a loss of the *objet a*. These two affects that can have serious mental effects on student teachers’ feelings toward self, teaching, and students are only two of the potentially disbarring results of coming too close to their pedagogical fantasies. Some suggestions for how to attempt to assuage the chaos, frustration, and anxiety that may come from the student teachers’ transitional movement of *becoming-teacher* is explored in the following chapter.
5.06 Conclusion:

In this chapter I attempted to offer interpretations of that data in an attempt to explore the tensions between what was intended and what was signified in the utterances of the participants, and between what was fantasized and what was desired in a pedagogical context. The interpretative statements presented were not meant to reflect an individual student teacher nor diagnose her with any psychoanalytic symptoms; rather, it was my intention to focus on the structure(s) these student teachers were embedded in, and not on the teachers themselves. This chapter was arranged around three main desires—power/recognition, love/connections, and salvation/social justice—that the student teachers employed in their pedagogical encounters. By exploring each of my three research subquestions, I more fully answered the primary research question about how visual culture representations of arts educators can be used as a catalyst to unfold student teachers’ unconscious pedagogical desires and fantasies about teaching art. In the following chapter, Chapter 6- Conclusions & Implications, I explore what the resulting interpretations from this chapter could mean within art education student teaching (preservice) classrooms and in the broader context of the field of art education.
CHAPTER 6- CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

Learning to teach is not a mere matter of applying decontextualized skills or of mirroring predetermined images; it is time when one’s past, present, and future are set in dynamic tension. Learning to teach—like teaching itself—is always the process of becoming: a time of formation and transformation, of scrutiny into what one is doing, and who one can become. (Britzman, 2003, p. 31)

The aim of this final chapter is to explore what the resulting interpretations from this study could mean within art education student teaching (preservice) classrooms and in the broader context of the field of art education. I attempt to do this by first briefly revisiting the concept of becoming-teacher and merge this with some suggestions for how information gleaned from this study could be useful in preservice classrooms while simultaneously considering some of the broader implications for the field of art education. Next, with a direct reference back to becoming-teacher, I compare this with a couple of my thoughts about conducting research with student teachers during my process of becoming-professor. Lastly, I segue into looking at some very specific differences I noticed in my personal approach to my current position as university supervisor of art student teachers. Once I began observing my student teachers in their clinical placements in January 2010, I soon recognized that I was utilizing pertinent
sections of my research to work with my new set of student teachers in ways that I had not with my student teachers in the past. In that section I will detail various aspects of my transition and productive transformation as a supervisor.

6.01 Unfolding the Chaos of Becoming-Teacher:

One of the most important concepts to transpire from this research was the idea of becoming-teacher or the student teachers’ continuous processes of “the unfolding of difference in time and as time” (May, 2003, p. 147). As a reminder, becoming-teacher is a minoritarian movement, and as such is considered a legitimate process of becoming, and more specifically as a molecular becoming. “The subject-in-process [art student teacher], that is, as becoming, is always placed between two multiplicities, yet one term does not become the other; the becoming is something between the two… a pure affect. Therefore becoming does not mean becoming the other, but becoming-other,” (Semetsky, 2006, p. 6, italics in original). Though the specific way I take up and utilize Deleuze & Guattari’s concept of becoming may not perfectly or completely fit their discursive formulation, I offer and employ the concept in a particular way that best fits my study and provides yet another conceptual amplification of its relevance and usefulness, in this case, with imagining teaching. Put another way, just like with becoming-woman, becoming-animal, and becoming-imperceptible that were referenced earlier in the related literature review, becoming-teacher further illuminates the magnitude of this theorization which can involve the continual transition of unfolding one’s (teacher) subjectivity.

Becoming-teacher does not mean that a subject, in this case a student teacher, becomes another person (teacher) in actuality. Instead, becoming is the dynamism of
change between the two states, of student and teacher, not the actual end state of having become a teacher. *Becoming-teacher* is not imitating this molar entity or even transforming into it. However, as Deleuze & Guattari might argue, one cannot overlook the importance of imitation, or moments of imitation of the teacher. These indissociable aspects of *becoming-teacher* must first be understood as a function of something else: not imitating or assuming the teacher form, but emitting particles that enter the relation of movement and rest, or the zone of proximity, of a micro-teachernesss, in other words, that produce in the student teachers a molecular teacher. Emitting particles that enter the relation of movement and rest of a teacher could include utilizing teacher-speak, standing in front of the class looking back at the students, and/or holding one’s posture in an authoritative teacher pose, etc. So in effect, *becoming-teacher* allows the student teacher to see the world from a non-student standpoint, opening up new understandings and perspectives, new conceptualizations of the very movement and being of difference between her/his current state and another state.

