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Almost since its inception, public education in the United States has been associated with preparing citizens. As early as the 1779 preamble of his bill for free schools in Virginia, Thomas Jefferson asserted public schools could – and should – be considered a means for educating students for democratic citizenship. “The government needs wise and honest laws, Jefferson argued, and thus it needs educated and virtuous law makers (Kaestle, 1983, p. 6). In large part, it was this assumption about the ability of public schools to prepare citizens that led to the creation of the area of study known as “social studies.” The Social Studies in Secondary Education: The 1916 Report of the Committee on Social Studies, considered one of the most influential documents in legitimating the field of social studies (Engle, 1994), explicitly states, “(T)he social studies of the American high school should have for their conscious and constant purpose the cultivation of good citizenship” (p. 9).

A closer examination of the concept of “citizen” and the historical development of the role of the citizen in democratic society, particularly as these have been presented in social studies education, illustrates the extent to which these conceptions have been limited by the hegemony of traditional interpretations. The intent of this study was to challenge the dominant discourse related to educating for democratic citizenship through feminist perspectives that illustrate the partiality of these traditions.
This study had both a substantive and a methodological focus. The main focus was substantive. The study explored the possibilities created by feminist and other alternative interpretations of citizenship in democratic societies -- particularly as these concepts relate to secondary social studies education. This substantive issue was addressed, however, by a less than traditional methodology; hence the methods themselves were also a secondary focus of the study.

The study is presented in five chapters. This, the first, provides an introduction to the study, summaries of the theoretical framework for the research topic and methodology, and a brief description of the research methods. Chapter Two presents an in-depth explanation of the research methodology. In Chapter Three, provides the reader with a brief orientation to the traditions that have influenced current interpretations of citizenship. In Chapter Four, the presentation of data and review of literature are integrated to present a "story." In this chapter, the study's participants interact with one another, share our experiences and ideas about citizenship and the role of education in preparing citizens for a role in democratic society, and discuss the theoretical literature related to the topic. The fifth and final chapter discusses the substantive and methodological implications of the study.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Almost since its inception, public education in the United States has been associated with preparing citizens. As early as the 1779 preamble of his bill for free schools in Virginia, Thomas Jefferson asserted public schools could -- and should -- be considered a means for educating students for democratic citizenship. "The government needs wise and honest laws, Jefferson argued, and thus it needs educated and virtuous law makers (Kaestle, 1983, p. 6). In large part, it was this assumption about the ability of public schools to prepare citizens that led to the creation of the area of study known as "social studies." The Social Studies in Secondary Education: The 1916 Report of the Committee on Social Studies, considered one of the most influential documents in legitimating the field of social studies (Engle, 1994), explicitly states, "(T)he social studies of the American high school should have for their conscious and constant purpose the cultivation of good citizenship" (p. 9).

A closer examination of the concept of "citizen" and the historical development of the role of the citizen in democratic society, particularly as these have been presented in social studies education, illustrates the extent to which these conceptions have been limited by the hegemony of traditional interpretations. The purpose of this study was to
challenge the dominant discourse related to educating for democratic citizenship through feminist perspectives that illustrate the partiality of these traditions.

My intention was not merely to "report" these perspectives as they are presented in the literature or as they emerged in the data collected for this study. Instead, the study was intended to generate a valuable heuristic tool for rethinking what it means to educate citizens in a democracy. In so doing, the product and the process used for its construction could not be separated. It was this recognition that led me to the decision to develop a "story," grounded in the data but including fictional elements, that reflected not only the challenges raised to existing conceptions of citizenship but also the process through which these provocations were raised.

**Overview of the Study**

This study had both a substantive and a methodological focus. The main focus was substantive. The study explored the possibilities created by feminist and other alternative interpretations of citizenship in democratic societies -- particularly as these concepts relate to secondary social studies education. This substantive issue was addressed, however, by a less than traditional methodology; hence the methods themselves were also a secondary focus of the study.

The study is presented in five chapters. This, the first, provides an introduction to the study, summaries of the theoretical framework for the research topic and methodology, and a brief description of the research methods. Chapter 2 presents an in-depth explanation of the research methodology. Chapter 3 consists of a brief history of the relationship between citizenship and education in the United States. In Chapter 4, the presentation of data and review of literature are integrated to present a "story." In this
chapter, the study's participants interact with one another, share our experiences and ideas about citizenship and the role of education in preparing citizens for a role in democratic society, and discuss the theoretical literature related to the topic. Finally, Chapter 5 consists of my discussion of the story, as well as the substantive and methodological implications of the story.

Rationale for the Study: Engaging Postmodern Feminist Perspectives in Social Studies Education

The genesis for this study emerged from a literature review I conducted in the spring of 1997 in which I attempted to synthesize and analyze the role of women in the field of social studies education. However, during my preliminary searches, I was surprised -- and dismayed -- to find relatively little information related to this topic. This is not to imply there are no women in social studies education. In fact, many female social studies educators are well published and assume active roles in the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) and the College and University Faculty Association (CUFA). My consternation from the literature review resulted not so much from the absence of women's voices, but the silences\(^1\) regarding some of the fundamental assumptions in which social studies education is grounded -- particularly as they relate to feminist perspectives.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\)It is interesting to note that while I see silence as something to be filled, Valerie Ooka Pang suggests that intentional silence is a powerful tool in democratic societies that can suggest respect and dignity as much as passivity and oppression. For a more thorough discussion of her ideas, see her recent article, "Intentional Silence and Communication in a Democratic Society: The Viewpoint of One Asian American."

\(^2\)When using the terms "feminist issues" I refer to those matters in social studies education in which the construction of gender has a particularly influential role in ways we think and act. This position is not limited to women.
Hahn (1996) observes that the "knowledge explosion in feminist scholarship" in the social sciences over the past twenty years is not reflected in social studies research (p. 8). A few notable exceptions exist, including Hahn's work. To a large extent, these rarities are feminists working within a postmodern framework; I found examples of this work thought provoking and catalytic. I wanted to create new spaces for women's voices that interrogate traditional approaches to social studies education. Specifically, I wanted to challenge what has long been considered the fundamental goal of social studies educators: preparing citizens for active roles in democratic societies.\(^3\)

Until recently, discussion of women's issues in social studies education has been limited primarily to criticisms of textbooks and curriculum, specifically the ways in which gender stereotypes are perpetuated and women's roles in history and government omitted (Noddings, 1995). Such issues are significant and I wholeheartedly support reform efforts in these areas. However, Bernard-Powers (1996a), in her guest editorial of a recent Theory and Research in Social Education edition dedicated to the relationship between gender and social studies theory and research, reminds us that "the project is far more complex" (p. 2). While textbook and curricular reform efforts address the way in which what we say we know is presented, questions about how we know and how our knowing is affected by our identities have been left unposed.

Recently, however, notable (though limited in number) exceptions to this trend have emerged. To a large extent, this work originates with feminists working within a

---

\(^3\)While I acknowledge the fundamental role citizenship education plays in social studies education, I also support Grant's (1996) position that this should not be exclusive to social studies. Instead, schools should develop a cohesive program through which citizenship education is supported in all academic areas and school-wide activities reflect a sense of civic involvement in the school and/or local community.
postmodern framework. Stone (1996b) notes, "the most vital theoretical work comes from postmodernist/poststructuralist feminists who promote women's posthumanist difference as the basis for equality" (p. 39). Stone's observations are not unbiased; she writes as a postmodernist feminist. However, I suggest these theories are more than passing trends. If social studies educators are to benefit from current epistemological debates, we must be willing to engage in the discourse. The following examples of research and theory from social studies education represent current attempts to enter the conversation.

**Postmodern Feminist Research and Theory in Social Studies**

Several recent articles in social studies journals indicate an important shift toward including feminist postmodernist perspectives in social studies education. Ten Dam and Rijkschroeff (1996), for example, explore the ways in which changing the social construction of gender influences male and female students' perceptions of women's history in the Netherlands. Ten Dam and Rijkschroeff note, "The meaning of gender varies according to context. Femininity, masculinity, and the unequal relationship between men and women are social manifestations that can assume a different form again and again" (Malson, O'Barr, Westphal-Eihl, & Wyer, 1989, p. 75, as cited in Ten Dam and Rijkschroeff).

Ten Dam and Rijkschroeff's position parallels the feminist postmodernist notion of situated knowledges. "Situated knowledges" are "marked knowledges" that produce "maps of consciousness" which reflect the ways in which race, class, gender, and nationality affect how knowledge is constructed (Haraway, 1991, p. 111). Wolf (1996) clarifies Haraway's conception of situated knowledges, "They reflect our locationality
(historical, national, generational) and positionality (race, gender, class, nationality, sexuality), acknowledging how the dynamics of where we are always affects our viewpoint and the production of knowledge without privileging one particular position over another . . . " (p. 14). Ten Dam and Rijks Schroeff’s conclusions indicate that, to a large extent, boys and girls’ interpretations of equality and difference, as well as the value they place on women’s history, reflect the ways in which they shape and are shaped by their positions and locations in life.

In an attempt to understand the implications of gender in political learning, Hahn (1996) employs both quantitative and qualitative methods in developing a case study of two civics classes. Hahn’s work challenges earlier research in political socialization which often identified gender as a factor in determining one’s political beliefs and opinions but left unchallenged the way in which gender is constructed in society. Although she found no significant differences between males and females in these two civics classes, Hahn suggests that additional research needs to explore minor distinctions in areas of political difference. Hahn’s work, while important in intent, is somewhat problematic. Her sample is limited in terms of quantitative analysis yet, instead of using these results as strictly descriptive statistics, she makes statistical inferences. However, her efforts to include both quantitative and qualitative methods are to be applauded. In addition, she attempts to take a previously established area of research in a new direction.

Another interesting trend in recent social studies literature is the blurring of lines

---

Hahn’s use of both qualitative and quantitative methods is a good example of most feminists’ rejection of the dichotomy often associated between these techniques. Campbell and Schram (1995) posit that “few feminist methodologists take a strong either/or positions [about qualitative vs. quantitative methods], and many argue that the . . . distinction is a false polarization” (p. 89).
between public and personal. Feminists often critique the ways in which women's issues are portrayed as "private" while the "public domain" belongs to men (Stone, 1996b, p. 43). Most notably, Noddings (1994, 1994a, 1995) challenges the public/private binary. She encourages teachers to use autobiographical, biographical, and fictional stories to illuminate the ways in which textbook knowledge is often fragmented and incomplete (1994a). In addition, she advocates the use of conversations on a philosophical, metaphysical (including issues often associated with religion), and personal level (between adults and children) as a means for promoting more effective moral education. Noddings argues the dichotomy between the personal and public creates a void in which students are left without the care and encouragement necessary for success.

In a similar attempt to demonstrate the interactive nature of social and public domains, Hart (1997) suggests the social studies curriculum include not only the names and faces of women, but also their contributions to social life. Hart argues that by limiting social studies to the "political," educators lose a valuable opportunity to demonstrate ways in which students, like many women in history, can yield political power by promoting a social agenda.

Bickmore (1996), Stone (1996b), and Bloom (1998) address issues of citizenship and democracy. Stone offers an insightful analysis of the feminist contribution to the concept of citizen. She mobilizes the writings of feminist philosophers in challenging the ways in which political philosophies have been presented in the past. Bickmore assumes a more pragmatic approach. She explores ways in which conflicting perspectives in social studies education (such as those identified by Stone) prepares young women for claiming a voice in social change toward equity. In addition, Bickmore suggests teachers
engage in practices of feminist pedagogy which "decenter authority in the classroom" and remediate the "antidemocratic practices" which have often characterized citizenship education in the past (p. 235). Bloom attempts to bring together the theoretical and pedagogical: "As a feminist theorist concerned with equity, I write to participate in the critiques of universality because this is essential to the ongoing project of reshaping women's places in society . . . As a feminist educator, I write to contribute to ongoing efforts to radically challenge the standard curriculum of democratic education" (p. 31).

This review highlights the most notable contributions to a developing body of literature in social studies education. However, it should be noted that some of these studies fall victim to what critics of feminist theory and research often refer to as "essentialism." Tensions between addressing feminist issues and dangers of promoting a singular "women's" perspective are constant.

**Implications for the Study**

Social studies researchers and theorists are only beginning to explore the extent to which "gender dynamics, gender identities, and gendered knowledges affect social studies education" (Bernard-Powers, 1996a, p. 2). I posit that such questions are imperative to the future of social studies education. However, creating spaces for these questions is problematic, particularly given the extent to which such issues have traditionally been omitted from social studies discourse. Fine (1992) suggests feminists challenge the androcentric hegemony by using "disruptive voices." She invites those of us concerned with women's issues "collectively and collaboratively, to disrupt, transgress, and invent possibilities . . . displaying all our contradictions and differences" (p. xii). Fine posits feminists promote change by interrupting what have traditionally
been unchallenged discourses.

Stone (1996a) suggests a similar strategy in describing the possibilities of “disruptive teaching.” Stone advocates that reading about individuals who have been influential in promoting change through their disruptions to the status quo may provide inspiration for others. She challenges educators to acknowledge teaching, schooling and education as ethical endeavors and to accept their “obligation” to engage in disruptive teaching. Stone concludes that nothing short of displacing the status quo can address the needs of those who have been marginalized.

As noted earlier, Stone (1996b), Bickmore (1996), and Bloom (1998) present three perspectives on the issues of citizenship and democracy. Stone’s position, well-grounded in philosophical traditions, articulates a postmodern, feminist, theoretical framework for reconsidering the definition and role of citizenship in the United States. Bickmore, however, focuses her attentions on the practical implications of applying feminist perspectives of democracy and citizenship to the classroom. Bloom’s attempt to integrate the theoretical and pedagogical dimensions of this issue reflects some of my own questions: How do feminist social studies educators perceive the concept of “citizen”? What are their responses to the theoretical frameworks presented by feminists and others challenging the status quo in “civic education”? How do they relate these ideas to their practice?

This study represents a response to these questions and an attempt to create spaces for feminist voices in social studies education. In collaboration with a group of classroom teachers, I attempted to mobilize Fine and Stone’s notion of “disruption” as a tool for demonstrating what may be considered “situated knowledges” but which are
often presented as complete and unchallenged. Collectively, the group addressed what is considered to be one of the most fundamental principles in social studies education: citizenship education. The connection between education and citizenship has been at the very core of the social studies tradition and, therefore, offered a particularly interesting opportunity for disrupting our thinking and practice related to educating citizens in a democratic society.

This study, then, emerged from two key assumptions. First, social studies educators should explore the possibilities presented by postmodern and feminist theories, particularly as these offer challenges to the hegemony surrounding citizenship education. The discussion presented above provides a foundation for this assumption. The second assumption rests on the premise that postmodernism and feminism affects not only what we know, but how we know. This assumption had obvious implications for the epistemological framework of the study, as well as the research methodology and design discussed below.

**Epistemological Framework for Research Methodology: Working Within the “Uneasy Alliance” of Feminism and Postmodernism**

Positioning myself as a “postmodern feminist” places me in the midst of oft-times competing paradigms, each of which is mired in contradictions, controversies, and conundrums. I do, however, live and work in the midst of this sometimes inviting, often angst-ridden terrain. In the following section, I provide an overview of related literature in feminism and postmodernism, including the juncture where these two philosophies meet.
Feminism . . . FeminismS

"Feminism" is a misnomer. The wide array of scholars working within feminist theory represents diverse perspectives, backgrounds, and theoretical foundations – making the term feminisms a more appropriate descriptor. Among these are scholars working in Black feminist thought (Collins, 1989, 1991; hooks, 1984, 1990; Lourde, 1984); postcolonial perspectives (Anzaldúa, 1987; Baca Zinn, 1979; 1996; Lal, 1996; Mohanty, 1988; Robinson, 1994; Trinh, 1989); and feminist materialism (Hartsock, 1990; Roman, 1993). Increasingly, feminist from these various theoretical frameworks are working within and/or against postmodernism. Recent controversies in feminist theory have focused less on the specific research strategies than on the way in which research is conceptualized and the theories of knowledge (and being) which undergird these interpretations. To more fully understand what Oleson (1994) describes as a “highly labile moment” in feminism, it is important to note the distinctions that have been drawn between method, methodology, and epistemology.

Harding (1987, p. 2) describes method as “techniques” or specific practices in research (surveys, observations, interviews). A research method provides a strategy for (or a way of proceeding in) gathering evidence. Researchers, including feminists, may utilize the same methods but the manner in which these methods are developed and the data interpreted varies widely. Methodology is much broader in scope and defined by Harding as a theoretically informed framework that may or may not specify a particular research method. A methodology is a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed. Lather (1991b), building on Harding, suggests that “methodology is a site where we make ourselves intelligible to ourselves, a place of constructed visibility and
incitements to see what frames our seeing” (p. 6). Epistemology serves as the foundation for method and methodology. Epistemologies respond to questions about “who can be a ‘knower,’ what can be known, what constitutes and validates knowledge, and what the relationship is or should be between knowing and being (that is, between epistemology and ontology)” (Stanley & Wise, 1990, p. 26).

While dissenting opinions exist among feminists regarding epistemologies, Wolf (1996) posits that there is general agreement in the challenge feminists pose to positivism and its underlying assumptions:

In a rather dwarfed nutshell, positivist science is based on the tenet of value-free objectivity that can, should, and must be attained by the scientist or social scientist in order to seek and uncover ‘facts’ and ‘the truth.’ Research must be completely replicable by others, and this entire endeavor is thought to further our knowledge of universal truths. This view of science entails and encourages distance and noninvolvement between the researcher and researched and assumes that the researcher can objectively see, judge, and interpret the life and meanings of his/her subjects. (p.4)

Wolf’s disclaimer regarding her summary of positivism as a “rather dwarfed nutshell” is well-heeded, however it lays the foundation for positioning feminist epistemologies. Griffiths (1995) concludes, “None of the feminist epistemologies assumes or argues that the perspective of the individual human being can be superseded by the ‘objective’ ‘view from nowhere’ or by a ‘God’s eye view.’ All assume that the self, or a particular subjective position, is a starting point. . . “ (p. 59). While feminists reach consensus on little else, there is almost unanimous agreement on their rejection of positivist tenets of objectivity and universal truths (Campbell & Schram, 1995; Gorenlick, 1991; Nielsen, 1990; Wolf, 1996). The contradictions between positivism and feminism are obvious, though worthy of stating as a means of finding similarities across various
feminist perspectives. However, the general rejection of positivism among feminists does not result in consensus regarding a feminist epistemology.

Harding (1987) suggests three epistemological positions for feminisms. First, *feminist empiricism* remains within many of the parameters established as part of the positivist tradition while also challenging some of the tenets of "normal" science (referring to Kuhn's work) because of its insistence that the identity of the researcher influences the research. "The people who identify and define scientific problems leave their social fingerprints on the problems and their favored solutions to them" (p. 184, also cited in Lather, 1992, p. 92). My informal review of the literature related to feminist research indicates that, while feminist empiricism continues to inform the work of some feminists (particularly in psychology), this position is increasingly rare for feminists publishing in the social sciences and education.

Harding's (1986) second epistemological position is *feminist standpoint theories of knowledge*. These theories place the researcher's social position in the foreground. Lather (1992) explains, "Male domination results in partial and distorted accounts of social life. A feminist standpoint, achieved through struggle both against male oppression and toward seeing the world through women's eyes, provides the possibility of more complete and less distorted understandings" (p. 93). Acknowledging the variety of social positions from which women come, Harding posits that there is not one feminist standpoint theory, but many. In all cases, however, feminist standpoint theory advocates privileging women's experiences as a way of gaining insights to existing social structures and power dynamics. This position assumes that, as part of the "oppressed," women will have an "outsider" perspective that can actually increase the objectivity of the study.
Therefore, women's subjectivities are not the only ones that exist but, because society is considered a construction of men's subjectivities, prioritizing women's experiences acknowledges realities that exist but have been silenced.

It is important to note that, while Harding clarified the distinctions between this epistemological position and feminist empiricism, Hartsock is also closely associated with its articulation (Wolf, 1996). Hartsock (1987), drawing on Marxist theory, posits that women's position in the patriarchal hegemony means that, generally speaking, women have better insights into the lives of other women (as cited in Wolf, 1996, p.13). Hartsock's position is similar to most feminist standpoint theorists in that she assumes a "critical" stance. Critical theorists, from a feminist standpoint perspective as well as others, seek to emancipate—that is, to uncover aspects of society that maintain the status quo by restricting or limiting different groups' access to the means for gaining knowledge (Nielsen, 1990, p. 9).

In framing what they propose for a feminist epistemology, Stanley and Wise (1990) identify some of the epistemological and ontological foundations which distinguish theories and research — both as a way to draw distinctions between feminist perspectives and others, as well as within feminism. Operating primarily within what Harding (1987) refers to as a feminist standpoint epistemology, Stanley and Wise argue that “feminism . . . should be present in positive ways within the research process, as feminist epistemological principles underpinning behaviour and analysis. . .” (p. 23). They suggest five “related sites” for these underlying assumptions:

1) in the researcher-researched relationship;

2) in emotion as a research experience;
3) in the intellectual autobiography of researchers; therefore

4) in how to manage the differing ‘realities’ and understandings of researchers and researched; and thus

5) in the complex question of power in research and writing (p. 23).

A radical subjectivist position on reality is embedded in these principles. According to this position, there are no objective social truths because there can be no facts -- only social productions of knowledge.

Stanley and Wise face criticism from other feminists. Code (1991) argues that the subjectivist nature of Stanley and Wise’s feminist epistemology, though understandable in the context of positivistic sciences which have relied on “masculine analyses of women’s experiences” (p. 40), risks the possibility that feminist analysis and research “be dismissed as one idiosyncratic way of seeing the world . . .” (p. 41). Code suggests that the “radical subjectivist” position “reveals the tenacity of a philosophical adherence to a strict fact/value distinction.” Challenging what she describes as “the malleability of social reality . . . to its most extreme interpretation,” (p. 40), Code suggests:

There is no doubt about the need for persistent and responsible self-criticism in feminist research and for acknowledging the self-referentiality of every inquirer’s position. Her position is as revisable, as negotiable, as the ‘negotiated’ reality she studies. She can, at most, conduct a temporally, culturally, and geographically located analysis, according to the best evidence available. But such an acknowledgment does not deny that there are right and wrong descriptions of social realities or that evidence needs to be counted, objectively, as evidence . . . . Women’s lives and experiences are constructed in ideology-saturated cultural locations, and there are facts, open to analysis, about how ideological effects operate . . . . Social practices, attitudes, institutions are far from constant, yet neither are they mere ephemera of a researcher's imagination. They are there, present for analysis. Facts may mean different things to different people, affect some people profoundly and others not at all: hence they are both subjective and objective (p. 45).
Code's position reflects the complexities of the epistemological debates. Her position offers a valuable response to one of the most common criticisms of feminist theories. By situating knowledge in a manner that can be both subjective and objective, depending on one's position, Harding (1986) posits a defense against charges of complete or radical relativism. Of course, her position will not satisfy positivists seeking absolute lines between objective and subjective facts. However, for those acknowledging that multiple social realities exist, she provides a foundation for assessing why and how some knowledges are viewed as more or less objective than others.

Although feminist standpoint theorists acknowledge the existence of multiple standpoints, this epistemology is often challenged by other feminists concerned with issues of power, voice and representation. Gorelick (1996), referring to the work of hooks (1984), Fisher (1989), and Hartsock (1987) notes that Harding fails to acknowledge the extent to which white, privileged women's positionality dominates feminist standpoint theories -- what she refers to as a "hierarchy of standpoints" (as cited in Gorelick). Gorelick argues that "the perspectives of women of color must move to the center of feminist theory and the feminist movement. White feminists' definitions of feminism must be overturned by the view from below or from 'the margin'" (p. 36). In addition, Reinharz (1992) challenges the "epistemology of insiderness," while Epstein, Jayaratne, and Stewart (1990) consider Harding's position essentialist in the sense that it overlooks questions of difference (as cited in Wolf, 1996, p. 13). The issue of epistemic privilege within feminist standpoints is contentious. The controversy is further complicated by feminists like Wolf (1996), who raises questions regarding the implications of taking feminist standpoint theory in a direction which suggests that "only
those of a particular race or ethnic group can study or understand others in a similar situation, or that only those who are women of color or lesbian can generate antiracist or antihomophobic insights” (referring also to Harding, 1991, p. 278).

While perhaps not the intention of feminist standpoint theory, the danger lies in the tendency for some feminists to present one particular experience or perspective as representative of all women — hence, the charges of essentialism. The political agenda, embedded or explicitly stated in most feminist research, makes the inclination for generalizations about what “women” need or the impact of existing social institutions on “women” considerably more likely. The challenge lies in recognizing women’s vastly different experiences while still presenting women as a political interest group with enough cohesiveness to challenge the status quo. In addition, criticisms from hooks (1990) and Collins (1989, 1991) suggest that feminist standpoint theory reduces the extent to which white women identify themselves as part of the power elite. Issues of race, ethnicity, sexuality and colonial pasts make this position a precarious one for Feminists -- particularly those striving for commonalities which unite women across these divides. Gorelick (1996) provides an insightful reminder: “The notion that there must be ‘many stories,’ that is, a fragmentary science, is similar to men’s assumptions that the study of gender is only about women’s worlds. On the contrary, difference of condition does not mean absence of relationship” (p. 36). These relationships include a complex web of power and identity in which the oppressed sometimes act as the oppressors and identities are multidimensional.

Harding (1987) suggests that the tensions within and between feminist empiricism and feminist standpoint epistemologies reveal their “transitional” status. She refers to
these as "successor sciences," based on their assumption that "feminist knowledges are better or truer because derived from 'outsiders' who can see the relations of domination and suppression for what they truly and objectively are" (Stanley & Wise, 1990, p. 27).

Harding proposes a third, though initially less clearly enunciated, epistemological position for feminists: feminist postmodernism. Harding posits that feminist postmodernism makes the tensions that exist in the successor sciences strengths instead of weaknesses. By acknowledging the existence of feminist standpoints (including, presumably, those of women of color, postcolonial and lesbian positions), we accept that each has an epistemological validity because each has an ontological validity, producing what Stanley and Wise (1990) refer to as "contextually grounded truths" (p. 28). While Harding's definitions have generated a storm of criticism among feminists (in addition to those referenced above, see Zita, 1988), her initial attempts at grappling with the issue of feminist epistemology make her a referent for virtually all discussion regarding the existence and/or articulation of feminist epistemology.

Some consider the lack of a cohesive epistemology disconcerting. Lazreg (1994), for example, notes, "The search for a woman-centered epistemology has resulted in a disappointing eclecticism, primarily due to the feminist quandary about what to do with existing epistemologies" (p. 55). However, the lack of consensus regarding feminist epistemologies, while confusing and frustrating -- particularly for the novice -- should not be considered the failure that Lazreg implies. Instead, the "eclecticism" reflects the disruption of essentialist notions and a rejection of the possibility of a new hegemony, particularly among feminists speaking from postmodern and/or postcolonial perspectives. Such a state in feminist theory may be viewed as a crisis. However, as Lather (1991a)
suggests, “Such questioning of basic assumptions might be seen as an effort to break out of the limitations of increasingly inadequate category systems and toward theory capable of grasping the complexities of people and the cultures they create — theories outside of binary logics of certainty, non-contradiction, totality and linearity” (xvi).

**FeminismS and Postmodernism: “An Uneasy Alliance”**

Clearly, no single definition of postmodernism exists and any absolute claims regarding a definition would be antithetical to the premise of the position. Nicolson (1990) notes: “Postmodernism must reject a description of itself as embodying a set of timeless ideals contrary to those of modernism; it must insist on being recognised as a set of viewpoints of a time, justifiable only within its own time (p. 11). Usher and Edwards (1994) explain that to discuss postmodernism “is to use a loose umbrella term under whose broad cover can be encompassed at one and the same time a condition, a set of practices, a cultural discourse, an attitude and a mode of analysis” (p. 7).

The “umbrella” rests primarily on the work of French philosophers, particularly Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, and Jean-Francois Lyotard. The emphases these philosophers place on the discourse of knowledge, power, and subjectivities, and truth provide a foundation for deconstructing what Foucault describes as “regimes of truth.” In most cases, this process requires not only new perspectives but also a different way of thinking about what and how we know. “The postmodern moment is an awareness of being within a way of thinking. The speaker (subject) cannot absolutely name the terms of that moment” (Marshall, 1992 as cited in Usher & Edwards, 1994, p. 6).
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1 Usher and Edwards (1994) provide a thoughtful discussion of what they describe as the “uneasy alliance”
Lather (1992) suggests the term postmodern can be generally used to describe “the shift in material conditions of the late 20th century monopoly capitalism brought on by the micro-electronic revolution in information technology, the fissures of a global, multi-national hyper-capitalism, and the global uprising of the marginalized... All of this creates a conjunction that shifts our sense of who we are and what is possible” (p. 90). Lather (1991b) also uses the phrase “postparadigmatic diaspora” to describe the postmodern world in which not only what we know is debated, but how we go about knowing what we know is questioned.

Strickland (1994), acknowledging that her definition speaks in general terms, states that postmodernism "opposes the search for coherence and a desire for the 'right answer'. It suggests instead the continuation of 'conversations' -- conversations having no given goal or end, and not aiming at a single representation of reality. Postmodern critique goes . . . to an insistence that justification and legitimation are internal to a practice, language game or tradition, with no wider standard to which they are answerable, no certain or external criteria against which to judge their adequacy” (p. 266). Strickland posits that, in spite of “superficial” similarities to feminism and feminists’ concerns about essentialism and universalism, postmodernism is problematic to feminism because of “very different” perspectives, reasons, interests and objectives in its critique of the Enlightenment.

Usher and Edwards (1994) suggest “any alliance between feminism and postmodernism is and will continue to remain an uneasy one, first, because there is a plurality of feminist positions . . . not all of which accept the need to radically challenge
modernism and, second, because feminism is itself located in the legacy of the Enlightenment tradition . . . ” (p. 20). This first point, regarding the multiple interpretations of feminism, makes connections to postmodernism, itself “not a unified discourse,” a complex and sometimes confusing matter (Usher & Edwards, p. 21).

Hartsock (1990), for example, warns against embracing postmodernist subjectivities that reject the possibility of women gaining power by re/decentering epistemologies (as cited in Usher & Edwards). Flax (1990) echoes this concern in her critiques of Foucault, Derrida, and Rorty for the absence of gender relations in their discussions of power.

Other feminists, however, argue for an integration of postmodernism and feminism. Hekman (1990) suggests feminism will continue to stagnate until it moves beyond rationalism. A product of the Enlightenment, Hekman asserts, rationalism is Western and masculine. Usher and Edwards (1994) clarify, “The claim that only rational, abstract, universalistic thought can produce truth embodies a masculine definition of truth. In each of the dichotomies, the male is associated with the privileged element – rational, subject, culture – and the female with the disprivileged element – irrational, object, nature” (p. 23). Consequently, postmodernism’s rejection of rationalism as a means of producing universal truth offers new possibilities for feminist thought.

It is here, in this space for new possibilities that exists at the juncture of feminism and postmodernism, that this study was conceived and designed. To a large extent, this study was designed to explore the epistemological foundations for our beliefs, attitudes,

---

6 The use of “rational” in this context is linked to rationalism in its historical and philosophical sense.
and behaviors regarding our roles as teachers whose goal is to educate citizens for a democratic society.

**Research Design**

In the following section, I provide a brief overview of the research design. A more thorough discussion of the methodology is presented in Chapter 2. The methodology reflects my effort to work within a feminist and postmodernist paradigm in which knowledge is considered constructed, partial and situated (Haraway, 1991); knowledge and power are generated through discourse (Foucault, 1991); subjectivities are embraced yet interrogated (Lather & Smithies, 1997; Peshkin, 1988; Williams, 1990) and writing is part of the inquiry process (Richardson, 1990, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1997).

**Identifying Participants**

Participants for this study were identified through a process of purposeful sampling (Patton, 1994). Participants were invited to join the study based on the following criteria:

1. Their position as a secondary social studies teacher;
2. An interest in engaging in the scholarly literature which challenged the hegemonic definitions of citizenship and educating for democratic citizenship;
3. A preexisting relationship with me and with the other participants.

In order for the group to engage in the level of discourse necessary to interrogate our assumptions about the meaning of citizenship in democratic societies from a variety of feminist perspectives, a level of rapport at which discussion could occur easily and ideas shared freely was necessary. The similarity in our positions, our mutual interest in the issues, and an already existing friendship among the group made it possible to
achieve an open environment for our discussions very quickly. However, this was achieved at the cost of introducing new voices that would have provided interesting challenges to our ideas.

After considering the possibility of using pseudonyms, the group opted to have their real names included in the study. In addition to myself, the other participants included Leanne Gabriel, Nancy Mallory, Shannon Tuzzi-Paletti, and Doreen Uhas-Sauer. In so doing, the other participants were able to receive public recognition for their role in our collaboration.

(Re)Defining Collaborative “Action” Research

One important trend in feminist research has been the move towards more participatory research practices (Benmayor, 1991, cited in Wolf, 1996). For researchers concerned with education, this usually means conducting research with teachers. While collaborative research between university-based and school-based educators is plentiful, these studies often focus on issues of classroom practice (Noffke, 1990, 1995) and the preparation of new teachers (Bossard, et al., 1996; Hohenbrink, Johnston, Westhoven, 1997).

Though not all collaborative inquiry falls under the category of “action” research, this particular strategy is often used to encourage classroom teachers to become involved in research. Narrowly defined, this research involves practitioners in an analysis of their own sites (Fueyo & Koorland, 1997). This study possessed many of the characteristics of collaborative action research, however, our focus was on an analysis of theoretical literature instead of being grounded in practice. The “action,” therefore, was not necessarily directly related to our perspective classrooms and institutions, but in our
perceptions of our identities and in our understandings of the multiple layers of the process of educating for democratic citizenship.

In addition, this study differed from collaborative partnerships in which all participants are working toward the same goal. When I invited each member of the group to participate in the study, I suggested the possibility that they assume a role in the writing. However, none of the participants (each for different reasons) were interested in becoming a co-writer. Instead of imposing my definition of a collaboration (in which we would all write), we each identified a goal she hoped to achieve as the result of her involvement in the study. These ranged from my objective of completing this dissertation to Leanne's desire to share ideas and gain support from other women in social studies education. While we were all facilitating each other's goals, we were each allowed to define what was most meaningful for us. This process was consistent with Reason's (1994) description of an inquiry group in which "there is full reciprocity, so that each person's agency is fundamentally honored in both the exchange of ideas and the action" though not necessarily resulting in the same action (p. 326).

Data Collection: Focus Group Discussions

The primary source of data for this study was collected through a series of eight focus group discussions. In distinguishing between group interviews and focus group interviews, these discussions met Morgan's (1997) broad definition for focus group interviews that "produce data" and provide "insights" that would not be possible without the interaction of the group (p. 2). However, most focus group interviews involve the researcher as facilitator (Ashbury, 1995; Morgan, 1995, 1997). For the purpose of this
study, however, I was acting as a co-participant. Consequently, the term "focus group discussion" was a more appropriate description of the data collection process.

Our focus group discussions centered on two issues: the theoretical literature we read prior to each of our meetings, and our personal experiences related to the issues raised in the readings. This strategy provided a mode for resisting a variety of binaries often imposed in research situations: theory/practice, public/personal, formal knowledge/personal life, researcher/researched, objective/subjective.

Analysis and Writing

Data collection, analysis, and writing in this study were simultaneous. Richardson (1990, 1994, 1997) suggests that writing is part of the inquiry process. Building on this theme, the data collected from the focus group discussions became part of a process in which the data were written and represented in a variety of ways. First, I transcribed the focus group discussions. Most of each session was transcribed verbatim, though in some instances sections were summarized or omitted if either I determined them to be too personal and beyond the scope of the study, or if the speaker indicated she preferred to have the comment deleted. Next, each of the participants' comments were identified with a different font. This provided a visual representation of our various voices and added another layer of meaning to the data.

In the next phase, pieces of literature that were consistent with or contradictory to our conversations were added in text boxes. These provided a social and political context for our discussions (Goodson, 1998). This process, which I refer to as a "postmodern constant comparative method" is discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.
The subsequent stage of writing and analysis involved developing a personal context for the data. By creating a “story” that was grounded in the data (Donmoyer, 1990; Goodson, 1998; Polkinghorne, 1992), I was able to introduce the reader to the daily lives of our group (Hargreaves, 1996). Ideally, the story might be read aloud with different voices representing each part, though the constraints of the dissertation process precluded this possibility. By using different fonts to represent the various participants (and relevant literature), however, I hoped to create a “visual reader’s theater” in which the textures of the various voices could be represented. In keeping with this strategy, the story was divided into three acts, each containing two or more “scenes” (Merryfield, 1987).

The process for creating a story from the data was complicated by two factors: the role of subjectivities and the representation of “the Other.” Using strategies developed by other researchers (Peskin, 1988; Williams, 1990), we cultivated an examination of our own subjectivities during the research process. In addition, I used a split text approach, similar to the approach used by Lather and Smithies (1997), in which excerpts from my researcher’s journal and my reflections on the data are included in a series of footnotes.

The process also raised questions about how to represent “the Other.” During our focus group discussions, the “Other” meant people of color, people from lower socio-economic backgrounds, gays and lesbians, and other groups who had been marginalized or oppressed. Our awareness of “the Other” was heightened by our readings of bell hooks, Audre Lorde, Patricia Hill Collins, and excerpts of literature from books such as
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7 The other participants and I will be using the reader’s theater approach to present the study at the annual
Dollmaker, Native Speaker, and, even, The Redneck Manifesto. These voices reminded us of the dangers of speaking for, or perhaps even about, others.

This presented a particularly difficult dilemma for me as I started the writing process. For me, “the Other” took on an additional dimension: the representation of the participants. To some extent, I attempted to reconcile this issue through the split text mentioned above. However, the issue of “voice” was problematic. Hargreaves (1996), while heralding the use of “case vignettes” that include teachers’ voices, warns against portraying teachers’ voices in a decontextualized way. I wanted to represent the teachers in the context of their daily lives, as well as in interaction with one another and the literature. After experimenting with several different strategies (writing autobiographically, writing in first person from the perspective of each of the participants, presenting the data in a more traditional form), I settled on the use of a “neutral” narrative voice to establish the context, maintained participants’ own words in relatively large chunks, and used different fonts to visually represent participants’ identities. I tried to avoid the tendency to talk about them “better” than they could speak about themselves (hooks, 1994, p. 70). I do, however, recognize that this may have been, at least in my mind, the least objectionable of options -- all of which in some way perpetuated a way of “Othering.”

Ethical Issues

Two ethical issues emerged during the inquiry process, both of which are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2. First, and foremost, was the extent to which I was taking advantage of our previous relationship to gain access to the participants and,
possibly, pressure them into participating in the study. I attempted to address this question when I invited them to participate in the study. In addition to assuring them that I would not be offended if they chose not to participate, I emphasized the amount of time and commitment the study would require, providing them with an “out” if they so desired. In addition, I provided the group with standard letters of consent, outlining their right to withdraw from the study at any time. While these were somewhat artificial structures among close acquaintances, I believed these implicit and explicit messages gave each of the participants an opportunity to decline the invitation.

The second, and more difficult, ethical issue emerged in the process of writing and analyzing the data. As I created the story, I was acutely aware of the violation I was committing by imagining the thoughts and actions of the participants from an omnipresent perspective. One way in which I addressed this concern was to limit the representation of their inner conversations to the words they had offered during our focus group discussions. In this manner, I may have been changing the context of their words, but not creating thoughts to put in their heads. In addition, the scenes were shared with participants in order to provide them with opportunities to express concerns, make changes, and/or add notations of their own.

Criteria for Evaluating the Study

Traditional interpretations of “validity” do not apply to this study. However, criteria do exist for determining the merit of the study, including definitions of “validity” which are more consistent with the study’s intention to generate new ways of thinking.
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8 Again, the exception to this “rule” was made for comments or thoughts represented in short phrases that were intended to assist the reader in developing a deeper understanding of the context. These exceptions were approved by participants.
and a new heuristic model. Eisner (1997) identifies the following "promises" of alternative forms of data representation: Alternative forms of representation "are used to shape experience and enlarge understanding"; "provide a sense of particularity that abstractions cannot render"; "provide what might be called 'productive ambiguity' . . . (meaning) that the material presented is more evocative . . . (and) generates insight and invites attention to complexity"; and promises "to increase the variety of questions that we can ask about the educational situations we can study" (p. 8). The merit and worth of this study were established by responses to these issues, as well as to the following series of questions: How does the study promote reflexivity for participants and readers? What role did participants play in shaping the study? What action emerged from participants' involvement in the study? How did the study challenge modernist, hegemonic traditions? What does the study contribute to the field of social studies education? Specific responses to these questions are presented in Chapter 2.

Substantive and Methodological Implications

The implications of this study are discussed thoroughly in Chapter 4. However, a summary of these conclusions is presented below. The implications fell into two broad categories: substantive and methodological.

Substantive Implications

First and foremost among the substantive implications was the group's conclusion that educating for democratic citizenship is related more to method than content. The classroom teachers in the group were not familiar with the concept of feminism as it related to "critical pedagogy" (Luke & Gore, 1992) prior to our discussions. However, they raised many of the same concerns regarding issues of "empowerment" often
addressed in the literature (Ellsworth, 1997; Gore, 1993). Interestingly, though very few of our Polish colleagues use the term “feminist” (in fact, it has a very negative connotation in Poland and is met with enormous resistance), our group concluded there were powerful parallels regarding questions of resistance and assumptions surrounding emancipation. Consequently, it is important to revisit the connections between pedagogy and conceptualizations of citizenship.

A second conclusion relates to the definition of democracy. Near the end of our focus group discussions, we confronted the elephant in the living room and reexamined the meanings of democracy. Using Mansbridge’s (1996) piece as a foundation, we also endeavored to “reconstruct” democracy on the basis of persuasion versus power “by drawing from experiences of both connection and domination” (p. 117). This discussion was intertwined with the discussion of pedagogy and, as educators, the group explored ways in which these tensions influenced our identities and practices.

Finally, embedded in the previous conclusions is transcending the boundaries between personal and public. Stone (1996b) suggests one of the tenets of feminism is that women’s “experiences collapse the former cultural distinctions between public and private, invalidating the segregation of women’s experiences into the latter realm and the denial of public (civic) voice for women” (p. 38). One of the group’s strongest reasons for rejecting many of the existing civic education programs was the extent to which citizenship was limited to the public domain (voting, political campaigns, structures and functions of governments). The group suggested one possibility for revitalizing the notion of citizenship in schools would be to move the study of local politics from the elementary to the secondary level, in an effort to provide students with more
opportunities for making public issues personal and personal issues public. The group agreed such objectives might be more easily accomplished at the local level though, even then, only in conjunction with significant reforms in pedagogical practices and curriculum.

**Methodological Implications**

Given the unique design of this study, it was also important to reflect upon the research process. As a researcher interested in collaboration with classroom teachers, but who also resides in the "ivory tower" of the academe, I was — and continue to be — intrigued by the possibilities presented in reconceptualizing collaborative research. To a large extent, this study met Noffke's (1990) challenge to do research "with" and not "on" teachers.