*Becoming-teacher*, as a continual process, is one that is constantly in flux and is affected by external sources, or “multitudinous influences and chance interactions” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 73), such as but not limited to, TV and movies, languages, organisms, societies, parental expectations, and/or laws. As evidenced by their interview excerpts in Chapter 4, the popular (re)presentations of teachers that were portrayed and produced on the big and small screen had an effect/affect on what student teachers believed was the molar form of teacher and hence influenced and predisposed their pedagogical desires to some degree. While the exact extent to which the (re)presentations affected the participants’ desires can never be fully known, their own utterances and resonances with
the screen instances provided evidentiary support that what they viewed as the mediated molar form of teacher influenced their own conceptualizations of art teacher. Consequently, this would seemingly affect the student teachers’ individual production of a particular molecular art teacher.

The three student teachers that participated in this study are all currently in the process of becoming-teacher and though there may be similarities in their processes, because of the foundational concept of difference-in-itself, which is “the uniqueness implicit in the particularity of things and the moments of their conception and perception” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 72), no two becomings-teacher were the same. To reiterate, Deleuze focused on the individuality of each person, thing or event and how it is perceived and experienced at that moment, not assuming a pre-existing unity with other items of its ilk or with other persons in the same preservice program. Rather, Deleuze’s “conception of difference seeks to privilege the individual differences between them,” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 73), and this is especially plausible in the context of the unique circumstances of a particular student teacher’s production of self as teacher. “Awareness of such specific circumstances means that the notion of some ‘thing in general’ can be set aside in favour of one’s experience of this thing, here and now,” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 73; emphasis in original). Contextualized within the parameters of this study, though there was a particular narrative constructed around the process of becoming-teacher, there was no meta-becoming and in fact, Olivia, Jean, and Marissa, as with all others becoming-teacher, had an individual experience of their continuous movement and dynamism of change. In other words, as mentioned in Chapter 1, I do not make claims as to the generalizability of the results of the study, rather I am concerned with transferability,
“regarding those criteria which are rooted in convincing the reader through drawing her or him into the world of the participants and sensing the believability of that world” (Goldbart & Hustler, 2005, p. 17). Put differently, I am not claiming that the results of this research are indicative of all individuals in the field of art education, rather, that the results of this study “provide a flavour” (Mason, 2002, p. 126) of the relationships between the contexts and individuals sampled, which could be transferred to others in similar situations. Becoming is also important in exploring the suggestions and implications that I offer for the field of art education and preservice classrooms in the following section.

6.02 Suggestions & Implications for the Field of Art Education & Preservice Classrooms:

The suggestions that I have for the field of art education and preservice classrooms are based on the practical experiences and theoretical breakthroughs that I encountered throughout conducting this research with three art student teachers. First I begin by talking about the productive usefulness of employing visual culture as a catalyst for unfolding student teachers’ (un)conscious pedagogical fantasies and desires. Next, I discuss how important it is to have a supportive space to talk and theorize with student teachers about their continuous processes of identity (re)formation and to work through the anxieties of the profession of teaching art. Lastly, I speculate on why certain individuals in the field of art education, including teacher educators, might desire to be supervisors of student teachers, especially when considering their students’ struggles typically encountered in the (often arduous) process of student teaching.
First, I briefly discuss the productive usefulness of employing visual culture as a catalyst for unfolding student teachers’ (un)conscious pedagogical fantasies and desires. I suggest that discussing repeated images of art teachers in the media (as social activists, carefree bohemians, saviors, etc) would be productive when working with student teachers in a preservice program because “[p]opular culture, much of which is influenced by images in film and other media, is meaningful in shaping how students [student teachers] view themselves and their relationship to learning [and teaching]” (McCullick, et al., 2003, p. 4). Beyond helping shape how student teachers view themselves (personal identity) and other art teachers (collective and professional identities), the repetition in the media’s portrayals of art teachers also affects student teachers’ desires and pedagogical fantasies. “Intense experiences in viewing enable the replaying of positions of desire in which viewers find their places in a film’s fantasy, and an ‘original’ fantasy (founded as it is on early, unresolved conflicts) exercises its capacity through the ongoing structuration of subjectivity, a process irrevocably wedded to representational practices” (Robertson, 1997, p. 85). As an example, similar to the previously mentioned screen instances with Mona Lisa Smile’s Katherine, student teachers may find their place in the fantasy of teacher as savior. These screen identifications in moments of pedagogical fantasy help construct the psychical image of what it is to be an art teacher and may affect what student teachers are desiring and/or expecting in their future classrooms. “It involves acknowledging that investments in particular images allow people to construct something for themselves out of the material at hand, something having to do with need, demand, habit, hope, pleasure, and even profit” (Robertson, 1997, p. 90). Art teacher educators can use visual culture images of (art) teachers as catalysts to assist student
teachers in exploring and unfolding how they imagine teaching and open up a supportive space where they can talk about the potential needs, hopes, and pleasures that may accompany those imaginings.