However, as a group we also moved beyond what seems to be an underlying assumption in education that teachers are not interested in theoretical literature. In fact, while often describing the readings as "laborious," "heavy," and "out of touch" with the classroom, all of the participants expressed a feeling of enhanced personal and professional development and an increased awareness of the relationship between theory and practice as a result of their participation in this study. Thus, many of the goals of traditional action research were met even as we engaged the theories so often perceived as far removed from the classroom. Additional research of this nature has the potential of creating a true synergy in which the boundaries between teacher/researcher, theory/practice, research/development cease to exist.
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Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide an introduction to the study. In addition to presenting an overview of the study, a rationale for engaging postmodern feminist perspectives in social studies education was discussed. This chapter outlined the epistemological foundation for the research methodology and provided a summary of the research design. In the following chapter, entitled “Standing on the Precipice: Alternative Forms of Collaborative Inquiry and Data Representation,” the research methodology is presented in more detail.
CHAPTER 2

STANDING ON THE PRECIPICE:

ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY
AND DATA REPRESENTATION

Speaking from what he describes as the "cutting edge" of inquiry in research methodology, Eisner (1997) suggests, "One of the basic questions scholars are now raising is how we perform the magical feat of transforming the contents of our consciousness into a public form that others can understand" (p. 4). Eisner's call from the precipice has particular relevance for educational researchers, like myself, working within/against feminist and postmodern theories while engaging in collaborative inquiry with practitioners. The feminist and postmodern discourse surrounding what it means to do research "with" and not "on" (Noffke, 1990) "Others" (hooks, 1994) has focused on issues of reflexivity, subjectivities, and the politics of representation. Eisner reminds us that the complexities of research extend beyond the ways in which we shape and are shaped by our "consciousness" and include the forms through which our research is communicated to others.
This chapter describes a study in which I attempted to address challenges from feminist and postmodern theories, as well as to interrogate traditional conceptions of collaboration. The eclectic research methodology that resulted also laid the foundation for an alternative form of data representation. While the study had both a substantive and methodological component, this discussion emphasizes the research methodology and representation of data.

**The Methodology: “Doing” Feminist, Postmodernist Educational Research**

“What does it mean to do educational research?” Like many doctoral students faced with the “Big D” (dissertation), I found myself asking what I believed about the process and intention of research. First, and foremost, I wanted my research to be consistent with my identity as a feminist. This process was made more complicated, and considerably more interesting, by my desire to work within a postmodern framework. The initial question, then, became “What does it mean to do feminist educational research in a postmodern world?” The considerations for responding to the question were twofold. First, feminism obviously cannot be discussed as a uniform, unchallenged set of ideas and, second, “educational research” encompasses a wide range of content, methodologies, and possibilities for representing data.

In introducing her chapter about feminisms and qualitative research for the *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Olesen (1994) notes, “At this highly labile moment in the history of feminist thought this chapter attempts to outline feminist . . . research even as the context and contours of . . . feminism. . . are shifting” (p. 158). Hulsebosch and Koerner (1994) agree and warn that to talk about a singular feminist theory opens the
door to charges of "essentialist" notions of a feminist "who can be [narrowly] defined and
described" (p. 51). Stanley (1991) explains that it may be more accurate to refer to
"feminismS" in a manner that emphasizes the pluralistic nature of feminist theory.
Criticisms directed at feminist theory for privileging white, middle-class women's
Lorde, 1984; Robinson, 1994); "the construction of the 'Third World' woman as an
essentialized Other" (Lal, 1996; see also Bar-On, 1993; Mohanty, 1988; Said, 1989 and
Trinh, 1989) and challenges from postmodern theorists (Code, 1991; Gore, 1993;
1996) reflect the polyphony of voices positing challenges to an untroubled presentation of
feminist theory. The diversity of voices speaking to feminist issues is a reflection of the
multiple identities and layers existing in society; these complexities not only have an
impact on our interpretations of women's issues, but also on our view of the relationship
between society and education.

Most educators acknowledge the intricate relationship between education and
society. This is particularly true in areas of research which relate to the social
construction of gender, women's identities as selves and others, and oppression within a
patriarchal society -- issues most often associated with feminist research. Lather (1992)
reminds us, while "the empirical work being done by feminists in education run the
gamut... such work exemplifies that to do feminist research is to put the social
construction of gender at the center of one's inquiry" (p. 91).
Denzin (1992) also argues feminist theories, particularly those emerging in the field of cultural studies, have potential to subvert previously static boundaries between academic disciplines. Studies which offer insights about society and social constructions are intricately connected to educational policies and practices, in part because they are unbounded by specific concerns within one discipline (for example, see Herbert, 1993 regarding adolescent girls’ perceptions of unwanted sexual attention; Zavella, 1996 and her discussion of Chicana identity). The complex nature of schooling and its role in perpetuating and/or challenging the status quo makes absolute distinctions between “educational” research and research from social science fields, sociology and anthropology in particular, almost impossible and, I would argue, completely undesirable.

These two considerations, the fragmented state of feminist theory and the broad scope of educational research, provide interesting challenges for researchers, like myself, interested in designing and conducting a study which might be considered “feminist educational research.” However, for the purpose of creating spaces in which feminist voices disrupt traditional notions of educating for democratic citizenship, theories of situated knowledges that address postmodernist challenges provide a solid theoretical framework for constructing the study’s methodology.

One of the most fundamental suppositions of this study -- a process through which a group “collectively and collaboratively” met Fine’s (1992) challenge to “... disrupt, transgress, and invent possibilities... displaying all our contradictions and differences” (p. xii) -- was that our knowledge about what it means to educate democratic citizens is constructed, situated, and political. As participants in the study, we explored the
epistemological foundation for our beliefs, attitudes and behaviors regarding our roles as teachers in a democratic society. Haraway’s (1991) discussion of situated knowledges as politics and the epistemology of location reflects this postmodern notion that knowledge is contextually (and structurally) embedded.

Situated Knowledges

One of the most useful constructs in examining the meaning of citizenship was Haraway’s (1991) definition of situated knowledges. She describes “situated knowledges” as “marked knowledges” that produce “maps of consciousness,” reflecting the ways in which race, class, gender, and nationality affect the knower (Haraway, 1991, p. 111). Wolf (1996) explains further, “They reflect our locationality (historical, national, generational) and positionality (race, gender, class, nationality, sexuality), acknowledging how the dynamics of where we are always affects our viewpoint and the production of knowledge without privileging one particular position over another, as in standpoint theory” (p. 14). An examination of democratic citizenship as situated knowledges was, in essence, the focus of the study. How has the meaning of this concept been shaped by locationality and positionality? The goal was not to create a “feminist” definition of the term that was to be privileged over another interpretation. Instead, the intention was to construct multiple meanings through our discussions. Haraway distinguishes between what can supposedly be “found” and the construction of knowledge: “Accounts of ‘real’

1 Haraway’s situated knowledges address many of the concerns raised by feminists who strive to create spaces for postcolonial women’s voices and experiences (Bar-On, 1993; Mohanty, 1988; Lal, 1996) and other marginalized women. Another interesting dimension of Haraway’s work is the extent to which technology influences our situatedness. Her position suggests that, given the technological advances in the

This study was not intended to push democratic citizenship into the abyss of relativism where no connections are possible; the objective was, however, to explicate the extent to which such linkages are constructed, temporary, and an extension of our locationalities and positionalities. Haraway’s (1991) theory of situated knowledges does not discount the possibility of making connections between locationalities and positionalities, but acknowledges both the partiality of such linkages and the extent to which difference can be systemic: “In the consciousness of our failures, we risk lapsing into boundless difference and giving up on the confusing task of making a partial, real connection. Some differences are playful; some are poles of world historical systems of domination. Epistemology is about knowing the difference” (p. 34).

These aspects of situated knowledges were particularly useful for this study. As co-participants in the study, we engaged in a sustained discourse over a period of several months in which we disrupted the traditions that have defined “civic education” for many decades. We analyzed the ways in which such commonly held beliefs have been socially constructed and invented new possibilities for educating students for a democratic society. These traditions of civic education, like all knowledge, are situated through their positions and localities in American society. Interrogating these traditions, and challenging the ways in which we thought about and talked about what it means to
educate in a democratic society, was consistent not only with feminist theory but addressed many of the postmodernist challenges to epistemology and inquiry.

**Postmodern Perspectives on Research**

Denzin (1992) defines poststructural as "... that theoretical position which asks how the human subject is constructed in and through the structures of language and ideology" (p. 32). Haraway adheres to this position by positing that knowledge is actively constructed based on relations with others. Code (1991) assumes a similar position by challenging the language and structures we have come to accept and problematizing the very notion of epistemology: "As long as 'epistemology' bears the stamp of the postpositivist empiricist project of determining necessary and sufficient conditions for knowledge and devising strategies to refute skepticism, there can be no feminist epistemology" (p. 314). Code argues that current debates surrounding epistemology are "androcentrically derived" -- meaning that they continue to position themselves in relation to men or, as Code describes it, in the "malestream."

For example, Stanley and Wise (1990) and Harding’s (1987) definitions of feminist empiricism and feminist standpoint epistemologies present what might be considered decentered epistemologies, theories which position feminist perspectives and issues at the core. In doing so, however, they continue to operate from a theory of epistemology which, Code (1991) might argue, has "retained allegiance to the pivotal
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3 Denzin uses the term poststructural here in a way which reflects its close association with postmodernism. Marshall (1992) suggests that postmodernism and poststructuralism are not the same, but that "only within the postmodern moment do the questions raised by post-structuralists have currency ... these post-structuralist concerns and questions – about language, texts, interpretation, subjectivity for example – specifically lend themselves to larger historical, cultural questions which inhabit the postmodern moment" (p. 8).
ideas around which epistemology—for all its variations—has defined itself” (p. 314). As a product of masculinist hegemony, such attempts at decentering continue to operate within the androcentric tradition from which such theories are framed. Code supports Haraway’s position that all knowledges are partial and situated within constantly shifting identities.

Code (1991) does not, however, suggest feminists cannot (or should not) be epistemologists. To the contrary, she argues “(f)eminists have to understand ‘the epistemological project’ to be in a position to see its androcentrism and to comprehend the political consequences of its hegemony” (p. 314). Code is not merely splitting philosophical hairs. She implies that in order for feminists to effectively create a space in which feminists “can take up a position, a standpoint, within a forest of absolutes (p. 317), “(t)hey need to engage in dialogues with the tradition to analyze its strengths and limitations; they need to develop politically informed critiques and to create space for productive relocations of knowledge in human lives” (p. 315).

Her goal is not to create a clean, simple, easy epistemology. Instead, Code proposes a messy world which acknowledges that “the diversity of situations and circumstances in which people need to be in a position to know makes it difficult to see how a theory of knowledge, an epistemology, could respond to their questions” (p. 315). The multiple layers of voices involved in discussions on citizenship represents a conversation filled with conflict and contradiction – just the type of dialogue, I posit, necessary to keep public and private discourse on the issue alive and well.
Lather (1991a) concurs and suggests "such questioning of basic assumptions might be seen as an effort to break out of the limitations of increasingly inadequate category systems and toward theory capable of grasping the complexities of people and the cultures they create -- theories outside of binary logics of certainty, non-contradiction, totality and linearity" (p. xvi). Working within/outside the category systems that sharply delineate between researcher/researcher, personal/professional, subject/object, fact/fiction created greater possibilities for representing these complexities. The design of this study, therefore, reflected both Code's "messy world" and Lather's rejection of inadequate categories.

In summary, my position is as a researcher "doing" feminist research in a postmodern world. I support challenges from critics charging that feminist theory has privileged white, middle-class women's experiences; promoted essentialist interpretations, particularly in representing women in developing countries; and perpetuated a new hegemony by privileging women's standpoints to the exclusion of race, ethnicity, sexuality and class. I also acknowledge it is more productive to talk about feminisms, with an emphasis on the pluralism within feminist thought (Stanley, 1991; see also Stone, 1994). Stone (1996), however, suggests some basic tenets of feminism to which I adhere:

(1) Women's experiences count because they are historically and empirically different from those of men; (2) these experiences collapse the former cultural distinctions between public and private, invalidating the segregation of women's experiences into the latter realm and the denial of public (civic) voice for women; (3) because of these conditions (and beliefs about biology and religion), (4) women have been denied societal equality with men (see Eisenstein, 1983) (p. 38, reference in original).
I also recognize that, though men and women’s experiences are different, there are differences among women as well. Therefore, I reject notions of the “essential” woman who characterizes all women. There are obvious tensions in a position that addresses “women’s experiences” even as it disclaims the possibility of assuming “sameness and a shared position for women” (Stone, 1996, p. 39). These conflicts serve as constant reminders that one of the few common bonds among women across different positions of class, race, ethnicity and sexuality is the extent to which we share our various identities as women.

Fine (1992) suggests feminists challenge the androcentric hegemony by using “disruptive voices.” She invites those of us concerned with women’s issues “collectively and collaboratively, to disrupt, transgress, and invent possibilities . . . displaying all our contradictions and differences” (p. xii). Fine posits that feminists promote change by interrupting what have traditionally been unchallenged discourses. Stone (1996a) suggests a similar strategy in describing the possibilities of “disruptive teaching.” Stone advocates that reading about individuals who have been influential in promoting change through their disruptions to the status quo may provide inspiration for others. She challenges educators to acknowledge teaching, schooling and education as ethical endeavors and to accept their “obligation” to engage in disruptive teaching. Stone concludes that nothing short of displacing the status quo can address the needs of those who have been marginalized. Ellsworth (1997) raises additional questions about the “politics of representation” and the implication of these issues on teaching and learning.
This study represents an effort "to disrupt, transgress, and invent possibilities" by layering the voices of four classroom teachers, a university-based educator, and the theoretical literature in the field in a postmodern story which may be used to as the impetus for more disruptions, transgressions . . . and possibilities.

**Research Design**

The overarching goal of this study was to *generate new ways of thinking* about what it means to educate citizens for a democratic society. This objective applied to me as the "researcher," to the other participants in the study, and to those who will read our stories. Needless to say, this was not consistent with the traditional "reports of findings" contained in many dissertations. Instead, this study resided in a space between a research report common to social sciences and a well-established tradition in the humanities, the personal essay. Since the intention of the study did not fit into rigid categories, the methodology was also eclectic; the methods were, however, firmly grounded in well-established research strategies. The research process involved a group of five women engaging in a series of focus group discussions. Throughout our interactions, we worked towards self-defined goals related to our personal and professional lives. The record of our discussions served as the framework for creating a "story," a type of visual reader's theater, which intentionally blurred the boundaries between "personal" and "professional," as well as between "facts" and "fictions."³

³ I agree, however, with Gough (1998) that "fact and fiction are much closer, both culturally and linguistically, than . . . narrative strategies imply."
Identifying Participants

Three assumptions shaped whom I invited to participate in this study. First, I believe that educational research ought to be collaborative and, whenever possible, involve classroom teachers. Feminism and postmodernism concur that power is embedded in perceptions of existing structures. Too often, theory and practice are presented as dichotomous domains, one of which belongs to the university and the other which is the "territory" of the classroom teacher. Consequently, I was committed to creating spaces in which teachers claim the right to participate in the educational discourse that is often limited to the academe, just as I was interested in creating opportunities for myself, a university-based educator, to become engaged in the discourse of classroom teachers. One expectation for the participants of this study, then, was that we would share a mutual interest in engaging in the theoretical literature, as well as a desire to connect these ideas to classroom practice.

Second, I support Goodson's (1998) claim that "probably progressively more important for the future, will be the site of everyday life and identity" (p. 3). I, therefore, hoped to identify participants who were willing to examine and share our lived experiences and our identities, including the ways in which these locations and positions affected our construction of the concept of "citizen" and the ways in which we mobilized this construction in our teaching. In order to achieve this level of trust and intimacy, I

^ Note that the term used here is to "create" space and not "give" voice. I hope to avoid the impression that I view myself as a gatekeeper or one in a position to grant teachers the "permission" to speak. I believe their voices are already speaking; they are simply "heard" often enough.
concluded that participants should have some preexisting relationship — a foundation upon which our discourse could build.

Finally, I decided the most effective method to engage a group in this type of inquiry process was through a form of focus group interviews. Based on the guidelines provided by Morgan (1997), I concurred that a small group works "best when the participants are likely to be both interested in the topic and respectful of one another" (p. 42). Given the first two assumptions, it seemed best to keep the number of participants limited to no more than five or six persons.

Having acknowledged these assumptions, four women were identified through purposeful sampling. Patton (1990) explains that intensity sampling, a specific strategy for "purposefully selecting information-rich sampling" (p. 169), includes "cases that manifest the phenomenon of interest intensely (but not extremely)" (p. 171). Patton continues by describing the use of intensity sampling in heuristic research: "Heuristic research draws explicitly on the intense personal experiences of the researcher . . . (c)oresearchers who have experienced these phenomena intensely also participate in the study . . . The heuristic researcher is not typically seeking pathological or extreme manifestations . . . such extreme cases might not lend themselves to the reflective process of heuristic inquiry" (p. 171). While rejecting Douglas and Moustakas' (1984) assertion that "the power of heuristic inquiry lies in its potential for disclosing truth" (cited in Patton, 1990, p. 73, emphasis added), as if "truth" is hidden and not constructed, parts of
the study's methodology were designed within a broad interpretation of the heuristic process.⁵

In January of 1998, I met with these potential participants to discuss the schedule, research questions, focus group discussion format, and to confirm their interest in the study. All agreed to continue with the study at this first meeting. At this point we also discussed the process of informed consent and my intention to tape all of our interview sessions. None of the participants expressed concern with issues of confidentiality and the group decided against using pseudonyms in the writing and presentation of the study. This issue was, however, discussed at some length. At the conclusion of our discussion the group decided using our real names seemed to make the study “more authentic” and provided an opportunity for me to acknowledge their intellectual contributions, as well as their time and commitment. In addition to myself, Leanne Gabriel, Nancy Mallory, Shannon Tuzzi-Paletti, and Doreen Uhas-Sauer participated in the study.

As a group, we represented a variety of levels of teaching experience (from 1 to 31 years) with positions in urban and suburban schools. In addition, the group ranged in age from 27 to 54 years. We initially formed an informal association through our participation in the Social Studies and Global Education Professional Development School (PDS) Network at The Ohio State University. In 1994-1995, I was one of three graduate teaching assistants working as student teaching supervisors with the PDS; Nancy, Doreen, and Leanne were all “field professors” (classroom teachers collaborating
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⁵ Patton (1990) identifies two “narrowing elements of heuristic inquiry . . . First, the researcher must have personal experience with and intense interest in the phenomenon under study. Second, others (coresearchers) who are part of the study must share an intensity of experience with the phenomenon” (p. 71). This study is not, however, intended to meet all criteria established for heuristic inquiry or other forms
with professors in the Social Studies and Global Education program area to teach the methods course); and Shannon was a preservice teacher participating in the program. Our first encounters were limited to PDS related classes, meetings, and functions. On a one-to-one basis, several of us met outside of activities associated with the PDS.

Beginning in 1995, each of us also became actively involved in a project entitled "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" (EDCP). I served as a graduate research assistant for the project for two years and then assumed the position of Associate Director. Shannon was hired from 1996-97 as the program’s administrative assistant. Doreen, Leanne, and Nancy were involved in various projects associated with EDCP, including acting as partner teachers with Polish educators, developing curriculum materials, and conducting workshops in the Columbus and in Poland. Through these experiences, this group had opportunities to travel together and establish a common bond.

As both a graduate research assistant with the PDS and in my position with the Poland project, I had numerous opportunities to interact with the other participants in professional and social settings. The first, and most important, criteria for inviting these women to participate was our previous professional and personal relationships. Working with an already established community of women also reflected my rejection of definitions of "objectivity" which require a dichotomous relationship between the "researcher" and the "researched." Also, the group’s cohesiveness, familiarity, and
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*EDCP was created at the request of the Polish Ministry of National Education in February, 1991, as a cooperative effort of the Mershon Center, The Ohio State University, and the Ministry. During 1995-96, EDCP had expanded to include as the major collaborators the Center for Citizenship Education, Warsaw, and The Ohio State University’s College of Education. Dr. Jacek Strzemieczny, Director of the Center for Citizenship Education, and Dr. Richard Remy, The Ohio State University, initiated EDCP and have served..."
shared commitment were essential to the design of the study. While Morgan (1997)
suggests one “rule of thumb” for group interviews is to identify “strangers,” he
encourages researchers to set aside this guideline when appropriate. The topic and design
of the study provided an adequate rationale for inviting participants with previously
established relationships to me and to one another.

Another important criteria for participation in the study was an expressed interest
in engaging feminist literature and discussions to disrupt our perceptions of what it means
to educate students in a democratic society. An interest in the topic was likely to increase
participants’ interest in — and commitment to — the study, as well as enhance the
potential for professional growth and development. 7

Finally, I wanted to involve women in secondary social studies. My personal
experiences indicated that women in this field often feel isolated from their male
counterparts. My observations had been confirmed, informally, through conversations
with each of the participants. As indicated in the rationale for the study, presented in Ch.
1, women’s voices and feminist perspectives are often omitted from social studies
education. This study provided an opportunity to add to the slowly increasing number of
research studies in the field concerned with these issues, and to do so in a way that moved
beyond essentialist notions of “women.”

---

7 During our first focus group discussion, we addressed our perceptions of the term “feminist” and whether
or not we identified ourselves as such. While our individual definitions varied rather widely, we all
acknowledged that we considered ourselves a feminist. In effect, our microcosm mirrored the diversity of
feminists in the larger society.
Given that all of the women identified were White, I considered inviting a woman of color or a man to our discussion groups. Either of these options meant introducing a “new” member to an existing group. Given the intention of the study was to generate new ways of thinking, adding a new voice (and different perspective) to our discussions could have provided deeper understanding and added another important dimension. I decided against recruiting another member for two reasons.