Similarly, teacher educators and/or supervisors can discuss what happens when a breakage of the fantasy structure occurs (without necessarily using those specific terms) when student teachers get too close to their own fantasy and they soon realize it is only imaginary, an image, a deception—it is a product of their own positing—which can lead to frustration or hopelessness when teaching in real life doesn’t affectively equate to their fantasies of teaching. This reaffirms my belief that “popular culture can be used within pedagogy to explore what fantasy hopes for and ignores when it imagines teaching” (Robertson, 1997, p. 91). Art teacher educators and/or supervisors can encourage student teachers to reflect on their feelings, affective investments, and pedagogical fantasies (verbally or in writing) as well as the possible affects on their ideal-egos and ego-ideals. “Getting students to explore in personal journals [or verbally] the thoughts and feelings that these [images] evoke can help them work through their own inner conflicts and anxieties concerning particular issues” (Bracher, 2002, p. 117) that they may encounter in their teaching lives (identities). In other words, visual culture (re)presentations of arts educators can be utilized in art education preservice classrooms to act as an impetus for discussion about/working through the anxieties of the profession of teaching art and art teacher identity.

Second, information on identity will help teacher educators and/or supervisors in the field of art education better understand some of the conflicts and disruptions that the student teachers may be dealing with as they complete their primary and secondary
school placements. Having scholarship about identity formation from education (Stout, 2004; Danielewicz, 2001; Pittard, 2003), art education (Walker, et al, 2006; Freedman, 2001), psychoanalytic theory (Žižek, 1989; Bracher, 2002, 2006), and philosophic theory (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, 1987; May 2003), will assist the educators and/or supervisors in constructing curriculum, seminars, and dialogue that are conducive to positive and realistic identity (re)formation. Because, as Stout (2004) states, “an optimal time for actively working with the identity development process is during the beginning of any new endeavor, especially entry into a profession, since the formative nature of this process may occur simultaneously with the beginning of professional practice” (p. 1). In other words, since art teacher educators and/or supervisors are working closely with student teachers, it is an excellent time to provide a supportive space to work through the difficulties they may be facing in their clinical placements due to assuming new (professional) identities that they have not had opportunity to construct previously. This is because

student teaching is typically the first time preservice [student] teachers are immersed for an extended period of time in the context of schooling as the teacher in charge, and one of the first opportunities for them to test self perceptions of their developing identity as a teacher. (Pittard, 2003, p. 5)

Beyond providing a supportive space to work through the difficulties the student teachers may be facing, it will also be imperative that teacher educators and/or

---

22 While one might argue that the space being opened up to talk with student teachers should also be a ‘safe’ space, when talking about one’s (un)conscious fantasies and desires around teaching, the space is anything but ‘safe’. Divulging and coming to terms with concepts that may be disrupting one’s fantasy of a ‘whole self’ will be intensely personal and potentially disrupting. See Aoki (2000). Therefore, I suggest that the space for talking through the (un)conscious fantasies and desires around teaching (art) should be done in a ‘supportive’ space because of the potentially unavoidable and necessary disruptions that may result.
supervisors within art education discuss how the student teachers’ personal and professional identities may affect how they construct knowledge and teach their students. In some cases, their personal beliefs and life experiences may lead them to employ a hidden pedagogy or subconsciously cause them to work out their own past conflicts while projecting onto their students. It is therefore incumbent on us [teachers and teacher educators] to make every effort to discern the respective identity contents, structures, and maintenance practices that underwrite each facet of our teaching, and in particular to make every effort to determine when and how our identity needs and strategies may be driving us to engage in pedagogical practices that are unproductive or even harmful to our students and/or society in general. (Bracher, 2006, p. 76)

In other words, understanding their different and sometimes conflicting identities and recognizing how those may influence their teaching habits and styles may help student teachers refrain from pedagogical practices that are potentially unproductive or even harmful to their students (racist, sexist, classist, etc). An intimate knowledge of different identity categories and the internal and external resources that influence their formation can potentially assist student teachers in broader acceptance of other educators in their collective in-group and non-group members. Additionally, as briefly alluded to in the preceding footnote, student teachers may need a lot of emotional support as they traverse their pedagogical border crossings. This is because student teachers... need support for their commitment, energy and skill over their careers if they are to grapple with the immense emotional, intellectual and social demands and as they work towards building the internal and
external relationships demanded by ongoing government reforms and social movements. (Day, Kington, Stobart, & Sammons, 2006, p. 614)

Teacher educators and/or supervisors have the distinct opportunity to provide support for student teachers as they grapple with their complex and ever-changing identities while they transition from a student at the university to a teacher in the classroom.