The first reason was pragmatic. I was in the fourth year of my Ph.D. studies; for personal and financial reasons, I was determined to finish the study in the spring so I might be ready to assume an academic position in the autumn. I felt it likely that including another participant would require additional time for the group to achieve the level of trust and familiarity necessary to share and challenge one another’s ideas. The second reason was more complicated. The common experiences through our work in the PDS and our cooperation with the Poland-related projects provided this group of women with a strong bond. Inviting a sixth member to join the group because of her color or because of his gender, seemed (ironically) reductionist and essentialist. I hesitated to extend an invitation on these grounds and feared (though this word may be too strong) that such a move might create the very feeling of Otherness that I hoped to avoid in my research. This uneasiness was articulated by one of the participants when I asked if she “knew of any women of color who might be interested in joining our discussion group.” After a short pause she asked, “Is the priority someone who is interested or someone who is ‘of color’?” Shortly after this conversation I decided against recruiting a sixth member for the group.
When inviting each of the participants, I explained the focus of the study and outlined my expectation that we would be reading and participating in a series of discussions. I asked for feedback on the amount of time and effort each would be willing to contribute to the study. Two things became clear: First, all of the participants were interested in the opportunity to engage in an ongoing dialogue about the issue, and second, none of them were excited about the possibility of extensive writing. Though I had explored the possibility of a co-authored dissertation, I was not surprised by their lack of enthusiasm. Shannon was at the midpoint of her first year of teaching and was struggling to stay abreast of her five preparations. Doreen, Leanne, and Nancy were already involved in writing chapters for a teaching methods book that was being developed in a collaborative effort with Polish educators. While all good writers, they were already somewhat overwhelmed with meeting the deadlines for their chapters.

At this point, I had to consider whether or not the dissertation could still be considered "collaborative." When conceptualizing the study, I hoped for each of us to assume an active role in creating the story; virtually all of the examples of collaborative research I knew involved each of the participants in the writing process in some way. However, when I asked the group what they hoped to gain from their participation in the study, they each responded with very specific objectives. In addition, they expressed an interest in helping me generate ideas for new interpretations of citizenship education and intended to be actively involved in the process of creating and analyzing these ideas. I concluded it was necessary to reconsider existing definitions of collaborative research.
(Re)Defining Collaborative Research

Benmayor (1991, cited in Wolf, 1996) suggests feminist researchers decenter themselves from the "ivory tower" to establish more participatory research practices. Researchers responding to this challenge and hoping to address issues of representation often engage in "collaborative" research. Noffke (1990), for example, echoes feminist concerns about wanting to do research "with" and not "on" teachers. As was the case with this study, Noffke (the university-based researcher) initiated the investigation and assumed primary responsibility for organizing the co-researchers/participants. While certainly more collaborative than many research studies, responsibility and power in both Noffke's study and this one were not fully shared. In Noffke's study, her voice still dominated the framing of the study and the presentation of the data. I planned to draw on developments in alternative forms of data representation, often grounded in postmodern theory, to represent the data in ways which would include my voice as one of many.

Finley and Knowles (1995) present a "postmodern article that is non-traditional in its form, content, and mode of representation" (p. 110). This venture was collaborative from its inception and includes an ongoing, written dialogue between Finely and Knowles regarding the ways in which they construct knowledge about art. Their discourse meets Kvale's (1992, 1996) postmodern definitions of knowledge and addresses the issues of power related to an interview process. Their conversation becomes knowledge as these co-authors interview one another, giving readers insight into the ways in which their constructions were shaped by both their internal conversations and their dialogue with one another. While these insights are essential if the collaboration itself is part of the
phenomenon being studied, one must also assess what is to be gained by collaborating when the phenomenon is outside the relationship between the researchers. A similar research study by Hunsaker and Johnston (1992) illustrates the ways in which power becomes a negotiated, instead of assumed, position in collaborative research.

While these studies are collaborative in nature, with the exception of Noffke (1990), all of these involve collaboration with another university-based researcher. As indicated, even Noffke’s study was severely limited in the amount of authority and power actually assumed by the teachers. While feminists have often experimented with various methods of representation, including co-authoring and alternative forms of data presentation as a way of challenging traditional power structures, Macguire (1987) notes that academic feminists continue to control research projects and ‘knowledge creation,’ much like conventional non-feminist researchers. While in the end I knew I would be the primary “creator of knowledge” in our story, I intended to use the form of the story to communicate the collaborative process from which it emerged. By highlighting the multiplicity of voices participating in the study, incorporating a social and personal context for the ideas, and moving my discussion of the ideas to the next chapter, the representation of data was less likely to become my story than a story created and shaped by the reader. I acknowledge, however, that I assumed more control over this process than the other participants in the study.

Given the nature of tenure and promotion inherent to university positions, it is not surprising that university-based researchers assume a more active role in the research process. In addition, there seems to be an underlying assumption that teachers are
interested only in classroom-based research to enhance their professional development.

“Action research” or “practitioner research,” terms often associated with research involving teachers, imply that the focus needs to be on the classroom. McCutcheon and Jung (1990), however, offer a broader definition: “Systematic inquiry that is collective, collaborative, self-reflective, critical, and undertaken by the participants of the inquiry. The goals of such research are the understanding of practice and the articulation of a rationale or philosophy of practice in order to improve practice” (p. 148, emphasis added).

This study was designed to promote a collective, collaborative, self-reflective, critical analysis that would result in the articulation of a rationale or philosophy of practice. And, like virtually all education research, the intention was to improve teaching and learning. However, unlike most practitioner research that is grounded in practice, the focus of this study emerged primarily from practitioners’ interaction with theoretical literature. In this instance, each participant, myself included, identified objectives she hoped to reach through her involvement in our discussions. These praxis-oriented objectives ranged from specific plans regarding grant proposals and curriculum projects, to more general aspirations related to personal growth and development. The group agreed to facilitate each other’s objectives through a collaborative process in which we contributed materials, information and support.

In my case, the goal was to represent our conversations in a story. While I was to assume responsibility for writing, the rest of the group agreed to assist me both in generating a conceptual framework (through our focus group discussions) and reading the
story I created from our discussions. This process of “member checks” insured I had represented our individual and collective experiences in a manner true to our collaborative arrangement and our friendship.

In addition to the objectives we established individually, the group committed to a larger goal: we strove to claim new spaces for women in social studies education. Collectively, we represented what could be described as “typical” situations for women in our field; each of us spent most of our careers in social studies departments in which we were the only women. Leanne, for example, had been chair of a social studies department for nearly a decade. Throughout that period, the department varied in size between eight and ten people, though the number of women never exceeded three. Shannon, a first year teacher, was the first woman hired in the social studies department of her suburban school district in twenty years. During the interview, she was assured she would do well “as long as she had a sense of humor.” With these and similar experiences in mind, we agreed to make our identities as women a focus for our readings and discussions.

Focus Group Discussions

Our group committed to a series of focus group discussions, which provided the primary source for “data” and ideas to be included in the study. Morgan (1997) describes one of the strengths of the focus group as “the ability to produce concentrated amounts of data on precisely the topic of interest” (p. 13). Given the nature of the study, and participants’ indicated interest in the topic, focus group discussions enabled us to create a

---

8 Initially, I planned on five focus group discussions. However, at the end of our fifth meeting, we concluded additional discussions needed to occur. In the end, we “officially” met for eight focus group discussions. Each of these discussions lasted at least ninety minutes and five extended into two-hours or more.
synergy through which we built upon and responded to one another's experiences, perceptions and conclusions.

Morgan also explains the definition of focus group interviews may be as broadly defined as all group interviews or as "exclusively" defined as only very formally structured group interviews designed to study a narrow topic. He argues, however, for an inclusive definition of focus group interviews which includes all group interviews in which the hallmark "... is their explicit use of group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found in the group" (p. 2). While in this sense the group discussions in this study were focus group interviews, the collaborative nature of the interactions and my role as an equal participant in the discussions made the term "interview" problematic. When describing the nature of the "interview," Richardson (1997) explains, "Such interviews are essentially interactional speech events created in particular contexts: interviews are themselves examples of lived experience" (p. 141). Consequently, I chose to use the term "focus group discussion" to denote the intentional and deliberate nature of the meetings, as well as our mutual exchange and shaping of ideas. By design, then, the discussions were similar in structure to seminars in which ideas emerge from shared readings, individual experiences, and group interaction.

The focus group discussions took place in my kitchen, usually on Sunday evening. This setting was particularly appropriate given the group's previous relationship. All of the other participants had been frequent visitors to my home, in many cases as a group. We sat at a large, oval-shaped table with the microphone in its center and the tape
recorder at my side. For each meeting, I provided coffee and some kind of food. In addition, other participants in the group provided food and/or beverages. During three of the meetings, we also shared a bottle of wine. The context was intended to be informal, intimate, and safe.

While the clattering of plates and coffee cups sometimes interfered with the recording, I felt strongly committed to maintaining our relaxed atmosphere for three reasons. First, and foremost, our previous friendships would have made any effort to impose a more “formal” or “clinical” atmosphere absurd. In addition, my desire to situate this study in a feminist, postmodern framework necessitated that we move away from any artificial attempts at objectivity through artificially imposed “research guidelines.” In many ways, the symbolism of women theorizing about feminist interpretations about citizenship and democracy while drinking coffee around a kitchen table seemed powerfully poetic. Finally, I felt a responsibility to create a refuge for these women, who willingly donated their time and energy to this study.

In preparation for our focus group discussions, the group read or listened to materials regarding various perspectives on educating for democratic citizenship. While many of these materials centered primarily on feminist issues, the scope of the readings was emergent and other theoretical orientations were included as issues arose. In the initial discussions, these materials were identified through my review of the literature, and were selected based on issues raised and our previous meetings. However, during several meetings, other participants brought materials (stories, newspaper and journal articles, poems) which they found relevant to the discussion. This practice emerged
informally and reinforced the collaborative nature of the process. These selections were usually quite different from my own and added an interesting dimension to our discussions. While most of my contributions consisted of academic publications, the rest of the group tended toward fiction, information distributed at their schools, and information they had accessed from the World Wide Web. The ideas and perspectives represented in these materials became part of the data and represented other voices in our conversations.

Prior to and after each of the focus group discussions, I recorded specific questions and/or issues I hoped to address in my journal. These entries provided a foundation for open-ended questions I submitted to the group at each meeting, as well as a process for initial data analysis. These questions reflected the issues that emerged in the previous discussion, as well as provocations from the readings. During the focus group discussions, I carefully noted the mood and visual subtleties that would not be evident from the audio taped record of our conversations. The tape recorder's counter provided a useful way to insure that the notes taken during the discussion could be matched to the audio tape during transcription.

For each meeting, the previous week's discussion was transcribed verbatim (except in certain sections where notes summarized discussion not clearly related to the topic) and shared with the group. This process provided possibilities for returning to ideas expressed in earlier discussions and an opportunity for member checks. In the data analysis, these threads of conversations that emerged consistently in our conversations became part of a thematic organization for the representation of data.
In addition to using the focus group discussions to respond to particular readings, the sessions provided opportunities for exploring participants' life histories in order that we might better understand our positionalities and localities. Kvale (1997) describes a "semistructured life world interview . . . defined as an interview whose purpose is to obtain descriptions of the life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomenon" (p. 5, original italics). The group's constructions of ourselves as women and our interpretations of "democratic citizenship" were intricately connected to the experiences we identified as most significant in shaping these perceptions.

Analysis and Writing

The design of this study demanded simultaneous data collection and analysis. The emergent focus group discussions required that I identify key issues in order to select pertinent readings for the following week. In addition, the group discussed what we perceived to be new and recurring themes at the end of each discussion. Several issues came to bear on the process of analysis and writing. These included the use of writing as analysis, the role of subjectivities in the process, and the extent to which problematizing the concept of the "Other" influenced the representation of data.

Writing as Analysis. From the beginning, it was clear that the process and product in this study could not be separated. Building on Richardson's (1990, 1994, 1997) model for writing as inquiry, the process of collecting, analyzing, and writing occurred simultaneously. The emergent design of the study required that each week's discussion be transcribed and undergo an initial analysis before additional readings could
be identified. Most of each discussion was transcribed verbatim, though in some instances I summarized parts of the session (when the conversation was in no way related to the topic) or omitted specific comments (when very personal information was disclosed or the participant expressed she would be uncomfortable with her comment being made public). Once the transcribing process was complete, I went back through the document and changed the fonts, so that a participant's words were represented in a particular font that could be easily distinguished from the others. This provided a visual representation of our voices. An illustrative example is provided below:

Dawn: One of the things I thought about was this notion of being uncomfortable. I was thinking that my grandfather would have been uncomfortable if anyone had questioned his sense of belonging. And then I thought, and my grandfather was a wonderful man, but maybe we all deserve to be a little uncomfortable once in a while. You know, it's that sort of right to space of, ok, well, the rest of you can be uncomfortable but I don't have to be.

Leanne: Well, I think when you have this comfort, it forces you to take a stand. It forces you to make a decision, to reason things out. Rather than just accepting things as they go along.

Nancy: Don't you think most people's reaction to discomfort is to dig in? I mean, it's not to be open. Well, fight or flight. But not usually to have an open discourse about it! (Laughter from the group.) I'm feeling a little uncomfortable, I think we need to talk about it! (More laughter.)

Shannon: I'm just picturing my father in law

As I reviewed the transcripts, I identified threads in our conversations. This process was facilitated by the rest of the group who, at the end of each session, assisted in identifying what they perceived to be the most compelling or important issues raised during the evening. As I identified consistencies or contradictions in our discussions, I
shared these with the group. In a dialectic and dialogic process, the group discussed my discussion of our discussions. This strategy supports Richardson's (1994) rejection of one dimension: "Rather, the central image is the crystal, which combines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, multi-dimensionalities, and angles of approach" (p. 522).

As a framework for all of the discussions developed, I initiated a process I refer to as a "postmodern constant comparative method." Unlike the constant comparative method of analysis posited by Glaser and Strauss (1967), in which data are broken down into discrete parts and then compared with other "units" of data to create categories (see also Strauss & Corbin, 1990), this process involved keeping the conversation intact and juxtaposing pieces of theoretical literature against the discussion to add other layers to the discourse.

For example, during our initial discussion we spent a great deal of time discussing how we would define the concept citizen. Not surprisingly, our definitions started with what might be described as a definition of political citizenship: the right to vote, the functions of the government, legal processes, etc. However, prior to our meeting, the group had also listened to an audio taped session of a 1997 AERA session in which Gloria Ladson-Billings, Jane Roland Martin, Nel Noddings, and Lynda Stone in which they presented other definitions of citizenship, including the concept of cultural citizenship. After discussing a variety of different meanings for the term, and analyzing the origins of these various interpretations, our discussion turned to the ways in which citizenship is presented in schools. Leanne concluded:
I don’t know if we ever really did teach citizenship, now that I think about it. But perhaps we’ve gotten to the point where we’re so afraid to step on somebody’s toes that we don’t dare tell anybody that this is the way a good citizen does things . . . We’re so afraid to push our values off on somebody else that we just teach about things rather than teaching students.

In reviewing the literature, numerous definitions of citizenship appeared which offered some of the social and political context for how citizenship is defined. Some of these definitions included:

*citizenship* (cit’ə zən ship), *n.* membership in a state or nation, with all the duties, rights, privileges, and responsibilities that go with being a member (Patrick & Remy, 1980, p. 547);

According to the *National Standards for Civics and Government*, “citizenship means that a person is recognized as a legal member of the nation; gives each person certain rights and privileges, e.g., the right to vote and hold public office; (and) means each person has certain responsibilities, e.g., respecting the law, voting, paying taxes, serving on juries. (Students should be able) to explain that citizens owe allegiance or loyalty to the United States; in turn they receive protection and other services from the government” (Center for Civic Education, 1994, p. 35);

And, finally,

The postmodern era, at the last, necessitates a new conception of citizenship, in which diversity and difference are valued and the modernist power hierarchy continues to devolve . . . The past, the present, and continuing lessons learned amongst feminist scholars contribute much to a new citizenship: difference over sameness, multiplicity over singularity, fluidity over stasis. If indeed postmodernism heralds a new age, then a new conception of citizenship is not only logically but also ethically appropriate. We need not deny the successes of modernism, but we must respond to its failures” (Stone, 1996, p. 51).

The inclusion of the literature in this manner responded to a concern expressed by Goodson (1998) regarding the use of narrative: “(A) primary reliance on narratives or life stories is likely to limit our capacity to understand social context and relationship as well as social and political purposes. Sole reliance on narrative becomes a convenient form of political quietism – we can continue telling our stories (whether as life ‘stories’ or
research 'stories') and our searchlight never shines on the social and political construction of lives and life circumstances" (p. 10). Once all of the focus group discussions had been completed, I returned to these frameworks and the recurring threads that we identified in the group.

In the next phase of analysis, I reorganized the data, including the pieces of theoretical literature, according to the themes we had revisited numerous times in our discussions and developed a "story" (Donmoyer, 1990; Donmoyer & Yennie-Donmoyer, 1995; Goodson, 1998; Polkinghorne, 1992) which was grounded in the data, but also included fictional elements and additional information from the literature. The excerpts from the literature were included in text boxes, to distinguish them from part of our original discussions. This strategy enhanced the richness of our discussions and allowed for a deeper understanding of the data. As early as 1973, Geertz asserted a good interpretation takes us to the center of the experience being described. A story enabled me to capture and personalize the complexity of this research process.

I divided the story into three acts, each devoted to a general theme which held together aspects of our discussions. These acts included two or more scenes (Merryfield, 198?) that focused on one of the participants but included the voices of the rest of the group, as well as those represented in the literature. Using scenes to represent the data provided me with an opportunity to contextualize the discussion by integrating dimensions of participants' lives and internal thought processes.

In the example introduce above, I created a scene in which Leanne was driving away from one of our focus group discussions. (See Ch. 3, Act I, Scene II.) The setting
provided an opportunity to introduce additional information about Leanne and the other participants in the study — much the way details about characters in a story unfold. In addition, changing the context illustrated the extent to which our thinking about these issues occurred beyond the confines of my kitchen. Finally, this strategy met Eisner’s (1997) challenge to represent data in ways that provide what might be called “productive ambiguity” . . . so that it “generates insight and invites attention to complexity” (p. 8). Like most “interviews,” the construction of knowledge did not begin or end with the discussion itself; instead, our discussions were the products of multiple layers of socially constructed meanings.

The quotations represented in the scenes were excerpts from the original data, with the exception of very short passages included to make the scene richer for the reader. These statements were intended to be consistent with the life and experiences of the participant (e.g., in the scene described above, Leanne talks to her dog; while I have seen her talk to her dog in a similar manner, I did not hear her make these particular comments). The final result of this process was a story in which our conversations and ideas were represented in the context of our daily lives. Thus, the story moved between the lines of the research and our personal spaces, as well as challenged the distinctions between what would traditionally be considered “data” and the fiction in which I embedded the data. Again, my desire was to represent the data in a manner that encouraged the reader to “hear” the voices of those involved in the discourse, including the calls from the literature. I wanted to create a way to create a way to display these voices in a type of visual reader’s theater. When developing the story, therefore, I
organized it into three acts, each containing two or more scenes. While typically used for plays and other forms of drama, I included the terms “acts” and “scenes” instead of “chapters” to move the story further into a genre in which participants became characters or actors and our personal spaces became settings for the “drama” to unfold.

In representing the story, I also mobilized the study’s recurring theme of “disruption” as a tool for demonstrating what the group perceived to be “situated knowledges” which are often presented as complete and untroubled. I presented the story using “disruptive texts.” These disruptive texts represented participants’ voices, excerpts from the literature, and my analysis. The different fonts acknowledge that voices of the “post-paradigmatic diaspora” speak from many perspectives. I intended to visually interrupt my readers as the partiality or situatedness of a particular idea was addressed. In addition, I value the symbolic representation of using varied styles of text. I also wanted to explore the situatedness of some of the knowledges we have come to accept as Knowledge. If, as Foucault (1991) and other postmodernists suggest, knowledge and power are generated through discourse, the discursive elements of this process needed to be clearly illustrated. This approach to data representation also provided an opportunity to include our subjectivities in a manner that not only recognized our positions, but we embraced them as part of the discourse.

While constructing stories from the data is not yet conventional in educational research, Eisner (1993) suggests, “The battle that once ensued to secure a place for qualitative research in education has largely been won . . . . Now the question turns to just what it is that different forms of representation employed within the context of
educational research might help us grasp” (cited in Kvale, 1997, p. 270). Eisner’s statement is not about the “mental representation” of cognitive science, but “the process of transforming the contents of consciousness into a public form so that they can be stabilized, inspected, edited, and shared with others” (cited in Kvale, 1997, p. 271). Using the data and literature to create a story and illustrating the multiplicity of voices through the use of different fonts, point sizes, and margins offered possibilities for a public form which would invite teachers, theorists, and students to “disrupt, transgress, and create possibilities” for (re)considering citizenship.

**Role of Shifting Subjectivities.** The collaborative nature of the study made it necessary to address two dimensions of subjectivities. As co-participants in the study, we used our positionalities and localities as part of our discussions. Consequently, we “tried to think without the very things we think we can’t think without” (Lather, 1993). In so doing, we rejected the notion that our discussions might produce an “objective” analysis of the ways in which educating for democratic citizenship is talked about and developed in public schools. Our subjectivities helped us identify the partiality of these traditions. In addition, we continually challenged one another to acknowledge the ways in which our life experiences influence the ways in which we defined both what exists and what is possible.

The second aspect to consider was the role my subjectivities, as the initiator and writer of the study, would play. McLaren (1992) reminds us that “...as field researchers, we do not stand beyond or behind every role we play as isolated homuncular selves, or detached, universalized Cartesian egos. We are structured as subjects or social
agents by economies of cultural codings and identifications that have political implications and consequences. As field researchers, we both actively construct and are constructed by the discourses we embody and the metaphors we enact” (p. 151).