I offer these aforementioned suggestions as potential ways to theoretically impact and change the existing discourse and protocol (standards) for preservice art education programs. While it may seem plausible or probable that art teacher educators and/or supervisors would/should already be incorporating many or all of these suggestions, for the most part it seems as if they currently are not, especially within the theoretical context I framed. For example, though some art teacher educators insightfully facilitate discussions on various aspects of identity in the preservice classroom, they do so only in the discursive context of instructing their teacher candidates (student teachers) on how to do this with the student teachers’ K-12 student population. Many art education scholars (Freedman, 2003; Walker, et al, 2006; Gude, 2007, 2009) offer numerous strategies and/or art projects and big ideas that can help (K-12) students understand and/or display their various individual and collective identities. Partially in response to this scholarship, art teacher educators and/or supervisors are telling their student teachers to “understand that individuals’ [students] identities can be shaped by the social and cultural groups to which they belong” (NAEA, 2009, p. 1), while neglecting to do the same with their own students—the art teacher candidates to whom they are instructing. The preservice classroom hasn’t been a space, so far, for talking through how the student teachers’ individual and collective teaching identities can be shaped by the social and cultural
groups to which they belong or how these groups potentially influence or disrupt how they understand or imagine teaching and learning and their conceptualization of students.

This pedagogical omission in the preservice classroom is upheld by the Other, in this case, NAEA’s (2009) *Art Teacher Preparation Standards* which overlooks missed opportunities in suggesting that art education faculty should facilitate/support their preservice/student teachers in interrogating their self-as-art-teacher identities, instead stating that the art teacher educators are responsible for preparing art teacher candidates to “have a thorough knowledge of how diverse learners acquire and develop [an] understanding of art” (p. 1). Once again, this negates the creation and utilization of a supportive space where the student teachers talk about themselves, their identities, desires, and their imagined roles in art education, succumbing to the customarily-mandated discussion of the student teachers’ future/current charges in K-12. What is overlooked and often left unsaid and untaught within current art teacher preparation is the conceptualization of student teaching positioned as the theoretical (and practical) concept of becoming-teacher, and once conceptualized as this, how to best (re)negotiate the border crossings of identity construction that are inherent in that process. This gap in art teacher preparation is where my study finds one of its distinctive niches, as information gleaned from this research could be used as a framework for interrogation and introspection of the psychic self as teacher. Utilizing visual culture representations of arts educators in TV and film in the manner I did in this study is one way of providing a pedagogical activity that can act as a springboard for (teacher) identity discussions. Anna Freud’s (1974) assertion that “teachers should have learned to know and to control their own conflicts before they begin educational work” (p. 131; as cited in Zook & Schlender,
2003, p. 75) supports my proposal of a (preservice) space for teacher-identity (re)negotiation and as a result could point to a reconceptualization of art teacher preparation programs in general.

Lastly, I speculate on why certain individuals in the field of art education, including teacher educators, might desire to be supervisors of student teachers, especially when considering their students’ struggles typically encountered in the process of student teaching. A plausible explanation for the desire to be a teacher educator/supervisor of student teachers directly harkens back to Chapter 5 and the three main desires that student teachers themselves have for becoming teachers, that of power/recognition, love/connections, and salvation/social justice. The desire for power/recognition is supported by the fantasy of being the subject-supposed-to-know, as the teacher educator/supervisor who possesses all the arts education knowledge required for her charges to successfully pass their methods classes and clinical placements. There is a desire to be seen as the one who knows, to be recognized as such, and to bask in the power that subject position imbues. Within the context of the Discourse of the University, there is also a (un)seen power in being the middle-man of arts knowledge; the teacher educator/supervisor is not the actual main source of the arts knowledge (field of art education as big Other is master of knowledge) and therefore can say that certain (unfavorable and/or costly) tasks need to be accomplished because the field of art education/department of education/state of Ohio mandated/dictated them, not the teacher educator. In other words, there is a power in being the one who knows until the information being disseminated is something the student teachers don’t want to know (there is a large fee to be collected so they can assessed by the certification board) and
then there is a power in the ability to deflect and blame this undesirable information on the Other, which in turn maintains good relations between teacher educator/supervisor and student teachers.

This deflection of blame to the Other can help foster the teacher educator/supervisor’s desire for love/connections supported by the pedagogical fantasy of student enchantment, which upholds the image of a caring educator that is on the side of the student teachers and will protect them from the uncaring big Other. Protection from the demanding master is also manifested in the desire for salvation/social justice. The teacher educator/supervisor is saving the student teachers from the Other’s social injustice of desiring certain teacherly behaviors, requiring money for particular procedures that actually reinforce the Other’s power as master (performance assessments, licensure, fingerprinting, etc), and demanding all of this within a predetermined space of time that often requires a student teacher to prioritize different aspects of her personal life (family, vacation, income, etc) in order to accomplish the demanded tasks for successful completion. There is great love given to the caring professional who fights for the student (teacher) in times of emotional/economic distress brought on by the Other.

Lastly, there may be a desire to see the self reproduced in others supported by the pedagogical fantasy of ego-identification that inspires teacher educators/supervisors to work with the student teaching population. In other words, the teacher educator/supervisor may feel a sense of power in influencing student teachers to act and sound just like her, using the same teacher postures, glances, and academic arts speak that the educator does. There is a great power in recognizing the self being emulated and/or reproduced in the other. In fact, student teaching, within the field of art education or any
other discipline, is built upon the teacher educator/supervisor determining whether or not any particular student teacher matches the other/Other’s fantasy of what it is to be a successful teacher candidate. If the student teacher doesn’t match this, the teacher educator/supervisor will mark this down on the observation form and potentially cause the student teacher to not pass—precisely because she doesn’t resemble the Symbolic and Imaginary psychic image(s) of (art) teacher decreed by the field of (art) education as the ruling Other. To reiterate, there is an insurmountable power in judging whether a student teacher candidate resembles the fantasy as dictated by the Other of which the teacher educator/supervisor answers to.

Coming to terms with these potential motivating pedagogical fantasies and desires for why I initially might have became a supervisor of student teachers and also plan on spending the majority of my career focused on this population, was difficult, but also liberating. By speaking these desires into the Symbolic, I am able to consider them, own them, and begin restructuring if I deem it necessary. Knowing these things about myself will not discourage me from working with the student teacher population; however, having this knowledge of self will help me remain reflexive about my own practices involved in teaching. While destroying, denying, or disavowing these fantasies is possible, but not necessarily desirable, being aware of my (un)conscious motivations in/for teaching will help me keep my behaviors in check. In other words, I will attempt to remain cognizant of my own desires not conflicting or potentially psychically/physically harming my student teacher charges. This realization has been a major breakthrough for me as a result of conducting this research, as has the conceptualization of student teaching as a process of becoming-teacher.
6.03 Personal Implications/Conclusions of Conducting Research:

_Becoming_ is also important in exploring my personal implications of conducting this research involving student teachers. As I was researching the processes of _becoming_ and analyzing and interpreting the data collected through the participants’ interviews, I recognized that I could transparently overlay the understanding of this concept with my own transitional chaos of _becoming-researcher_ or _becoming-professor_. These indissociable aspects of _becoming-researcher/professor_ should be understood as a function of something else: not imitating or assuming the researcher or professor molar form, but emitting particles that enter the relation of movement and rest, or the zone of proximity, of a micro-researcherness or professorness, in other words, that produced in me a molecular researcher/professor. Emitting particles that enter the relation of movement and rest of a researcher/professor could include utilizing researcher/professor elucidation techniques, writing in specific theoretical academic jargon, and continually refining an acute awareness of the current scholarship from which I am drawing and personally situated. So in effect, _becoming-researcher/professor_ allowed me to see the world from a non-doctoral student standpoint, opening up new understandings and perspectives, new conceptualizations of the very movement and being of difference between my current state as a doctoral student and another state as researcher/professor.

Coincidentally, as I was conducting this research, I had to grapple with my own moments of chaos and psychic disruption involved in gathering data and considering it for what it was as opposed to what my own experience may have dictated it as being. In other words, my own journey (and memories) as a student teacher over ten years ago
affected how I constructed my questions and also how I analyzed and interpreted the interview responses because

I did not enter this world as innocent or as an empty vessel waiting to be filled with the knowledge of student teachers. Indeed, throughout my career, I have been a student teacher… [and a classroom teacher, and a university supervisor]. These positions have shaped my present understanding. (Britzman, 2003, p. 33)

My own experiences with 20 years of learning as a student, my semester in student teaching, six years spent teaching, and three years supervising, all vastly affected how I came to conceptualize this study about art student teachers and influenced my construction of a narrative around what it means to become-teacher. I did not approach this topic as a tabula rasa expecting to be filled with all-things-student-teacher, nor did I expect to learn a substantial amount about the act of student teaching, or myself, that I felt I didn’t already know or had already experienced. Over the course of my three years as a university supervisor I witnessed my students, current art student teachers, really struggling with their various border crossings involved in learning to teach art. As a result, I desired to learn more about how I could best help facilitate student teachers through their often traumatic transitions from student to art teacher.

In the research I was conducting on the pedagogical world of art teachers, I recognized that it was both advantageous and disadvantageous for me to be an arts educator. For example, understanding and utilizing similar visual culture terminology seemed to be advantageous when asking interview questions and needing to explain concepts in a similar, but different way when prompted for clarity or reiteration by the
participants. Additionally, being able to reference plausible scenarios/situations within the art classroom (e.g. overcoming the toxic smell of modge-podge, cleaning up ever-present clay dust, and reminding their students to put ‘names on papers’) assisted me in understanding the tasks of the subject position(s) from which they were speaking. Further illustrating the point, for it to be both advantageous and disadvantageous for me to be an arts educator, Finlay (2002) shares a similar thought in her research of occupational therapists, of which she was also one.