McLaren’s observation addresses the extent to which our subjectivities come to bear on our role as researchers. Increasing numbers of researchers, particularly ethnographers, have started to explore the relationship between their “cultural codings and identifications” and their research. This focus on subjectivities also responds to postmodern challenges. Many researchers draw on Foucault’s use of genealogy as a method for analyzing subjectivities -- their own and those of the people they research.9

I explored numerous ways to identify and explore my subjectivities during this process. One strategy involved “reading against” my field notes and the pieces I selected to share with the group. This process of deconstruction is modeled on a method described by Williams (1990) in which she deconstructs her field notes from a feminist perspective in order to understand the ways in which her construction of herself as a white female affects the collection and interpretation of the data. Williams explores her subjectivities as part of the research process but still separates these positions in the presentation of the data. Williams returns to field notes from a previous study and “reads against” them from a feminist perspective. In this manner, she is able to identify some of the ways in which her self was being shaped by her interactions with others (both prior to
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9 Foucault’s method of genealogy relies on history, but not the singular “objective” history often associated with academic studies. Foucault attempts to displace these accepted histories by juxtaposing them against the historical perspective of marginalized peoples, the understandings not of the powerful or of the experts, but of those who are subjected in society. Bailey (1996) notes that “this perspective of genealogy is based on Foucault’s rejection of some notion that the interests involved in the truths and knowledges circulating in western post-industrial societies have been erased, allowing them to be presented as neutral (p. 120).
and during the study) and vice versa. In this instance, Williams revisits her study and presents her deconstruction in separate spaces. While embracing the process advocated by Williams, I opted to analyze the data and my subjectivities simultaneously.

Peshkin (1988) encourages this strategy and posits that “researchers should systematically seek out their subjectivity, not retrospectively when the data have been collected and the analysis complete, but while their research is actively in progress. The purpose of doing so is to enable researchers to be aware of how their subjectivity may be shaping their inquiry and its outcomes” (p. 17). While Peshkin advocates an examination of these subjectivities, he does not specify that the researcher's self becomes part of the research data. As a participant in the study, I could not separate myself from the data. Consequently, I viewed the exploration of these subjectivities as another dimension of the data. Lather and Smithies (1997) provide an interesting method for integrating researchers’ subjectivities and the data.

Lather and Smithies (1997) describe their subjectivities in conjunction with the narratives of women living with HIV/AIDS. The clarification of their biases, assumptions, and responses is integrated with the more traditional presentation of the narratives or what VanMaanen (1988) referred to as “the realist tale.” In this way, Lather and Smithies’s deconstruction of their subjectivities becomes another layer in the tale. Their strategies for creating multi-layered texts enables readers to recognize the interactions not only between the “participants” in the study (the “others”), but also makes explicit the ways in which they became participants who were being shaped by
these others. Not only do Lather and Smithies eliminate any pretenses of objectivity; they use their subjectivities to illuminate another dimension of the study.

Using a similar strategy, I opted to include excerpts from my researcher's journal regarding my reflections and concerns about the process, as well as my rationale for selecting certain pieces to share with the group, in a series of footnotes. In this Exploring the issue subjectivities is one of the ways in which feminists can push the parameters of research into multi-layered, multi-voiced "messy" texts. In an increasingly complex world, it seems unlikely that linear, "clean" texts that claim objectivity can meet challenges about representation. Foucault, however, warns that researchers (and others) must recognize the extent to which subjectivity is itself "site for contested discourse" (Ransom, 1996, p. 134). Including this additional layer of "data" in the footnotes opened the door for me, as well as others, to interrogate my subjectivities.

The issue of subjectivity was particularly germane to this study, given that part of the goal of the study was to collectively subject our subjectivities to examination. Consequently, Foucault's reminder served as an impetus for pushing the discussions past an initial layer of "feminist" analysis and deconstructing both the ideas traditionally associated with educating citizens in the United States and the feminist criticisms of the hegemonic discourse. In particular, our various interpretations and competing definitions regarding the term "feminist" made it easy for members of the group to interrogate our various positions and the ways in which we inscribed meaning on the various texts and experiences.
Problematizing “the Other” in Data Representation. One of the most consistent issues that arose during our discussions and the writing process was the issue of “the Other.” The process also raised questions about how to represent “the Other.” As we worked our way through various pieces of literature and issues of an expanded or completely new definition of citizenship, our conversation frequently focused on issues of diversity, including our own Whiteness and heterosexuality. As these issues arose, I introduced readings about black feminist thought from bell hooks (1990) and Audre Lorde (1995); a piece by Amy Gutman (1994) on the role of multiculturalism in “the politics of recognition”; and a reading from David Alperin (1990) that raised questions about classism from a Marxist notion of “standpoint” in feminist thought. Doreen contributed excerpts from fiction (The Dollmaker and Native Speaker) and Shannon helped us interrogate our Whiteness by introducing the group to The Redneck Manifesto. In our discussions, then, “the Other” meant people of color, people from lower socio-economic backgrounds, gays and lesbians, and other groups who have been (and are) marginalized or oppressed by the dominant society. We discussed our discomfort with “talking for” these groups and questioned the frequently made assumption that women’s experiences with oppression are monolithic and similar to those from other groups who have suffered persecution.

A piece by bell hooks illustrated our discomfort:

I am waiting for them to stop talking about the ‘Other,’ to stop even describing how important it is to be able to speak about difference. It is not just important what we speak about, but how and why we speak. Often this speech about the ‘Other’ is also a mask, an oppressive talk hiding gaps, absences, that space where our words would be if we were speaking . . . .(It) annihilates, erases: “no need to hear your voice when I can talk about you better than you can speak about
yourself. No need to hear your voice. Only tell me about your pain. I want to
know your story. And then I will tell it back to you in a new way. Tell it back to
you in a way that has become mine, my own. Re-writing you, I write myself
anew. I am still author, authority. I am still the colonizer, the speak subject, and
you are now at the center of my talk.’ Stop. (hooks, 1990, p. 151-152; cited in
Fine, 1994, p. 70).

Hooks is not alone in her scathing criticism of the ways in which feminists, as
well as other researchers, have perpetuated the definition of the “Other.” Bartky (1997)
notes it is generally accepted that, what she refers to as “Second Wave” feminists (those
who rejected positivism and accepted feminist standpoint epistemologies), have been
“race and class biased, heterosexist and ethnocentric, that they have often construed as the
experience of women generally what was merely the experience of those women who, by
virtue of relative race or class privilege, were in a position to theorize their experience in
the first place” (p. 177). These accusations come not only from feminists from post­
colonial countries, such as Mohanty (1988) and (Lal, 1996), but also from women of
color and/or marginalized social positions within the United States (Anzaldúa, 1987;
positions of power to present essentialized versions of women, or classroom teachers,
generated numerous questions regarding the ways in which the data would be analyzed
and presented.

A journal entry, written just after I wrote the first draft of one of the scenes,
illustrates another dimension of Otherness, one which was unique to me as the writer of
the story: “How will I avoid objectifying the other participants. Hell, how do I avoid
objectifying myself as one of the characters in the story?”
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My position as the university-based researcher, working with classroom teachers in a study I designed and initiated, was embedded with issues of power. While the processing of our discussions was collaborative, in the end, I assumed responsibility for representing their voices. Doing so in a manner that was consistent with the feminist, postmodern intentions of the study while avoiding proselytizing from my own position presented a considerable challenge. Lather (1992a) raises provocative questions about the possibilities for moving to a postmodern feminism that challenges the "vanguard" approach of previous feminist theorizing. "To abandon crusading rhetoric and begin to think outside of a framework which sees the 'Other' as the problem for which they are the solutions is to shift the role of critical intellectuals from universalizing spokes-persons to cultural workers who do what they can to lift the barriers which prevent people from speaking for themselves" (p. 47). The implication, according to Said (1986) is that who speaks is more important than what is said (cited in Lather, original emphasis).

Said's concern reflects the postcolonial perspective of attaching ownership, regardless of position. While these women (all White, middle class, educated) can not be equated with oppressed groups from postcolonial societies, classroom teachers are often subjected to power structures in which they find themselves in positions with little "formal" power and few spaces in which their voices are heard. This is particularly true
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10 Foucault (1991), however, challenges this emphasis on the speaker: "What matter who is speaking; someone has said: What matter who is speaking?" (p. 72, cited in Ransom, 1993: p. 121). The significance he gives to the discourse and not on the identities of the speakers suggests another tension between feminism — which is based on the premise that efforts should be made to pay particular attention to the experiences of women, and postmodernism — which rejects the centering of any one subjectivity. By focusing solely on the discourse (the structured ways of knowing that subjectivities both produce culture and are shaped by culture) postmodernists reject the possibility that any one struggle can be centralized. Again, to some extent, this position works with feminists who challenge the "vanguard" approach yet it continues to work against the possibility of privileging any voice.
in the academe, in which “scholarly activity” is often associated with research “on” and not “with” teachers (Noffke, 1990).

In searching for ways to represent “the Others” and recognize other sources of power, Hekman (1996) suggests that “agency is a product of discourse, a capacity that flows from discursive formation” and encourages feminists to find spaces for discourses which enable agency (p. 202-203). She continues by stating, “(E)ven though in every era there will be hegemonic discourses, other nonhegemonic discourses will also exist, forming a discursive mix from which subjectivity can be construed.” While Hekman was addressing specifically the content of hegemonic discourse, I determined that the form of the discourse is just as important. Wolf (1996) agrees: “Postmodernist theorizing has created opportunities for further innovation in research methods and the post-fieldwork process, particularly representation and writing” (p. 63).

I chose, then, to address my discomfort with representing the voices of my co-participants through the way in which the data was displayed. Disregarding the usually clearly distinguished boundaries of “academic writing” and “fiction” enabled me to be more effective in my goals to both politicize the work and present it to audiences outside of the academe. A variety of alternative methods of writing and displaying data can be found in the literature across virtually every discipline. Geertz (1983) advocates that researchers “blur the genres” in their writing. He explains that “social scientists have become free to shape their work in terms of its necessities rather than according to received ideas as to what they ought or ought not to be doing” (p. 21). Building on Geertz’s suggestion, I used the data to create a “story” about our experiences.
Writing the story, however, presented its own set of issues related to voice and Otherness. Written as a first person narrative, the story became an autobiographical musing which minimized the roles of my co-participants. When discussing this issue with one of the participants, she suggested assume their identities and write scenes from the first person narrative using "I" to represent each of us in turn. This approach of entering each of their minds and assuming their identity to tell part of the tale, however, felt like a violent intrusion.

Finally, though not an ideal solution, I wrote as the omnipresent narrator — the strategy most commonly used in fiction. This decision was, however, a compromise. While uncomfortable with the voyeurism of a storyteller who was capable of reading thoughts and who could follow participants from our discussions into our daily lives, the alternative was a flat story, lacking in the richness and detail that characterized the group's lives and conversations. In the end, I presented each of us as a type of "Other" whose voice and thoughts are displayed across the pages. This process raised ethical issues, as well as questions regarding how the validity of the study should be judged. The next two sections explore the moral implications of the study, the measures taken to insure the trustworthiness of the data included in the story and criteria for assessing the quality of the study.

Criteria for Evaluating the Study: Pinnacles and Pitfalls

One of the challenges in developing an eclectic research methodology is the difficulty of assessing the quality of the study. While this study fell into what Eisner (1997) describes as a "broad" conception of research, it did not fit neatly into pre-existing
categories of research. While in many ways the process of generating the data and ideas included in the study were consistent with more traditional approaches to research, the strategy for representing the data was not. The most important issue in using participants’ voices and ideas to create a “story,” particularly one which also contains elements of fiction, concerns my ethical obligations to them and to the reader. In addition, I drew upon current discussions about new ways of interpreting “validity” to identify five criteria for assessing the study. Each of these criteria is presented in the form of a question; the first two address concerns regarding the methods used during the research process and the last three reflect the goals of the study. Finally, using the “promise and perils” Eisner identifies for alternative forms of data representation, I include four additional questions that provide guidelines for determining the merit and worth of the study. After discussing the “standards” for evaluating the quality of the study, I present what I perceive to be potential “pitfalls” in this alternative form of data representation.

What Are My Ethical Obligations?

In every research process, there are ethical issues to consider; this study was no exception. Throughout the study, I struggled with two issues. First, there was an element of power dynamics at work because of my role as the study’s initiator and coordinator, and second, it was inevitable that I would “own” the majority of what emerged from the study, given that the data would be used for my research.

McLaren’s (1991) work on “Field Relations and the Discourse of the Other” and “Collision with Otherness” (1992) addresses many of my concerns about power. McLaren raises questions about “Whose interests are being served by our research
efforts?" and receptive formations. Participants will come to the study, McLaren explains, with "conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions . . . (and) . . . ways of understanding (their) relation to the world" (McLaren, 1991, citing Weedon, p. 32).

From the beginning, I attempted to approach both of my roles, as participant and as researcher, with sensitivity. When inviting each individual to participate in the study, I expressed my understanding if they were unable to commit their time and energy. In addition, I provided them with letters of informed consent, in order to insure they understood my responsibilities as a researcher. I also made explicit the ways in which my interests were being promoted through their participation in the study. While we each identified goals or reasons for participating in the study, in the end none were so concrete or self-serving as my own.

The study's flexible design, however, provided opportunities for the group to determine the direction and, to some extent, the outcome of the study. Reason's (1994) model for co-operative inquiry emphasizes the importance of addressing participants as "self-determining, which means that what they do and what they experience as part of the research must be so some significant degree determined by them" (p.325). While I prepared a list of guiding questions for each week's discussion, the group rarely responded to many, if any, of the queries posed. Instead, participants routinely build on one another's ideas to generate ideas. I reviewed the transcripts at the end of each session to determine whether or not my voice dominated the discussion or dictated the direction. In addition, on numerous occasions I asked for feedback from the group regarding whether or not the discussions should be more or less structured. While clearly my own
agenda was promoted through their participation, in our final debriefing, each member of
the group expressed an appreciation for the opportunity to share in our discussions and
develop her own thinking on the questions raised by the study.

The second issue, that of ownership, was even more complex. To some extent, these issues are related to the ethical considerations faced by all “insider” researchers.\textsuperscript{11} The friendship that existed within the group before this study was initiated added another layer of complexity. In representing the voices of the other participants, I was aware of the trust they bestowed on me – particularly when, as a group, they decided that I should use their real names. As the final drafts of the story were written, my role in its creation became more and more prominent. While this may have been inevitable, my relocation to the state of Washington in the final stages of writing made regular communication with the group even more difficult.

I was, however, committed to crafting a tale that, while representing our angst and contradictions, also reflected the warmth of our community. During one of our sessions, we discussed a chapter entitled “Care as a Political Concept” (Tronto, 1996). Noddings (1995) also uses this term when describing schools. I found this term uppermost in my mind as I constructed scenes and shared small details of the lives of these participants . . . these women . . . my friends. In the end, it may be this very feminist notion that as researchers we should care for those \textit{with} whom, and to some extent \textit{on} whom, we do research that will have the most lasting impact on me.

\textsuperscript{11} For a compelling discussion of these issues, see Baca Zinn (1979).
What Role Did Participants Have in Constructing the Story? Throughout the process, participants were asked to provide *member checks* on the quality of transcription and interpretation of the data. The story was shared with participants as various segments were written and they were asked for comments, corrections, and revisions when the story was complete. Participants’ suggested revisions were made or noted in a text box to insure their perspectives regarding the story were represented. In addition, while the story itself contains fictitious elements (settings, actions, context of the thoughts or conversations), participants maintain our own voices (i.e. quotations or thoughts presented as Doreen’s can be traced to her contributions to the focus group discussions).

What was the Process for Collecting and Organizing Data? In addition to conducting regular member checks, all aspects of the study were carefully recorded and filed in my journal. My journal includes all of the memos, readings, and transcriptions shared with the group. In addition, I used the journal to record my reflections on the process. The original materials were maintained in chronological order so that I could trace the development of certain concepts and themes throughout the process. For example, prior to each meeting I selected two or three readings to share with the group. In order to identify these readings, I typically considered ten to twelve possibilities. Each of these possibilities, and my notes, were included in the journal. The journal also includes the pieces selected for each of our meetings, with a one or two page summary
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12 While I broached the subject with having each participant maintain a journal, the idea was met with little enthusiasm. I was keenly aware of the amount of time these teachers were already dedicating to this study. The readings I distributed each week required considerable time to digest, particularly given that much of the language in several of the pieces was new to most of the group. Although members of the group were offered course credit for their participation, thereby providing justification for spending additional time on their participation, Shannon was the only one interested in acquiring more credit hours. She, however, did
regarding my rationale for choosing those readings. My notes on each of the readings are color coded and dated. Notes from my initial reading appear in black, comments on the readings that emerged during our discussions are noted in red, and additional reflections on the pieces are made in blue; all are coded and dated accordingly.

The process of transcribing the focus group discussions also required careful documentation. The date of each discussion and the number of the discussion in the sequence was recorded on each cassette. Copies of each of the interview tapes provided a back-up in case of accidental erasure or damage. As indicated earlier, I noted details about the discussion (gestures, rolling of the eyes, expressions of frustration) which would not be evident in the audio taped version of our discussion. My position next to the tape recorder allowed me to monitor the tape, as well as record the counter number in my notes. As I transcribed the discussions, these details were added in parenthetical notations.

While most of the data was transcribed verbatim, portions of the conversation not directly related to the topic were summarized. In addition, the familiarity among group members also elicited comments or revelations about personal lives that were not relevant to this study. These sections were noted with a series of stars in the typed transcriptions. The original transcriptions were numbered by line so pieces of data could be easily identified and traced. After the initial process was completed, I changed the fonts of each of the speakers in order to represent visually each of the voices engaged in our

not have access to a fee waiver and paying fees for tuition were not an option at that time.
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conversation. My comments and reflections were noted in italicized print so these could be distinguished easily and quickly from the original discussion.

**How Does the Study Promote Reflexivity for Participants and Readers?**

Scheurich’s view of validity in terms of “our reflexion on our practices and our ‘worlding the world’ through discourse” (cited in Lenzo, 1993, p. 12) was also relevant to this study. Since one of the primary objectives of the study was the (re)consideration of citizenship from feminist perspectives, the extent to which participants express deliberate, thoughtful analysis of the issues as they related to multiple perspectives and worldviews also served as an indication of validity. Our success in this area was determined both through the original focus group discussions (evidence of connections to the classroom, critical considerations of our assumptions, deconstruction of the readings and terminology) and the representation of the data (juxtaposing our discussions with others in the larger discourse, layering of multiple voices).

**What Action Emerged from Participants’ Involvement in the Study?** The collaborative nature of the study rested on the assumption that each participant might identify and reach a goal through her participation in this study. Lather (1986) refers to “catalytic validity” -- meaning the extent to which the research process resulted in action. This pragmatic criterion for validity would be met if each participant in the process achieved her stated goals. With varying degrees of success, these conclusions were confirmed with participants as the study ended.

For example, Nancy indicated a change in her approach to teaching, this achieving her goal to reconsider her practice from a feminist perspective. Specifically, Nancy
identified a new approach to issues of power and control in her classroom. In addition, though her participation in this study merely served to reinforce this desire, Nancy is considering embarking on her own doctoral studies with a possible emphasis in Women’s Studies and/or feminist pedagogy.

Shannon, at the time of the study a first year teacher, discussed the desire to develop curriculum materials that “worked against” the apathetic acceptance her students exhibited towards malestream conceptions of citizenship. During the course of the study, Shannon routinely sought feedback from the more experienced teachers in the group regarding student-centered projects and lessons oriented toward getting students more actively involved in their local community. Since our last “official” focus group discussion, Shannon has left her previous position and currently works with Doreen in one of Columbus’s alternative schools. This particular school, in part because of Doreen’s encouragement, supports strong connections to the community and promotes students’ involvement in local civic issues.

Doreen’s goal related to the prospect of attaining grant monies to support programs that would enhance the concept of citizenship among high school students. At the end of our focus group discussions, Doreen discussed the possibility of using our discussions as the basis for a summer institute on citizenship for students from their respective schools. While the project was not initiated during the summer of 1998, possibilities for summer, 1999 are being explored.

When asked at our first focus group discussion what she hoped to gain from her participation in the study, Leanne replied, “I just value the conversation and the
opportunity to connect with other women in social studies.” While it is impossible to
assert our participation in this study brought us closer as a group, I believe that without a
clearly defined reason for gathering, our busy schedules would often have prevented us
from meeting so frequently. These meetings provided each of us with an opportunity to
reinforce our relationship with the others and explore our ideas in a safe, but challenging,
environment. The ongoing contact of the group through e-mail, telephone conversations,
and meetings, as well as our plans for the future (conference presentations, additional
opportunities for collaboration) demonstrate a commitment to the community we
established.

My goal was the conduct and completion of this study. As the “researcher” in the
group, I hoped to develop a new, participatory, feminist methodology for collaboration.
For the most part, I, too, achieved this goal. The process confirmed my beliefs regarding
the false dichotomy between theory and practice, the extent to which university-based
researchers underestimate teachers’ interest in and ability to consider “high theory,” and
the value of providing broader definitions for “collaboration” if we are to truly “invent
possibilities.” I am left, however, with numerous questions about the methodology –
including how “standing on the precipice” will serve me as an assistant professor in an
academe still dominated by modernist criteria for success.

Our effectiveness in achieving catalytic validity should not, however, be presented
as a “victory narrative” in which one is left with the impression that participating in this
study was a life-changing event for any of the participants. I suspect each of these
“changes” would have occurred with or without our participation in the study. As
discussed in the final chapter regarding the methodological implications for this study, additional attention should be given to each participant’s goals in order for the collaboration to be more meaningful. The preexisting relationship among participants in this study provided a sense of purpose for our group independent of the goals identified in relation to this study.

**How Did the Study Challenge Modernist, Hegemonic Traditions?** Lather (1992) posits another criteria for validity: rhizomatic validity. Lather suggests certain studies are appropriately assessed on the basis of whether or not the study “destabilizes authority from within through connectivity” (p. 32). One of the assumptions of the study was that citizenship in the United States has been defined primarily in terms of political citizenship by White, men holding positions of power and authority. By making connections among voices from historically disenfranchised and marginalized groups, the study attempted to challenge this hegemony. The representation of data challenges the hegemonic discourse surrounding the concept of citizen and citizenship education by juxtaposing these ideas with a cacophony of voices, including but not limited to those of the participants. My intent was for educators, those who participated in the study and those who will read about it in the future, to consider the possibilities that exist if we interrogate the authority of existing curriculum and programs and move beyond narrow interpretations of citizenship.