Early in the research, I needed to work to unravel instances in which my participants and I shared understandings and ones in which we diverged. I had to guard against assuming that we shared the same language and saw the job in the same way; if I failed to do so, I might have missed the point that there were differences. (p. 537)

Like Finlay, I started with an assumption, based on my own experience as a former student teacher and classroom teacher, that as art teachers we have heightened skills at various studio techniques (such as ceramics, painting, printmaking, assemblage, etc) and that we all enjoy (to some degree) creating art. It was quite a surprise to me when I found out that not all of the student teachers I interviewed considered themselves skilled at studio, nor did they all express immense joy in artmaking. For example, when Jean announced that “I don’t feel like I’m good at it [making art]” (Jean, 6-18-09, p. 4), I recognized that though my research participants and I had many similarities in our Midwestern backgrounds, and several of us held the same career goals at that particular point in our lives, we actually had some large differences in our conceptualizations of art teacher and ourselves as art teacher subjects.
Because of this recognition of divergence and through the process of writing this dissertation, while grappling with my own becoming-researcher/professor identity, I came to understand that though I brought a lot to the (research) table, I brought that information bound within the normalizing conventions and dominant ideological frameworks of my own life circumstances. Much like my research participants, my particular social, economic, racial, and religious upbringing affected what I saw as the discourse reflecting proper art teaching. There were times when unpacking those aspects of my always-shifting identity and coming to terms with their influences in how I read the participants’ responses and re-invested and revisited my own chaos in becoming-teacher was challenging, disheartening, and/or euphoric. Other times it was emotionally numbing—especially when finding out things about myself that perhaps I wasn’t quite ready to deal with (such as my tendency to abreact my own unconscious and unsolved difficulties on my students).

Different reconciliations and theoretical work-throughs of some psychoanalytic and philosophic concepts took longer than others to acknowledge in my own behavior, and then to dissect, reassemble, and own—as my own—but I continued on, sometimes with great trepidation and sometimes resulting in absolute melancholia. However, I felt it was ideal for myself, as I previously pointed out in regard to art teacher preparation, that “teachers should have learned to know and to control their own conflicts before they begin educational work” (Freud, 1974, p. 131; as cited in Zook & Schlender, 2003, p. 75), or in my current situation, before I began (interpreting) my research. While I believe Freud’s sentiment is a bit idealistic and nearly impossible to do successfully, I did notice through my experience with the writing process that I often had to grapple with
understanding my own identities, behaviors, and responses (to the visual culture representations) within the context of psychoanalytic/philosophic thought before I could profitably work through analyzing and interpreting the collected data from the student teachers’ interview transcripts. As I had anticipated, examining my own feelings and responses, helped me better understand my participants’ responses and motivating pedagogical fantasies and desires and change my approach to my current group of student teachers that I am supervising at their various clinical placements. Furthermore, like with my increased understanding of my participants’ desires, I foresee that working through/maneuvering my own chaotic transitions while researching and becoming-professor will help me better comprehend and facilitate my future teacher candidates’ various becomings-teacher.

6.04 Supervisory Differences in Time and as Time:

Once I began observing my art student teachers in January 2010, I soon recognized that I was already referencing and utilizing pertinent sections of my research to work with and assist my new set of student teachers in ways that I had not with my former student teachers in the past. First, I now consider their two full quarters of student teaching as a process of becoming-teacher, and with that conceptualization I use it to provide a framework for better understanding their current situations as chaotic movements and dynamisms of change in time and as time. Upon divorcing the idea of student teaching as only an institutionally-determined educational requirement for licensure (or certification), I began to consider each student teacher as having a becoming individual to herself, and through this realization I become less frustrated and anxious
about the sometimes-traumatic transitions that the students were going through. Not meant to exude a callousness on my part, I simply (or not) reframed my understanding of student teaching as a process of unfolding and as a movement or transition often fraught with a necessary chaos. To reiterate, the different Lacanian and Deleuzo-Guattarian theoretical lenses through which I now view student teaching have allowed me to realize that these transitions and movements of chaos are necessary for a dynamism of change to occur. As a result, I use different language when addressing my student teachers, typically being more supportive, empathetic, and understanding as they share their dramatic lamentations from their classrooms.

The actual change in my behavior and approach to supervising student teachers is directly related to my research results and may be best understood as a switch from personally and solely championing the fantasy of being the supervisor-supposed-to-know to balancing that with a fantasy of embodying a more compassionate and connectible teacher. In other words, I no longer desired recognition as the supervisor as an astute authority that was looked (up) to or as the one that had all the Other’s (art education) answers. This was (un)consciously based on my research participants’ strong responses regarding the fantasy of student enchantment and the need for positive teacher counter-transference, and as a result, I attempted to re-coordinate my own pedagogical fantasies as supervisor. Because Olivia, Jean, and Marissa had such deep resonances with scenes involving the fantasy of student enchantment, I recognized that student teachers in the midst of such a destabilizing transitional movement potentially need a lot of support, reassurance, and personal recognition more than they need someone reminding them of the correct way to write a lesson plan. They have heard about the proper techniques and
methods for the last four years of undergrad and know this quite well. What they also might (un)consciously know is that they want someone there that has been through this process before and can guide them with a balance of arts knowledge and empathy.