In this case, the study’s rhizomatic validity may not be ascertained until the story is shared with others.
How Does this Form of Representation Shape Experience and Enlarge Understanding?  Eisner (1996) suggests that one “job” that researchers have is “engendering a sense of empathy for the lives of the people they wish us to know” (p. 8). He advocates that researchers use the tool most appropriate for accomplishing this task. Why is empathy important?  Eisner posits that “we have begun to realize that human feeling does not pollute understanding.” I would argue even further, that human feeling enhances our understanding in a Hegelian sense by generating internal relations among our various ways of knowing.

Creating scenes in which the reader obtains glimpses of our lives and the interaction of our daily experiences with our thinking about the issues that emerged in the study provided a vehicle for this type of empathetic understanding. Data presented in traditional forms, with excerpts presented in small sections that are often isolated from the speaker’s identity, fail to have “the power to evoke in the reader what the reader needs to experience to know the person someone portrays” (Eisner, 1997, p. 8).

How Does the Story Provide a Sense of Particularity that Abstractions Cannot Render?  Again, building on the guidelines provided by Eisner (1997), the intention of the story was “… to know each individual character. When done well, the situation and the people take on their own distinctive qualities. They acquire dimension. Particularity and dimensionality are conditions of something being ‘real’” (p. 8). When framing this study, I was struck by the extent to which citizenship had stopped being something real, authentic, meaningful. In addition to wanting to represent the participants and our discussions as genuine, I sought a method for “revisioning” citizenship in a way
that encouraged re(new)ed discourse among social studies educators. Placing our
conversations, as well as the theoretical literature, in the context of every day life offered
an opportunity to encourage readers to see connections to their own "real" lives, as well
as to disrupt those lives and consider new possibilities.

How Does the Story Create “Productive Ambiguity”? Eisner (1997) explains
that “productive ambiguity” means “the material presented is more evocative than
denotative, and in its evocation, it generates insight and invites attention to complexity.
Unlike the traditional ideal of conventional research, some alternative forms of data
representation result in less closure and more plausible interpretations of the meaning of
the situation” (p. 8). My goal for the study was not to develop a definitive, feminist
interpretation of what it means to educate citizens in a democracy. In fact, it was just the
opposite. Instead of a narrow definition, I hoped to generate interest in a public discourse
on what this means as we face a new millennium. That this was accomplished among the
participants in the study is a small measure of success. If I am able to use these initial
conversations as a genesis for additional dialogues with people representing multiple
identities and localities, an even greater level of “productive ambiguity” will be achieved.

Does the Story Provide an Opportunity to Exploit Individual Aptitude? The
extent to which I am able to use my skills as a writer to invite the reader into our lives and
discussions is still in question. My previous experiences with data representation have
been limited to more traditional forms and brief forays into reflexive and postmodern
writing. This task, however, stretched my skills as a scholar, as a researcher, and as a
writer. I leave the response to this question to the readers of the story that follows.
What are the “Pitfalls” of Using Alternative Forms of Data Representation?

In addition to the issues of subjectivity, the problems associated with representing “the Other” and the ethical questions addressed earlier in this chapter, there are additional considerations for any researcher embarking on this path. One challenge is the extent to which existing structures preclude alternative forms of data representation. For example, in order to write the story using different fonts and text boxes to represent the various voices involved, I first needed permission from my committee. I am grateful to have had a committee that not only supported this idea, but encouraged me in the endeavor. However, I also needed to petition the Graduate College for a waiver on the established guidelines regarding font size and type, margins, and the use of text boxes. (See Appendix C.) While permission was granted for the dissertation, I foresee future difficulties finding journal editors willing to reproduce any segment of the story as it is currently represented because of format standards.

Eisner (1997) identifies a second “peril” that has to do “not with a problem inherent in the use of alternative forms of data representation, but in a potential backlash from their use” (p. 9). Like Eisner, I foresee a potential for resistance from educational researchers not hanging out here “on the precipice” with me. I needed to assume responsibility, therefore, to demonstrate that I was not “substituting novelty and cleverness for substance” (Eisner, p. 9). In order to create spaces for research such as this, I and others of like mind, must clearly describe the context of our work and hold ourselves to the highest of standards.
Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a detailed description of the research methodology, including the process for identifying participants, collecting data, and writing and analyzing the story. In addition, this chapter presented criteria by which the story in Chapter 4, entitled "Disrupt, Transgress, and Invent Possibilities: The Ladies’ Auxiliary Desert Club and Terrorist Society Does Citizenship" should be judged. Next, Chapter 3 provides a brief history of the historical connections between citizenship and public education in the United States. This summary sets the context for the discussions that occurred as a part of this study. In Chapter 4, the story is presented in three acts, each containing two or more scenes. In Chapter 5, I present my discussion of the story, as well as the substantive and methodological implications of the product and process developed in this study.
CHAPTER 3

SETTING THE STAGE:
A BRIEF HISTORY OF EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

The purpose of this summary is to set the stage for the story presented in Chapter 4. The story represents the discussions of four classroom teachers and one university-based educator as we grapple with what it means to educate students for their roles as democratic citizens. These ideas, however, were not created in a vacuum. For the most part, the story was created to challenge the unspoken assumptions embedded in the ways in which we have traditionally talked about and taught about citizenship in the United States. Since the intention of this project was not to review where citizenship had been, but the possibilities for where it might go, this review is purposefully selective. Instead of a comprehensive review of the literature on citizenship, I offer a critique of those ideas that illustrate the strongest link between citizenship and education. In so doing, I continue the "sins of omission" by underrepresenting the voices of women and people of color. I posit, however, that the ideas presented below reflect the historical roots of the hegemonic discourse on what it means to be a "good" citizen in a democratic society, particularly in the field of social studies education.
Purpose of Public Schools

The purpose of public schools in the United States has been at the center of a long and heated debated. Sehr (1997) argues that recent efforts for “educational reform, restructuring, privatization, and vouchers” rest on the assumption that the role of public education is “to prepare Americans to compete, both as individuals and as a society, in the new global economic order” (p. 1). However, the emphasis on the economic reasons for public education is only one of many objectives, one that has generated criticism for its lack of moral and practical value. Increasingly, calls are being made to refocus schooling towards its original objective of educating informed citizens for a democratic society (Aronowitz, 1994; Apple & Beane, 1995; Giroux, 1988; Sehr, 1997; Shor, 1992).

Indeed, at its inception, public education in the United States was intended to educate the polity. As early as 1779, in the preamble for his bill for free schools in Virginia, Thomas Jefferson “laid out the basic logic of state-sponsored schools for republican citizenship” (Kaestle, 1983, p. 6). Jefferson argued:

Citizens must choose leaders wisely, defeat ambition and corruption in politics, and protect liberty by keeping a vigilant eye on government. All citizens should have a chance not only to vote but to be elected. The government needs wise and honest laws, Jefferson argued, and thus it needs educated and virtuous law makers. In a republic, these men must be chosen “without regard to wealth, birth or other accidental condition.” (Kaestle, 1983, 6)

Jefferson’s call echoed the sentiment of other policy makers in the newly formed United States of American who were concerned with protecting the freedom they had recently won, and “also with maintaining order, without which all might be lost. Education could play an important role in reconciling freedom and order” (Kaestle, 1983,
p. 5; see also Spring, 1997). While Jefferson advocated that schools should “provide the average citizen with the tools of reading and writing and that political beliefs would be formed through the exercise of reason,” (Spring, 1997, p. 57), he emphasized that, without adequate schooling, there would be no educated leadership to direct the new republic.

Contemporaries of Jefferson argued for more direct instruction regarding the basic principles of a republican form of government. In 1790, Noah Webster, an influential leader in education, explained, “An acquaintance with ethics and with the general principles of law, commerce, money and government is necessary for the yeomanry of a republican state” (as cited in Kaestle, 1983, p. 5). The competing expectations regarding the school as a socializing and politicizing agent was the subject of considerable debate among the early proponents of public education (Kaestle, 1983; Spring, 1997). At the heart of this debate, however, is a more fundamental question, “What characteristics does a good citizen possess?” In this aspect, there was virtually unanimous agreement regarding at least three qualities that must be common to all: citizens were white, male, and, at least initially, property owners.

The origins of the assumption that women, as well as people of color, should be disenfranchised and, consequently, limited in their role as citizen, developed through a variety of factors, including social, cultural, political and economic traditions. In order to appreciate the setting for a discourse among women in social studies education regarding the concept of citizen and what it means to educate students for their roles as citizens, it is necessary to contextualize our discussions. First, the political philosophies of Plato and Rousseau regarding the characteristics of the ideal citizen are presented. An
examination of these philosophers, both influential in the thinking and policy-making of the original founders of the United States, provides insights regarding the conflicting and limited roles women were assumed to play as citizens in democratic societies. Next, I demonstrate the ways in which some of these same assumptions influenced the design and implementation of public education in the U.S.. Finally, an exploration of the extent to which these same suppositions emerged in the framework of the newly created "social studies" in 1916, as well as evidence that many of these assumptions continue to promulgate discussion about citizenship and citizenship education in the 1990s, is presented. This review is not an exhaustive analysis of this topic. Instead my intent is to provide sufficient background on this topic so readers will understand our discussions, and thus, the story, did not develop in a vacuum. Instead, as Martin (1985) suggests, we were attempting to "reclaim the conversation" which had excluded or trivialized the contributions of women since its beginning.

Republicanism and Plato

Western philosophical thought, including the traditions in which the U.S. Constitution are grounded, traces its roots to ancient Greece and Rome. Specifically, Plato’s *Republic* was enormously influential in shaping political philosophies and democratic forms of government, leading Alfred North Whitehead to characterize European philosophy as “a series of footnotes to Plato” (cited in Martin, 1985, p. 11). In Plato’s republicanism\(^1\) emphasizes two primary themes: (1) the importance of virtuous

\(^1\) The representational democracy formed by the U. S. Constitution has roots in two traditions: republicanism and democracy. Madison, sometimes referred to as the “Father of the Constitution,” recognized that the newly formed country was too large to function as a “direct democracy” in which the people would administer the government themselves. Instead, a republican form of government, in which the people’s representatives would administer the government, presented a less cumbersome option.
citizens and (2) the government’s obligation to act for the good of the whole rather than to the advantage of particular groups or individuals.

While very few of these later traditions in European (and American) philosophy address the role of women, Plato’s Republic includes specific suggestions regarding the inclusion of women in the polity as part of the guardian class. This dimension of his philosophy, however, received little attention from later male philosophers. In addition, he radically challenged what were, even in ancient Greece, “traditional” roles for women, including child rearing and household responsibilities.

Plato argues that the virtuous citizen is one who works for the good of the state from his or her respective position in society. According to Plato, each individual has innate tendencies that make him or her suitable for a particular occupation. Some, he argues, are well-suited to be artisans, other auxiliaries (or foot soldiers), and a small number should be prepared to assume their positions in the guardian class. Each of these groups should receive a different education, one which helps them better meet the needs of society. While not eliminating classes, Plato does suggest that classes be based on ability and not necessarily the result of the situation into which one was born -- later making his ideas quite revolutionary in British and French monarchies. In addition, Plato’s Republic emphasizes the extent to which each individual is responsible for the good of the entire society. This dimension of his philosophy played an important role in shaping future discussion about the role of the citizen.

However, Madison and the other writers of the Constitution, wished to maintain certain principles of democracy. Consequently, members of the government were to be elected by the majority. In this sense, the government “was a democracy in the sense that it derived its authority — its right to govern — from the people as a whole”(Center for Civic Education, p. 17).
There is considerable debate among feminists regarding Plato's intent for including women in the polity. Okin (1978) suggests that Plato intended to emancipate women by abolishing their obligations to the family and home (cited in Martin, 1985: 18). However, Hartsock (1984) claims that Plato was "forced into an inclusion because of aristocratic loyalties" but never really meant to include women in the guardian class (200). The conflict between Plato's allegiance to the aristocracy and his attitudes about women may explain some of the inconsistencies in his positions.

Plato's Republic includes glaring contradictions regarding the position of women (Martin, 1985; Spelman 1996). While stating that women can, and should, be part of the guardian class, Plato also uses the term "womanish" in consistently derogatory ways: "Isn't it small-minded and womanish to regard the body as your enemy, when the enemy himself has flitted away, leaving behind only the instrument with which he fought?" (Plato, 1974, p. 144). Plato's references to "womanish" behaviors include those reflecting cowardice, stupidity, contradictory behavior, and hysteria. Okin (1979) also notes the deprecation of women: "Plato certainly shared his fellow Athenians' contempt for . . . women," categorizing them "with the immature, the sick, and the weak" (p. 22, cited in Stone, p. 41).

Even philosophers who support republicanism have not always agreed with Plato's definitions of the virtuous citizen, or the ways in which he suggests the good of the whole should be determined in society. In addition, later philosophers challenge Plato's educational goals that severely limit the role of desire and passion. However, Plato's insistence that citizens be educated for their role in society establishes a foundation for education to shape and be shaped by the state. Later philosophers often
accept this premise and present a political philosophy that includes a philosophy of education.

**Emile: Rousseau’s Perfect Citizen**

Rousseau is one of the political philosophers who further developed the connections between education and citizenship. In addition, as a contemporary of Jefferson, Adams, and Madison, Rousseau’s writings on the relationship between the government and the governed (citizens) were influential in providing a philosophical foundation for the fledging United States. For example, in *The Social Contract* (1761, 1988), Rousseau recognizes what people lose by agreeing to their role as citizen but emphasizes what is gained, namely liberty and the right to property. However, Rousseau asserts that moral liberty is acquired only through “obedience to a law which we prescribe to ourselves . . . .” (p. 19). Rousseau states that people should be sovereign; therefore, self-government should replace monarchies. He also introduces the concept of the general will: “Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and, in our corporate capacity, we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole” (p. 32).

Like Plato, Rousseau made explicit connections between education and citizenship. In his political treatises, Rousseau outlines his conception of the state. It is in *Emile* (Rousseau, 1762, 1979), however, that he specifically identifies the qualities of a good citizen and describes, in great detail, the education necessary to produce the “ideal” citizen. Rousseau creates a fictional student, Emile, and places himself in the role of the young boy’s tutor. He provides readers with specific learning activities and content for Emile’s education. The situation is, indeed, only possible in the ideal: the tutor remains
with his student for twenty-five years. However, many of Rousseau's suggestions reappear during the Progressive Education movements in the United States and Great Britain almost two centuries after the writing of *Emile*. While Emile's education has often been heralded as the model for educating democratic citizens, few of these proponents acknowledge the last book (or chapter) in the volume in which Rousseau describes what he believes to be an appropriate education for a woman. Emile's development as a well-rounded, liberal, egalitarian citizen is largely at the expense of his fictitious female counterpart, Sophie.

"Everything is good as it leaves the hands of the Author of things; everything degenerates in the hands of man" (Rousseau, 1762, 1979, p. 37). With this first statement in *Emile*, Rousseau lays a foundation for an education which, he claims, is intended to "shape" men as "plants are shaped by cultivation" (p. 38). Rousseau assumes that, left to a natural state, humankind would lead healthy lives in which one's most important needs would be satisfied. In *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* (1753) Rousseau identifies these needs as "food, a female, and sleep."

Consequently, while Emile is being educated for citizenship, Sophie is being educated for Emile. Rousseau states, "[T]he whole education of women ought to relate to men. To please men, to be useful to them, to make herself loved and honored by them, to raise them when young, to care for them when grown...these are the duties of women at all times and they ought to be taught from childhood" (p. 365).

Rousseau extends his definition of Social Contract to the family. In fact, one might consider his description of the ideal family as a microcosm of an ideal society. More than once, in *Emile*, he draws parallels between the role of husband and father with
that of citizen. Rousseau misses the seemingly obvious contradiction that, unless women accept his narrowly defined role for them, they suffer under laws imposed by others—be it a husband, men in the general sense, or society. Rousseau's rigid conviction to his interpretation of men and women's natural state makes it impossible for him to recognize this challenge to his theory.

**Education for Future U.S. Citizens: Preparing Girls for Supporting Roles**

Plato's contradictory and sometime misogynist claims about the role of women as citizens, as well as Rousseau's plans for a society in which gender roles fall within clearly marked boundaries, were not the only factors influencing early educational policy-makers in the United States. These two philosophers were discussed, in large part, because other philosophers relevant to the discussion barely mention the role of women at all, thereby confirming the existence of an assumption that women should not, and perhaps could not, assume the role of active citizens in democratic societies. Consequently, two themes emerged from the development of public education in the United States.

The first trend reflected an increasing emphasis on the link between education and citizenship. Like Plato, Rousseau, and Jefferson, later advocates of schooling would argue for the importance of an educated polity. While the path by which educators and their students ought to travel to the road of "good citizen" remained controversial, virtually all educational reformers promoted the idea that schools should serve to educate future citizens, though how this should be accomplished is still under debate. The
second trend was the glaring contradiction of an educational system that purported to
prepare students for a role less than half would ever have the right to assume.

The schism that existed between the stated purpose of schools and the realities of
the U.S. in the 19th Century failed was simply not acknowledged by many of the policy-
makers of the era:

Ignoring the fact that the majority of Americans could not vote, Pennsylvania’s
superintendent [of public education] stated in 1842 the democratic principle that
animated citizenship education: “The foundations of our political institutions rest
upon man’s capacity for self-government; not the capacity of one, of a hundred,
of a thousand, but of all . . . . Enlightened public opinion will be a wall of fire
around our free institutions, and preserve them inviolate forever” (Kaestle, 1983,
p. 97).

This contradiction was particularly glaring given the steadily increasing number
of female teachers. However, Spring (1997) posits that the increasingly passive
expectations for the role of citizens who “were to learn not to break the law, but . . . were
not taught how to deal actively with injustice,” was consistent with the “general social
attitudes about women” (p. 132). He explains, “It would not have been in keeping with
the temper of the times if . . . [women] had been trained to become public crusaders,
because active, political and social endeavors were not considered a proper part of the
social role of women in the nineteenth century.”

The tensions surrounding the women’s roles as teachers, mothers, nurturers, but
not fully recognized citizens, created a culture in which women devised their own
methods for exerting influence. “Essentially what most female leaders did was to enlarge
women’s sphere rather than to question it, using the moral authority and social prestige
 accorded to women, but not directly challenging the view that power in the public
domain belonged to men" (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 63). This approach is, perhaps, most clearly in Catherine Beecher's *A Treatise on Domestic Economy*, published in 1842. Beecher argues that, while "women have an equal interest in all social and civil concerns," they have no claim to the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. However, according to Beecher, women are not isolated from the polity. Martin (1985) explains: "Beecher's daughters are not full citizens, but in requiring their husbands to represent them, Beecher gives women an indirect voice in the laws they must obey. Moreover, in maintaining that women have an equal interest in social, civil, and political concerns and institutions, she acknowledges that although they are not exactly citizens of the state, they are nonetheless to be counted among its members" (p. 107).

The role of women as "indirect" citizens of the state was widely accepted. Kaestle (1983), in describing the role of ideology in U.S. public education in the middle of the 19th Century, explains, "Moral education thus overlapped with citizenship education. Future citizens – *and the women who as mothers and teachers would train them* – not only needed to know some United States geography, history, and law but also needed to be impressed with the moral responsibility of protecting American institutions" (Kaestle, 1983, p. 97, emphasis added). There were, however, staunch critics of a system which left women to exert control through subversive and ambiguous ways. The struggle for women's suffrage moved forward at an agonizingly slow pace. In 1869, Wyoming Territory provided opportunities for women holding property to vote in all elections. The 15th Amendment, giving voting rights to males who were former slaves, provided new hope for advocates of women's suffrage. By 1900, a handful of Western states included women as part of the voting public.
Interestingly, as the debate surrounding whether or not women would “be provided” (one might argue “successfully claim” is a more appropriate phrase) the rights of citizenship, another reform was at hand. The same Progressive Movement which served as the driving force behind women’s suffrage, also resulted in the creation of the social studies. Barth (1994) explains, “Conventional wisdom would assign the founding of social studies to reform-minded educators; but, as we know, the foundation was set by social critics and politicians who were influential in pointing to a need for an organized public school effort to educate the American public to the job of enlightened citizen” (p. 13). The influx of immigrants during this same period and the political, social, and economic diversity which resulted increased the calls for a coordinated effort in schools to socialize these newcomers.

Educating Citizens through Social Studies

This fledging, interdisciplinary, academic area was the subject of a report compiled by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association (Nelson, 1994). The Commission defined social studies as “those whose subject matter relates directly to the organization and development of human society, and to man [sic] as a member of social groups” (p. 9). This report, The Social Studies in Secondary Education: The 1916 Report of the Committee on Social Studies, is considered one of the most influential documents in legitimating the field of “social studies” and clearly establishes the goal of social studies: “(T)he social studies of the American high school should have for their conscious and constant purpose the cultivation of good citizenship” (p. 9).
In 1916, while the Committee on Social Studies was making recommendations regarding the importance of the "cultivation of good citizenship," women in the United States still did not have the right to vote. As teachers, women were given responsibility for preparing (male) students for their participation in the polity while women teachers themselves remained disenfranchised. In addition, teachers were asked to make citizenship a priority for all students -- in spite of the fact that young female students, like female teachers, were limited as citizens both by law and tradition.

This contradiction did not escape Annie G. Porrit in 1911, when she wrote: "[I]f the training for politics and for the larger life of the nation is necessary for boys, it is manifestly absurd to give such training for girls -- training which would unfit them for their own sphere" (p. 448, cited in Bernard-Powers, 1996b, p. 287). Though the Committee noted "the greatest obstacle to the vitalization of the social studies is the lack of preparation on the part of teachers" (Bulletin, 1916, p. 58), it did not, however, recognize that part of this "lack of preparation" may have resulted from female teachers' limited rights as citizens.