Additionally, having conversations about how all student teachers are going through individual processes of *becoming-teacher*, which are necessarily chaotic and full of change, will help reassure student teachers that they are not alone in their struggles, nor is their frustration, anxiety or confusion about who they are *becoming* abnormal. It can be reassuring for student teachers to know that it is okay that their *becomings-teacher*, as well as their “identities are constantly under construction as they are reformed, added to, eroded, reconstructed, integrated, dissolved, or expanded. Each of these conceptions of ‘self’ exists simultaneously and fluidly, with varying degrees of importance or relevance given any one time or place” (Danielewicz, 2001, p. 4). These conversations help assuage a desire for recognition and validation of a student teacher’s personal struggles. As I said before, knowing that they are not alone in feeling these disruptions and conflicts that are seemingly tumultuous in their teaching lives will be a first step to potentially relieving some stress of *being the only one* going through this process.

Second, as a result of conducting this research and talking closely with my three participants, I discovered that what student teachers may desire and fantasize about in their imaginings of being an art teacher and art teacher culture may be quite different than how they actually maneuver themselves in their clinical placements, on their particular *plane of immanence*. Recognizing this from the data collected during my research, I also became aware of this occurrence with my current student teachers. Sometimes what they
state that they value most about being an effective art teacher is not apparent in their actions/mannerisms in front of their classes or written within the text of their units and lesson plans. For example, some student teachers speak of their desire to possess more arts knowledge, whether of artists, movements, or studio techniques, often supported by a fantasy of being the *subject-supposed-to-know* to their students. However, when I point out that they do not have any content knowledge (references to art historical information) listed in their plans, they often respond that it’s not needed or doesn’t fit within an art lesson where they are merely ‘making something’.

In the past when responding to a student teacher’s contradictions between fantasies and actualities (actions) in the classroom such as this one, I was a little less understanding about the discrepancies in what was uttered and what I actually observed in their written plans or in the classroom during a site visit. In the past, I did not apprehend that their desire(s) to have more arts knowledge could be supported by a potential fantasy of embodying the *subject-supposed-to-know*. I had never thought of various aspects of teaching art as fantasies that are necessary veils to make the student teachers’ (and my own) educational lives seem like coherent wholes. I can now think of various pedagogical fantasies that some art student teachers may employ, such as *subject-supposed-to-know, student enchantment*, and *ego-identification*, and potentially discern what desires may be motivating these fantasies. I do not intend to publicly call attention to these probable desires in an attempt to purposely embarrass my students, nor do I intend on categorizing (or judging) the student teachers accordingly. Even though I will try not to embarrass students because of their pedagogical fantasies and desires, I am aware that may inadvertently occur because when talking about one’s (un)conscious
fantasies and desires around teaching, the space may cause discomfort and will be anything but ‘safe’. Divulging and coming to terms with concepts that may be disrupting one’s fantasy of a ‘whole self’ will be intensely personal and potentially disrupting. Therefore, thinking of student teaching in the context of pedagogical fantasies about art education moves me in the direction of possibilities that had been beyond my comprehension before conducting this study. In other words, besides creating a new and interesting way for me to look at student teaching, it is my hope that I will also be providing student teachers with offerings of new ways to think, and ultimately to act, in a classroom, community, or world that oppress them with their preconceived art-teacher identities.

Finally, because of the findings from my research, I am better able to separate myself from my students’ (occasional) psychic disruptions involved in student teaching and have become consciously aware not to take their frustrated or anxious behaviors and/or utterances as a personal affront to how I am conducting myself as supervisor. As an example, the previous two years in my position as a supervisor I noticed that my students would lash out at me in person or via email when they were overly frustrated about something (real or perceived) going on at their clinical placements. Not understanding that frustration, as a very real feeling of dissatisfaction resulting from unfulfilled needs or unresolved problems, was in psychoanalytic terms a refusal of the student teachers’ demand for love. Now I know that when desired/demanded behaviors are not provided by their students, the student teachers may sense that they have been wronged and may become frustrated. However, the frustration may not be caused by the fact that the students didn’t complete their homework, listen to the student teachers in
class, or respond positively to their projects, but in actuality “the true frustration comes from the [students’] refusal of love” (Evans, 1996, p. 70). Being aware of this likely occurrence in their classrooms, I can have personal conversations with the student teachers and facilitate redirecting their frustration into thinking of productive ways to mend their practice(s) and potentially deflect the frustration from a (perceived) refusal of student(s) love.