Of course, one can dismiss these oversights as a reflection of the context in 1916. However, the women's suffrage movement was not new. In addition, and perhaps even more disturbing, is Murray Nelson's presentation of "The Social Contexts of the Committee on Social Studies Report," published in 1994, which also fails to address this contradiction. His analysis of the social history of the report provides details about educational structures, labor movements, and the position of immigrants. However, there is no discussion of the position of women or their efforts in gaining full and equal status as citizens. While recognizing that the term "citizen" is not necessarily limited to
suffrage, it is impossible to deny that having a voice in the polity is considered an inherent part of one’s role as a citizen.

The importance of linking civic education and social studies is also reflected in the definition of social studies adopted by the Board of Directors of NCSS in 1992:

Social studies is the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence . . . The primary purpose of social studies is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world (NCSS, 1992: 3, emphasis added).

It is the last part of this statement “as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world” that begs for a reconsideration of how we define citizenship. The statement implies the world is changing yet interpretations of what it means to be a citizen has been expected to remain static, resulting in definitions grounded in the misogynous ideas of philosophers such as Plato and Rousseau.

Conclusion

In order to fully understand the implications of educating citizens, one must analyze some of the philosophical traditions upon which this concept of an “informed citizen” rests. Many contemporary definitions of an “informed citizen” are grounded in the Enlightenment Era and the subsequent development of logical positivism. These definitions promote the possibility of objective truths that are reached through a process of rational thought.

Most feminists and postmodernists reject this basic premise of positivism. Griffiths (1995) notes, “None of the feminist epistemologies assumes or argues that the perspective of the individual human being can be superseded by the ‘objective’ view
from nowhere’ or by a ‘God’s eye view . . . . (p. 59). Stone (1996) adds, “[T]he
traditional definition of citizenship and of woman within it, either as inferior, segregated,
or invisible is based upon a conception of rationality that is assumed universal: Humans
(read man) possess a natural rationality (augmented by education and civic participation)
that feminists assert has been denied to woman” (p. 44).

If social studies teachers adhere to the belief that our role is to educate citizens,
how can we define citizenship in more meaningful, inclusive, and stimulating ways?
What happens when we move away from conceptions of citizenship that are grounded in
rationalism? How are these conceptions (old and new) shaped by our identities? The
following chapter contains a story, a visual reader’s theater, in which a group of women
in social studies education consider these questions. The story challenges the reader to
juxtapose the story with the traditions and the excerpts from feminists, postmodernists,
and others calling for changes in how we think about, talk about, and teach about
citizenship in the United States. Chapter 5, the last chapter, provides the reader with my
discussion of the story and the implications I have identified for social studies and
educational research as a result of this process and product.
CHAPTER 4

"DISRUPT, TRANSGRESS, AND INVENT POSSIBILITIES":
THE LADIES' AUXILIARY DESERT CLUB
AND TERRORIST SOCIETY DOES CITIZENSHIP

The purpose of this chapter is to present an alternative form of data representation, the story. The story is divided into three parts. The first act, "Disrupt," includes three scenes. In the first scene, each of the "characters" in this story is introduced and information regarding her "identity position" (Popkewitz, 1997) is presented. The second and third scenes illustrate the extent to which the group experienced ruptures in our thinking about the concept of citizen and our roles of educating students for active citizenship in a democratic society. "Transgress," the second act, includes scenes in which we, as participants/characters, struggled to make meaning fissures created by our (re)conceptualizations. The final act, entitled "Invent Possibilities," presents scenes in which we explored the issue of agency.¹

¹Agency is used here in the postmodern sense, thus rejecting the critical definition in which the focus is on "change agents" who invoke transformation (i.e. Giroux's (1992) "transformative intellectual"). As Popkewitz (1997) posits, "Rather than identifying power and change in agents, postmodern social theory gives attention to the social construction of 'reason' (knowledge)" (p. 24). Popkewitz continues by asserting that "the postmodern focus on how the actor has been constituted and reconstituted in different social spaces paradoxically reintroduces a type of humanism. This humanism occurs not by looking for the
Act I: Disrupt

Scene I. "We are Gathered Here to Officially Begin My Dissertation Research": The Cast of Characters

As Dawn arranged the chairs around the table, her mind buzzed. She could smell the coffee brewing and the aroma of the coffeecake she had baked for the meeting wafted through the kitchen of her old Victorian-era house. Dawn was in her fourth year of a doctoral program in Social Studies and Global Education; tonight would bring her one step closer to the end. This evening marked the first of a series of focus group discussions that would provide the data for her dissertation about feminist perspectives on educating democratic citizens. She smiled as she remembered her conversation with her partner, Rick, which had ended just an hour ago.

"So, let me get this right," he said, with a hint of doubt in his voice. "You’re going to conduct focus group interviews with a bunch of women you already know, while you sit around your kitchen table and drink coffee, and your committee is going to accept this as data collection for your dissertation?" As his question continued, his voice grew more incredulous. Rick was a staunch positivist who thought his research would be perfect if he could only find a truly random sample with a 100% response rate.

agent in the narrative of inquiry, but by destabilizing the conditions that confine and inter the possibilities for agency" (p. 25).

2 As I discussed in Chapter 2, writing about myself in third person was awkward. However, (re)presenting myself in first person left me with the question, "How do I represent the other participants?" In the writing process, however, I found that describing myself from the perspective of one outside my identity, though still inside my thoughts, forced me into a new and different level of reflection.
“Yeah, that’s right,” Dawn responded, feeling a little annoyed at what she perceived as condescension in his voice. She wanted to end this conversation, sensing another heated debate at hand. “Listen, not everyone defines research as number crunching. I know I’m pushing the boundaries here. It’s like, well, it’s like a conceptual dissertation only the process for conceptualizing is a group effort. I have to go. I need to get the readings organized and I want to have some questions ready in case the discussion doesn’t really go anywhere. And I still have to get batteries for the microphone.”

“Oh,” Rick exclaimed, “so you’re using a structured interview format.”

“Not really,” replied Dawn. “I’ll call you later.”

Click.

The knock on the door brought Dawn abruptly back to the task at hand. “Shit,” she thought, “I still don’t have the batteries.” Nancy Mallory’s smiling face appeared in the storm window. Nancy had been teaching for six years, four at the middle school level and two years at the high school teaching Economics and Government. While sometimes frustrated with the older, somewhat more conservative members of her department (all men, except for her), Nancy was generally happy in her position with a fairly affluent district in the area. She, was, however, always looking for new ways to challenge herself and hoped participating in this study might pose such an opportunity.

---

3Between the conversation with Rick and the group’s arrival, I wrote the following excerpt in my journal: “I'm feeling a little nervous about this methodology and wonder why I didn't do something cleaner, more traditional. During my meeting with Bob (Donmoyer, one of my committee members), he described my research as 'sort of this...but not really...sort of that...but not really.' So what is it? I know what I want to do, I just have to find the right terminology to explain it to others. Morgan's
Dawn took a quick look around the kitchen and sighed. “Here we go!” she thought, and opened the door. After thirty minutes (and a trip to the drugstore down the street for batteries), the entire group had assembled in the kitchen.

Shannon Tuzzi-Paletti had arrived shortly after Nancy, wearing the fatigued look of a first year teacher. Her already slight frame was even thinner than it had been in September, when she had started her position in a rapidly growing suburban school district. Like Nancy, she was the only woman in the social studies department. In fact, she was the first woman to be hired in the department in more than twenty years. This year, she had five different “preps” each day – an almost inhumane schedule for an experienced teacher and the kiss of death for someone just entering the profession. Fortunately, her previous experiences working with the Girl Scouts and in a shelter for battered women had prepared her for a wide variety of situations. “I wonder if Steve called about the tile?” she mused as the others were getting coffee and settling into their seats. In addition to facing her first year of teaching, Shannon and her husband had recently purchased a house and were doing most of the remodeling themselves. Part of her hesitated to commit to this project: after all, she already felt pulled in so many directions. She looked around the table and smiled to herself. “How could I not participate?” she thought. The women gathered around the table were resources, mentors, and friends.

“Anyone want a brownie?” asked Leanne Gabriel. She was, after all, the unofficial Queen of Desserts and rarely appeared at any function without a plateful of goodies.
Tonight, she had managed to bring brownies, lemon bars (one of her specialties) and a bottle of homemade Bailey’s Irish Cream. Leanne was a veteran teacher. Though she hated to admit it, she’d been in the classroom almost as long as Nancy had been alive. Leanne did not, however, seem old enough to have the twenty-year-old daughter who had called Dawn to say her mother was running a little late. Those who knew Leanne well would dismiss this description as superficial but those who first met her might use the adjective “perky.” She had a gift for putting a positive spin on things but also took an active role in promoting change. For example, Leanne was part of a team of trainers involved in preparing teachers to meet the new standards for professional certification. Leanne was also the only woman working full-time in her social studies department. As department chair, she recognized her male colleagues’ as excellent teachers but hoped to have more women in the department soon. The women who had been hired in recent years had been excellent, until their positions were cut because of a lack of funding. The responsibility she felt for the profession was matched only by the commitment she made to her family and friends, and her intense love of shopping.

Doreen Uhas-Sauer poured herself a cup of coffee, added a little of the homemade Bailey’s, and settled into her chair. “It was no problem,” she said as Dawn thanked her again for the ride to the drugstore for the batteries. Doreen was somewhat accustomed to pulling things together at the last minute. She organized most of her life in the short journeys between meetings of her various committees. Doreen had been in the classroom almost thirty years. She spent many of these years as a middle school teacher but had moved to an alternative high school for the performing arts a few years earlier. Her students never bored her, though the other details about teaching sometimes did. She
assumed an active role in the local community and served on the boards of the historical preservation society, the university-community collaborative, and what seemed like a dozen other organizations. Those who had observed her in meetings marveled at her ability to prop her glasses on her nose, reach into a tote bag stuffed with a hodge-podge of printed matter, and pull out exactly what they needed.

The kitchen’s bright, yellow curtains and the flood of sunflowers, which started as a subtle decorating theme but grew out of control as they appeared in every birthday and Christmas gift, seemed warm against the cold, February winds blowing outside. The homemade Irish Cream that Leanne had contributed to the evening probably added to the feeling, as well. The microphone with the newly installed battery and the tape recorder rested in the middle of the table. “Ok, I’m going to turn this on now,” explained Dawn. The tape whined a little as it started. An uncomfortable pause fell on the group.

The strangeness of the tape recorder contrasted sharply with the familiarity of the group members. The women sitting around the table knew each other well. They had worked together as part of the Social Studies and Global Education Professional Development School Network, a group of teachers and graduate students who worked collaboratively with professors at The Ohio State University (OSU) to teach the secondary social studies methods course. In addition, all of these women had participated in one of OSU’s projects in which they cooperated with civic educators from Poland. As part of the project, they had traveled to Poland together and presented at conferences. Most importantly, they had spent time together outside of the various projects and shared their ideas about what it meant to be a woman teaching in the field of
social studies. These experiences were part of their bond, and part of their reason for being around the table that night.

Dawn cleared her throat, "We are gathered here to officially begin my dissertation research." She thought her voice sounded strange, official and artificial in the context of her own kitchen. Dawn thanked the others for participating in the study and explained she wanted her research to focus on women in social studies education:

I was thinking about what is it about women in social studies... that... was most interesting to me. [I decided it was] "How do women [think about] this issue of... education for democratic citizenship?" And so I thought you all would be a really great place to start... There is a body of literature that is relatively new and... over the last five years is getting more attention, from women -- mostly in philosophy -- who are writing about this issue of citizenship from feminist perspectives. And so that sort of gives us the voices of people who are sitting in universities and theorizing about all of this but what has been missing are the voices of classroom teachers who are actually thinking about what this does to their classroom practice.

"The manifest acknowledgment of gender... has been difficult to find in the text of social studies education and research. Links that connect feminist thinking and scholarship to mainstream social studies and social science education are serendipitous at best. While those in the field have occupied themselves with standards and the defense of terrain, feminist scholarship and critique essentially have been ignored." (Bernard-Powers, 1996a, p. 4)

Dawn continued her introduction by explaining what she hoped the dissertation would accomplish:

- So, in the long run, I see this dissertation...
- filling a very important gap and moving...
- school-university collaboration in a new way.
- One of the things that has been somewhat
- typical of school-university collaboration is
- that if teachers are doing research with
someone at the university it is only considered collaborative if they are "co-researchers."
And, they have to assume the traditional role of a researcher but that may not necessarily be the role that the classroom teacher wants or needs.

Wagner (1997) identifies three models for "researcher-practitioner cooperation." His "co-learning agreement" describes the research process as "reflective, systematic inquiry, stimulated in part by ongoing collegial communication between researchers and practitioners" (p. 17).

Dawn explained the process for informed consent and asked each of them to review a letter she had prepared to see if they were comfortable with the wording. Next, she asked the group whether or not they wished to use pseudonyms or their real names when the study was presented to others. What followed was a long, laughter-filled discussion regarding the names they would like to have. Dawn’s new Marlene Dietrich compact disc was playing softly in the background. "Who wants to be Marlene?" she

---

4 When I first approached each of these women about participating in the study, I extended an invitation for them to write with me. My committee seemed open to the possibility of a co-authored dissertation. However, none of the participants indicated any interest in becoming a "co-researcher" in this sense. While they each expressed what I believed to be a sincere interest in the topic and participating in the group discussions, these women conveyed a sense of reluctance about being involved in the writing process. Shannon, for example, indicated she did not have the time to invest in a lengthy writing project. As a first year teacher, she had different professional needs. While I had initially hoped to have a collaborative writing process as well, these initial discussions raised questions for me regarding how we define collaboration and whether or not other professional development goals might be reached through this process.

5 Wagner's (1997) article presents three models of researcher-practitioner cooperation in educational research: "data extraction agreements," "clinical partnerships," and "co-learning agreement." These models are useful in that they provide a framework for matching the type of cooperation with the intent of the research. The "co-learning agreement" model most closely resembles the type of cooperation illustrated in this study. However, Wagner describes this model in terms of inquiry on "processes of education and systems of schooling" and not on considering theoretical constructs, such as the activities in which our group engaged.
asked. Before leaving the topic, a parade of famous actresses from the 1930s and 40s had been posited and rejected for various reasons. Trying on different names seemed to make the group relax.

"That’s great," Dawn said, still laughing at Nancy’s carefully articulated reasons for wanting to be called “Scarlett.” (In addition to being from the South, her Vivien Leigh impression wasn’t bad.) After a short pause, Dawn added, “The other thing is I prefer this not be a very formal interview and I’m thinking of these (indicating the list of open-ended questions she had prepared) as ideas or suggestions for our discussion.”

Doreen chuckled knowingly, “You’re worried about that with us? More laughter from the group.

“Well, I’m worried about me having to direct things all the time and so I hope to think of these more as focus group discussions where everybody feels free to sort of redirect and, um, we can see how that goes and if it seems to be better for us to have some kind of guided discussion, I thought we’d start very unstructured and we could always become more structured if that seems to be necessary.” Dawn recognized the difficulty of her dual role as researcher and participant. She felt a sense of panic rising in her gut. “Maybe this wasn’t such a great idea,” she thought to herself.

---

6 My notes from the discussion that evening reflect the angst I started to feel about my role in the process. At this point I wrote, “How directive should I be?” in the margin of my paper. I wanted to avoid falling into the trap of essentializing the discussion into narrow interpretations of “us” and “them” – particularly given what I knew of the criticisms from postmodern and postcolonial challenges. As a group of White, (at least currently) middle class, college-educated women, it would have been somewhat easy for us to find consensus among ourselves and conclude that we had somehow reached the “feminist perspective.” The group, however, also recognized the dangers of drawing such conclusions. By introducing readings such as Bloom (1998); Gutman, (1994); hooks, (1990) we continued to position our interpretations against others.
"So your sense is to start to explore how there is a gender difference in perceiving the
definition of citizen, citizen value, citizenship, citizen education?" asked Doreen. Dawn wrinkled
her forehead. She had been thinking a lot about where the group should begin and hoped,
in part, for them to establish a direction collaboratively.

I'd rather stay away from "Here's how all the men
think about it and here's how all the women think about
it" . . . There's a woman named Lorraine Code who
writes about getting out of the malestream. Getting
out of that thinking all together and starting with a
whole different language - Doreen acknowledged her
agreement -- and that's why I've even avoided calling
this civic education because . . . it seems to me that
there is a whole body of values and knowledge and
things that are not included [in existing civic education
programs]. So, that's -- I guess I'm thinking about
what's out there that we're not including now.

Nancy recalled a term she had picked up on the tape of a session called "Feminist
Conceptions of Citizenship" from the American Educational Research Association
Conference that Dawn had given them in preparation for the night's discussion. "Is that
what they meant by cultural citizens? Because I had trouble with that term. I don't
know if you want to start here but I was confused by that term."

Dawn smiled and felt the knot that had been tightening in the pit of her stomach
slowly loosen. She looked around the table, taking advantage of the tape recorder that
was spinning in slow, easy circles, catching every word, and realized her dissertation
research was underway.

An hour and a half later, the group's discussion was winding down. Before they
left, however, Dawn asked them what they hoped to gain from their participation in the
study. She had asked them to consider this question when she dropped off the audio
tape copies of the AERA session. Shannon was the first to reply:

When I talked to you on the phone I mentioned having a clearer sense of
overall important goals. I feel so much like I'm going day to day right now.
Lessons for tomorrow. And to just get a better sense of the purpose of the
whole thing. I think about that but, of course I'll have this summer which
should help to plan for next year. But, that and I'm really concerned about
the distance students feel from things happening around them. Not being
involved in things, not caring about things.

I think that's always been an issue for young people -- older generations
think that younger generations don't care or aren't involved or only care
about themselves. Just the detachment that so many feel from government,
from their communities, from anything. That's a big concern of mine. So, I
guess I'd like to think about making connections, kind of trying to draw
students in more or to care about things.

The rest of the group nodded their heads. All but Dawn were currently classroom
teachers and she had also spent six years as a middle and high school social studies
teacher. They understood Shannon's concerns, and the slightly tired, frustrated tone of
her voice. After a moment of silence, Nancy started:

I want just two things. For me, one of the things
that I've been . . . noticing, as I've thought about this, is
the gap between my perception of myself as feminist
slash woman, whatever, and what I'm actually doing in
the classroom. Because I think I do a good job [of]
modeling citizenship and creating as much of a
community as I can in my classroom but I bet I could do
a better job.

And I think I want to find out how to do that -
- how to actually do it not just talk about it or
think about it. What do I do to restructure my
lessons or what the kids are doing to make that
better? And I like the idea on the tape about

---

7 This question was in response to the other participants' resistance to writing with me. What was it
that they hoped to gain from participating in our discussions? Arrangements had been made for them
to register for course credit but Shannon, the only one interested in doing so, did not have access to a
fee waiver and was reluctant to pay tuition, given the recent purchase of their home. I hoped,
however, for them to identify some goal they hoped to attain. Not surprisingly, perhaps, their goals
were closely related to who they were, and wanted to be, personally and professionally.
being subversive. And I think I do a good job of being subversive but I think I'm too polite about it and I think I probably have a lot more room to do that and affect more positive change than I do.

Dawn turned to Leanne, "So what do you want to get out of it?"

Leanne sighed, "I don't know. I feel like I'm so self-centered when I hear you say, 'I want to get this out of it for my students.' I think I'm real selfish. I'd like to just do this for me."

Clinking her spoon against her coffee cup, she continued. "I enjoy sitting with other women that I like and respect and talking about ideas. Which is something that I don't feel like I get to do. I mean I do more than I did before. The PDS is fine. But this is just better. It causes me to think and I feel like whatever I think is ok. It's almost a safe place to share ideas. So, I'm not nearly as lofty as the two of you are."

Dawn turned to Doreen.

---

8 One may argue that Nancy, a White woman educated at Duke University and working in one of the most affluent school districts in the area, is herself privileged. However, Nancy's position as a young (28 years old), divorced, woman in a department of somewhat conservative men did, sometimes, make her feel a part of the 'silenced' group.

9 Leanne is active in several professional organizations. In addition to taking an active role in PDS, she also participates in a cooperative program with the German government that provides teaching materials and travel opportunities to teachers in the United States. At the time of the study, Leanne was also taking a role in establishing a process for instituting professional standards for teachers that was organized through the State of Ohio.
I don't know, because like, Leanne, I think I would be very content if it's just exchanges of ideas because I enjoy it. On the other hand, I always feel as if everything in my life is project oriented, so I can't catalogue something unless there is a project attached to it. I had really thought about, because I really am intrigued by the idea of a sort of feminist approach to citizenship, that maybe we could be spurred on to author an article and we'd try to get it in *Ms. Magazine* or something. And then, I went to the other extreme, probably being closer to leaving teaching and thinking about the long haul... I was thinking about my students in a kind of feminine response and I thought, 'What if we had students from each of our schools, a small circle of girls, and talked about very much the same thing -- kind of once we got through this -- a colloquium to sort of discuss this?' That would be sort of fun because it would be like reviving Ophelia and smacking her into citizenship.

The rest of the group laughed.

But then it kind of goes into [the question], 'Am I not creating the same kind of thing by pigeon-holing women into certain holes?' So, what if it were, because in the university there used to be a model for this and then the YW(CA) picked it up, was the peace school for a couple of weeks in the summer. It really was wonderful... And I was thinking about a two-week citizenship school for kids who were interested. What about redefining citizenship for kids, when we're done with this, in a way we think citizenship could be? I'm thinking maybe a grant. I can see us having a little fun with the way we'd do things if we weren't constrained by school systems and stuff.

When the tape recorder had been turned off, an agreement made that the group would gather again around the kitchen table next week, and the dishes moved to the sink, each of the group members took her leave. Nancy, the first to come, was the last to leave; she stayed to help wash the dishes and put away the extra food. As she walked out the door she turned and asked, "So, do you think you'll get what you need for your dissertation?" Dawn nodded and closed the door. She knew she needed to review her
notes from the discussion while the ideas were still fresh in her mind. It was late. She was tired. The phone rang. She smiled. Her favorite positivist was on the other end of the line.