Similarly, considering anxiety as more than just a feeling of distress or uneasiness of mind caused by fear of danger or misfortune or as a state of psychic tension, and conceptualizing it as the indication of the loss of the objet a, has really assisted me in speaking differently to my current student teachers. Now, instead of telling my students that anxiety “is something that everyone (in teaching) faces and they should just get over it”, I talk to them about being fully prepared before going into the classroom (so that there is less of a chance to lose the respect and adulation of students {potential objet a} when prepared with the day’s lessons). I also mention that as student teachers they are not responsible for knowing everything in the field of art education and they are not expected to be virtuosos of studio techniques. What I expect of them is to go to their placements and experiment with different techniques, both artistic and managerial, be open to making mistakes within a supportive environment and reflect on how to make the mishap better next time. In other words, I consciously try not to overly support the fantasy of having to be the subject-supposed-to-know so that I do not further stress out young, impressionable beginning teachers. Instead, I have proactive conversations about what to do before going into a classroom so that there will hopefully be no anticipated loss of the objet a.
6.05 Conclusion:

The aim of this final chapter was to explore what the resulting interpretations from this study could mean within art education student teaching (preservice) classrooms and in the broader context of the field of art education. I attempted to do this by revisiting the concept of becoming-teacher and merge this with some suggestions for how information gleaned from this study might be useful in preservice classrooms while simultaneously considering some of the broader implications for the field of art education. With a direct reference to becoming-teacher, I compared this with a couple of my thoughts about conducting research with student teachers during my process of becoming-professor. I also looked at some very specific differences I noticed in my personal approach to my current position as university supervisor of art student teachers. Through doing all of this I have come to the conclusion that

[I]earning to teach is not a mere matter of applying decontextualized skills or of mirroring predetermined images; it is time when one’s past, present, and future are set in dynamic tension. Learning to teach—like teaching itself—is always the process of becoming: a time of formation and transformation, of scrutiny into what one is doing, and who one can become. (Britzman, 2003, p. 31)

While the pedagogical fantasies and desires that may initially motivate one to teach can seem counter-intuitive to a caring, socially just conceptualization of the (art) educational field, coming to terms with one’s pedagogical fantasies and desires can also be liberating. Being aware of what is fueling educators to teach can potentially help them remain cognizant of their own desires so as not to conflict with or potentially psychically harm their student teacher charges. What a psychically distressing day it will be when we as
teacher educators get too close to our fantasies of (art) education and (art) student teachers and they break down as soon as we realize they are Imaginary illusions of our own (and the Other’s) positing. God save the (fantasy) screen!
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APPENDIX B: RESEARCH LETTER
Dear former 2008-2009 Student Teacher:

In association with the Art Education Department at The Ohio State University, and under the supervision of Professor Kevin Tavin, I am conducting individual and small group interviews as part of my research into student teachers’ perceptions of the ideas, reasons, and/or desires for becoming an art teacher and what representations may have mediated them. My research is concerned with exploring how those various representations [including TV and film images] of teachers and teacher culture may have influenced the perceptions art student teachers have of their emergent professional identities and their pedagogical desires. Specifically, I am interested in the transition and dynamism in the movement between the student teachers’ individual states of being a student at the University and their states of being a teacher in the classroom. Personal illustrations and survey questions will also be part of participation in the study.

As a former student in the Student Teaching Practicum (Autumn 2008—Spring 2009), I am hoping you will be willing to answer some questions about your transition between being a student at the University and being a teacher in the art classroom. Students who elect to participate in these interviews will be asked to share short narratives from their past for this study, however, sharing these narratives is completely voluntary. The individual interview will last between one and two hours, and the small group interview is anticipated to last between two and three hours. The research illustrations, surveys, and individual and group interviews will be conducted between June 8, 2009 and July 17, 2009. The interviews will be audio recorded for accuracy. You will have the opportunity to review and approve your contributions through a final check of your interview data before the research is concluded.

You are under no obligation to participate in this study’s individual or group interview, or final survey. If you do choose to participate, please know that I will make every effort to protect your confidentiality: All responses from the interview will be made anonymous, both by expunging identifying personal information and by using pseudonyms. You must be over 18 years of age to take part in this study—please include your date of birth on the attached consent form if you decide to participate. [If you participate, I will send you an actual consent form, you do not need to print it].

I hope you will consider participating in the study. Your insights will be of great help to me in my work of exploring and understanding the student teacher’s transition between being a student in the University and becoming an art teacher in the classroom. This research will be an important contribution to the study and teaching of preservice curriculum in future art teacher education programs.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact me (hetrick.81@osu.edu) or Professor Kevin Tavin, the faculty member serving as principle investigator of this research project (tavin.1@osu.edu).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Laura Hetrick
Department of Art Education
258 Hopkins Hall
Columbus, OH
APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

I consent to participating in research entitled: Pedagogical Desire(s): The Unfolding of Art Teacher Identity in the Context of Media Representations

In written communication, Dr. Kevin Tavin, principal investigator, or Laura Hetrick, co-investigator, have explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described, as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: _________________________          Signed: ___________________________________

(Participant)

Signed: __________________________     Signed: ___________________________________

(Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative)

(Person authorized to consent for participant, if required)

Witness: ___________________________   Participant’s Date of Birth: ___________________

HS-027E Consent for Participation in Exempt Research