10 Doreen, from our first conversation, was probably most like to challenge our language and resisted any use of labels, such as "feminist," "citizen," and "social studies."

11 Our discussions usually lasted longer than I would have anticipated. The unstructured nature of the conversations meant we wove our ways in and out of the topics, integrating tidbits of our personal lives as the discussions continued. This pattern presented a challenge during the transcribing process. What would I transcribe verbatim and what could be paraphrased? I felt a sense of responsibility for protecting the group and, in instances where particularly personal information was disclosed, I summarized the conversation with rather cryptic notes that others would not understand. Most of the rest of the discussions I transcribed in their entirety. In all but one case, I was able to transcribe the previous discussion before the group's next meeting. As discussed in Ch. 2, this process enabled me to identify specific issues the group could address in the future.
Scene II: "I Don’t Think I’ve Ever Taught Citizenship, Not Really": Defining the Discussion

As Leanne walked to her car, she heard Shannon yell, “Thanks, again, for the goodies. I’m sure Steve will love them.” Leanne was pleased she had convinced the others to take the leftover cookies and brownies. She eased into the driver’s seat of her Toyota, started the engine, and waited a moment for the engine to get warm. It was cold, and the discussion had gone longer than she had planned. “Brrr!” She shivered against the cold and turned the heater to full blast, knowing that doing so would not necessarily heat up the inside of the car any faster.

As she pulled away from the curb, she saw Dawn and Nancy’s silhouettes in the window. Though anxious to get home and spend a little more time with her daughter, who had come home for a weekend of respite from the demands of her life as a college junior, Leanne felt glad she had agreed to participate in these discussions. Most of all, she valued her relationship to the women in this group: Shannon and Nancy for their enthusiasm; Dawn for her continuing interest in working with teachers, in spite of her affiliation with the university; and Doreen for the common history they shared – though each had experienced it separately and, probably, differently.

As Leanne eased on to Highway 315, heading north, she noticed the heater was gently blowing warm air into her face. She felt the muscles in her back that had tightened against the cold relax just a little. Her mind wandered back to their discussion and how they had struggled to define the term “citizenship.” “I wonder if Dawn is really getting what she needs.” Leanne mused. As she recalled the conversation, the group had spent

---

12 The group was continuously concerned that I "get what I needed" from them. This was, in large part, due to our friendship and their desire to support me. This attention, however, also highlighted
considerable time talking around what citizenship does, or should, mean. Leanne thought about the tape Dawn asked them to listen to before the night’s discussion. Parts of the tape bothered her, largely because there seemed to be that all too familiar theme about how teachers and schools needed to do more to “fix” the ills of society in comments made by both the panel and the audience. “I don’t know if it’s a fair assumption or unfair,” Leanne had observed to the rest of the group.

But I do know that I was thinking — and that part I was listening to again as I was driving down here — and I felt like, ‘Oh my Gosh, here we go again.’ I feel like schools are given so many things to do, so many things to teach, so much nurturing to do. Not that it’s wrong but there’s just so much to do. And I found myself thinking, ‘If we have to define what home is — if schools have to define what home is — for these kids, rather than home defining what home is, that’s just something else to be blamed on schools. Does that make sense?

The nods and sounds of agreement from the group had confirmed for Leanne that at least these women had felt the same pressures. Leanne started to turn their conversation over in her mind.

“If it doesn’t happen then it’s the fault of the school?” Dawn offered.

the extent to which — while the construction of our ideas was collaborative — what I was to gain was more tangible, and probably more self-serving, than anything they hoped to achieve. For me, this raised questions regarding whether or not the study was collaborative or not.

13 The panel for the AERA session, referred to here, included Gloria Ladson-Billings, Nel Noddings, Jane Roland Martin, and Lynda Stone. I chose to start with this tape because it introduced the rest of the group to the issue of alternative perspectives on citizenship, as well as provided them to hear from some of the most prominent scholars in education who are writing about this topic. In addition, I valued the opportunity for us to hear the voices of some of the women whose work we would be reading. The voices provided a texture and richness that the written text would not provide. During our first meeting, however, it also became apparent that, without some familiarity of the women and points discussed in the session, some of the meaning was lost. My journal reflects my internal debate about where to start. Finally, I had concluded, “My goal is to invite them to this discussion that’s been going on — going on, to a large extent, without classroom teachers.” I may have underestimated both the difficulty of keeping track of who was speaking without prior knowledge of each panel member’s work and the alienation classroom teachers might feel at the superfluousness and sanctimoniousness
“Exactly!” Leanne replied, relieved a bit that the others understood this frustration.

Doreen added, “I guess I would say that yes, I got that out of it. That, yes, schools could affect society eventually by being nurturing places and providing -- I hate to say model or example but, in essence, I guess model or example. You could produce citizens who are more caring, more civic minded, more compassionate. And I think that’s true.” Doreen paused for a moment and adjusted her black-framed reading glasses that were perched on the end of her nose. “But I don’t think it’s something you teach so much as how you teach it or how you act in daily discourse with students. I think school can be a very nurturing place and I don’t think the curriculum has to shift, I don’t think it has to change.”

As usual, Leanne felt a sense of admiration for Doreen’s ability to articulate the nuances of an issue. She nodded her head and stated, “I agree.”

Doreen continued, “I think it’s simply treating kids as if they’re humans.”

Shannon had been Doreen’s student teacher two years earlier and frequently commented on the unique relationship between Doreen and her students. She smiled as she remembered the mornings when students’ eyes would light up at the spread of coffee, juice, bagels, and muffins that students contributed to the morning breakfast and Doreen had carefully arranged on a table in the corner of the room. “Absolutely,” she chimed in her agreement.

“And with a sense of politeness and responsibility and respect and the old . . .” her voice trailed a bit, searching for the word.

“Modeling,” Leanne offered.

---

that sometimes emerges in AERA sessions. (In Act II, Scene II this issue is discussed in more detail.)
"Yes, modeling."

Shannon pushed the idea along even further, "And you could be talking about the most traditional part of civic education while you're doing that, while you're listening to what they have to say."

Dawn asked, "So is that part of civic education?"

"You mean in the overall sense of how civic education is done? Yeah, I think it is. In that sense, every teacher is a civics teacher," Doreen responded.

Leanne had been bothered by the way in which certain terms had been used in their discussion. She liked to have clear definitions of things before she jumped into a discussion. She turned to Dawn, "I was going to ask you at the very beginning but then I thought better of it. But now I will. When you said traditional civic education, can we define traditional civic education?"\(^1\)

"What do you think it is?" she replied, joking about feeling like a psychoanalyst.

"That's what I'm thinking. I'm thinking that probably if we went all the way around this table everybody would have a different definition. When I think of traditional civic education I think of the functions of government, how government works, you know those kinds of things and then, I know when I was a 9th grader and had civics we learned very basic government but it was how to get involved in government. So, I guess because of my background, because of the experiences I've had, that's what I think of as traditional civic education."

---

\(^1\) My reluctance to impose definitions on the terms we were using seemed to frustrate Leanne. She knew I wanted to avoid getting tied into definitions of "civic education" yet also needed to clarify what we were talking about. The ambiguity of an inductive process for defining terms may not have been the most effective way to approach the discussions. In retrospect, I wish we would have started with competing definitions of citizenship and deconstructed each with them.
Dawn shrugged a little, "Is that the way civic education is in schools now? Where is civic education? Because it's not usually taught as a separate course in a lot of schools. It's kind of embedded in government or embedded through other social studies or the assumption is that all teachers are somewhat civic education teachers."

Leanne's mind raced as she worked through the courses of study in her high school, "I don't think in my school we have civic education. I don't think we actually," she paused, turning to Shannon. "You teach it."

"I'm the only civics teacher and it's an elective . . . I will have taught less than 40 kids over the course of the year, who signed up for that as an elective," Shannon explained.

The group discussed the various configurations of their courses of study. Most high schools required seniors complete a government course, though in Nancy's school it was a combination of government and economics. while at Leanne's school it was one semester of "federal" government and one semester of "state and local" government. While each of these provided some dimensions of what she considered "civic education," Leanne felt somewhat dissatisfied.

"I don't know. I guess the more I think about civic education just as I sit here, I think of what I saw in Poland. In the elementary school. Was that 6th grade we saw?" she asked Doreen, who had been on the same trip. Leanne continued by describing a lesson on citizen involvement in which students were creating a children's bill of rights that was a reaction to the United Nations Bill of Rights for Children. "The teacher was encouraging them to get involved. And I'm not sure that a lot of civic education in the United States, well, what I
know of it — I shouldn’t make a blanket statement about the United States at all — but the civic education that I know of involvement is just a small part of that.”

“Why do you think that happens?” Dawn asked, sounding like the psychoanalyst again.

Leanne’s headlights caught the reflection of the sign that marked her exit. She gently eased the car on to the exit ramp and eased up on the accelerator. As she did so, her response to Dawn’s question echoed in her ears:

Oh, I don’t really know why that happens. I think probably a lot of it... is that we take so much of the involvement for granted. It’s just assumed. If you want to go out there and get involved, go for it, if you don’t, then that’s ok, too. But I think maybe in former communist countries involvement is being taught and being stressed so that the citizenry will actually take some part in making the decisions and I don’t know if we accept the fact that not everybody wants to get involved and not everybody wants to get involved in anything. Or if we just don’t push it. I don’t know.

Leanne braced herself against the car’s gentle rock as she eased into the driveway of her suburban home. She sighed as she remembered Doreen’s conclusion regarding citizenship in schools:

---

15 One of the strongest connections among the members of this group was our involvement in the Poland project. Each member of the group had been to Poland at least twice (some as many as five or six times) and had worked closely with Polish educators who visited the United States. Their extensive involvement in the project had been an important part of my decision to invited them to participate in the study. The focus of the Poland project had been, since its inception in 1991, developing curriculum materials and teaching methods for civic education in a democratic society. In the process of working with our Polish colleagues, we had each found ourselves wondering exactly what this meant to educators in the United States as well.
I wonder if sometimes one of the reasons it is not taught . . . is the introduction of the citizenship proficiency test. And so thereafter civic is defined as what is on that stupid test. And I always love [to] tell students, "If they ask you anything about finances, the answer is always taxes and if they ask you anything about being a good citizen, the answer is always volunteerism." So, in other words, as long as you check the appropriate box, you don't have to actually do these things . . . We've avoided the question, "What do you do?" You don't have to do what say, you only have to check the right box about what you would do. 17

As Leanne shifted her bags to open the door, she realized it was already dark inside. Her daughter must have given up waiting for her and gone to bed. Leanne was disappointed until Arthur waddled in to greet her. “Good, old Arthur.” The basset hound’s long ears brushed the floor as his tail swung back and forth in greeting. “What about you, Arthur, are you a good citizen? How would you do on the citizenship proficiency test?” Arthur did not answer, but moved closer to the place he knew the treats were stored. Leanne, always a soft touch for the look of anticipation in the soft, droopy brown eyes, proceeded to get Arthur a treat.

She remembered the quiz she was giving in tomorrow’s class and thought, again, about the issue of evaluating proficiency in citizenship.

Teaching methodology is changing. I know teaching methodology is changing, no longer do most teachers lecture 50 minutes a day or whatever a class period is. It’s more student-involvement and participation, and if we were to put our money where our mouth is, then we would require that in civic education. We would say, ‘Ok,

16 In the first two discussions, I often found myself slipping into the old “interviewer” role and felt somewhat reluctant to contribute to the conversation as a participant. Consequently, the first two discussions included numerous comments that sounded like a poor imitation of Carl Jung.

17 The State of Ohio’s Proficiency Test in Citizenship is a topic that arose numerous times during our conversations. Without exception, the group was dissatisfied with the prospect of using an objective, multiple-choice test to assess citizenship and was concerned about the ways in which the results were being used to influence curriculum. Of particular concern were the public’s reaction to the test scores and the tendency to use these scores as a basis for comparing schools in the area.
"Yes," Doreen had observed, "Also, it's subject to cheating. Isn't that the ultimate irony?"

“Yes, it is,” thought Leanne as she organized herself for the next morning. But almost as ironic was this group of women agreeing that, in some ways, coaches may offer students some of the best modeling regarding citizenship. “How had that happened?” she wondered. Like many women in social studies education, the women gathered around the table that night were often critical of the men who proudly announced that they wanted to become teachers because they really hoped to coach sports. Social studies seemed to be a magnet for the stereotypical coach with the whistle hanging around his neck and a movie lined up for game day. Was social studies perceived to be less academically rigorous? Or maybe because the curriculum was often dominated by tales of “teams” waging battles against each other in wars? In her twenty-five years of teaching, Leanne had never figured out why it happened, but her anecdotal evidence assured her that whenever a position in social studies would open, it was highly likely the school was also looking for a coach. Leanne did not dislike coaches, she just resented those who put coaching before teaching. Doreen, however, had offered another version of the much-maligned coach.

I really stand back and say, “How many civics teachers get involved in anything?” And I don’t mean constantly, and then, transmit that kind of sense to their students? I think that’s the modeling that doesn’t take place often . . . Maybe it is unfair . . . to write off male social studies teachers as ‘the coaches.’ Had the coach mentality been explained to students in the sense that “this is civic responsibility,” they would have been far better off than presenting it as “this is my supplementary paycheck.” And I’m
sure some did. I'm sure there are some people who coach at a high school and then, they'll be the ones who give up all of their time to go out and do the Little League. And they seem nurturing; they do the scouts or whatnot and I think they're probably the really good examples. But I would tend to think the bias against the coach mentality comes because it's never explained in another sense or never thought of in another way.

“Do you think that touches on one of the questions we started with was what is this idea of cultural citizenship?” Dawn had asked. She continued:

Some of our definitions, even tonight our discussion was about ‘joining political parties, going to city council, getting kids involved in community in a political sense, changing public policy through voting or petitioning a school board.’ Is that political citizenship? Is Doreen’s example of coaching cultural citizenship?

And what does that do to everything we’ve talked about if we sort of shift it a little bit and say, ‘What if citizenship became this?’ That’s, I think, what they were arguing on the tape... In my experience teaching in East LA [political citizenship] was not ever going to be something that my kids [would really understand]. I could force them into service learning projects of going to city council meetings but it was never going to mean anything to them because they were not a part of that in their minds and in their hearts. So, if I was ever going to cultivate any kind of citizenship or a sense of belonging to a larger community, I needed to somehow think about citizenship in a more cultural sense. What is it in their culture that connects to the broader society? How do I start with that?

And I didn’t do it. I missed that. Well, probably, in small ways we did it but that wasn’t my purpose. My purpose wasn’t to cultivate citizenship. I was trying to cultivate belonging to the school and senses of community but I didn’t think of that as citizenship. Now, I’m thinking, ‘Ah, maybe that’s what they’re talking about with cultural citizenship.’ Those sort of ways of making connections to people and cultivating that sense of belonging. I think the coaching is a good example of something that we would not tend to frame in that way but could.

The group was particularly sensitive to this issue in two veins. First, as teachers in the school we had all experienced, either first-hand or through direct observation, situations in which individuals were hired not because of their interest in or abilities for teaching, but based on the need for an athletics coach. In addition, as participants in the PDS (though in various roles), each member of the group had also encountered the “I really just want to coach” mentality from several of the preservice teachers. Doreen’s comment, consequently, challenged many of our own assumptions.

When I started to think about this issue, I realized that many of my concerns regarding citizenship evolved from my experiences as a teacher in East Los Angeles. As a young teacher I spent considerable energies thinking about how to make my students feel like citizens of their community,
Leanne looked at her face in the mirror and concluded she looked tired. In a moment of panic, she rushed to the kitchen to make sure there was coffee for the morning. "After all these years of waking up early to get to school," Leanne thought, "you'd think I'd finally become a morning-person." But she wasn't, and now she looked forward to retirement when the first period bell would no longer dictate what time she got out of bed.

"What was it that Doreen had said about defining citizenship?" Leanne searched through her recollections of the night's long discussion. She wanted to remember the comment because she thought she might be able to use it as a basis for discussion with her ninth grade Global Studies class, that was if she could get her ninth grade students to think about anything except sex; "ninth graders are so squirrely. It was something about Cuba," she thought. "That's right," Doreen's words came back to her.

How would we view it differently if students were enthusiastic and goal-oriented and promoting the culture but they happened to have red scarves around their necks and they're in Havana? Does that suddenly skew our own notions of citizenship?

I think we want to put it on the sides of the angels and we want to think of it as somehow purer than it was, or is. Which is kind of a lost opportunity we have . . . Isn't it interesting, we talk about the citizenship of Rome, we've probably never ever defined what the hell it meant. We probably have a passing definition of the citizenship of Greece because we like to remind everybody that they had slaves too. We like to draw parallels between state, and federal government. It never really occurred to me that the other question to ask would be, "Why do they have to conform to this definition of citizen?"

I returned to this particular phrase about wanting to "put (citizenship) on the side of angels" numerous times during the analysis. I used this as a reminder to "read against" the concept and unpack my own assumptions about what it meant.
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Athens and Sparta and somehow, in Sparta they weren't citizens, they were citizen-soldiers, or they were just soldiers. But we never talk about citizenship in China, for example. We never talk about tribal citizenship, like in Africa. We don't even talk about it in European History, pre-Middle Ages -- which was as tribal as you get. Somehow it only comes in when we talk about the Germans because Tacitus did such a great job of making them seem honorable when compared with the Romans . . .

Nor do we pay much attention to all of the people who weren't citizens. Which is one of the things that is troubling for me about . . . this narrow definition of political citizenship. I feel really hypocritical saying to kids, female students to some extent and students of color to a really large extent, 'You're a part of this,' because statistically they're not a part of it. If you look at the way women have tended to be involved, women have tended to go through very unofficial, unpolitical channels to affect change. But those aren't the skills, that's not the knowledge or the kind of citizenship that we're talking about in schools.

Leanne moved quietly into the bedroom, where she could hear her husband's familiar breathing. "So," Leanne concluded as she crawled into bed, "I don't know if we ever really did teach citizenship, now that I think about it. But perhaps we've gotten to the point where we're so afraid to step on somebody's toes that we don't dare tell anybody that this is the way a good citizen does things . . . We're so afraid to push our values off on somebody else that we just teach about things rather than teaching students." She thought, for a moment longer, of the students she would face the next day and wondered if they would understand the many layers of citizenship she had worked her way through during the evening. She doubted it; she was fairly certain that if she asked them to define citizenship, they would consult the glossary in the back of their textbooks.
The postmodern era, at the last, necessitates a new conception of citizenship, in which diversity and difference are valued and the modernist power hierarchy continues to devolve... The past, the present, and continuing lessons learned amongst feminist scholars contribute much to a new citizenship: difference over sameness, multiplicity over singularity, fluidity over stasis. If indeed postmodernism heralds a new age, then a new conception of citizenship is not only logically but also ethically appropriate. We need not deny the successes of modernism, but we must respond to its failures" (Stone, 1996, p. 51).

According to the National Standards for Civics and Government, "citizenship means that a person is recognized as a legal member of the nation; gives each person certain rights and privileges, e.g., the right to vote and hold public office; (and) means each person has certain responsibilities, e.g., respecting the law, voting, paying taxes, serving on juries. (Students should be able) to explain that citizens owe allegiance or loyalty to the United States; in turn they receive protection and other services from the government" (Center for Civic Education, 1994, p. 35).
“Well,” she thought as she felt the gentle pull of the long awaited sleep, “at least they'd have a definition. After all that, we still couldn’t come up with one.” Her last conscious awareness was the dread she already felt for the inevitable ring of the alarm clock.

“Thank goodness for coffee,” she sighed and drifted into sleep.

“As Paul Gilroy has recently argued, cultural workers need a discourse of ruptures, shifts, flows, and unsettlements, one that functions less as a politics of transgression than as a part of a concerted effort to construct a broader vision of political commitment and democratic struggle” (Giroux & Shannon, 1997, p. 8).
Nothing about Shannon’s first year of teaching had been easy. She had five preps each day and felt somewhat isolated from the rest of the social studies department. The other social studies teachers were all men and, nice though they were, she felt pretty sure that her philosophy of teaching and political orientations did not mesh with the rest of them. She did not know this for sure; she’d felt it best not to test the waters for fear of drowning. Shannon spent most of her energies on her relationship with her students, which was why her eighth period Current Issues class had been such a thorn in her side.

During the first semester, Shannon spent much of her time thinking, “If only these kids would talk and express their opinions.” She had planned for the Current Issues course to be a forum for debating controversial issues. The reticence of her first semester class had driven her crazy. She was about five weeks into a new semester, and a new set of issues. “Be careful what you wish for,” she thought as she recovered from the bedlam of that day’s class. “Now I have a combination of pot-smokers and conservative right-wing Republicans . . . one of whom sits on top of his desk and points his finger at other students when he’s trying to make a point. I have a few people who do all the talking and it’s lively and we’ve got a diversity of opinions — except when one of the pot smokers can’t remember his point.” While grateful for the participation, she was concerned about the comments students frequently made during class; they often seemed unconcerned about the fate of others and uninterested in the world beyond their immediate lives. While located less than fifteen miles from a metropolitan area, her students seemed unaware of issues related to diversity, poverty, or social justice.
Shannon had also noted an interesting trend in her classes. "Between two Current Issues classes, an elective class with juniors and seniors, I have 2 girls out of 20 in one class and 4 in the other class. That's who signed up for Current Issues." She wondered if high school girls just weren't interested in what was happening in the world or if there was something in the system that funneled mostly boys into her classes. She caught herself before she jumped to too many conclusions. After all, she had already had one experience that day in which her assumptions had led her astray. She smiled a little as she remembered the exchange in her last period class.21

Opinions are going around and I'm worried about people who aren't speaking... There's one girl who's very vocal and a few others who are very quiet. And so I said something. I said, 'I'm concerned about those of you who aren't speaking.' I realized I was kind of uncomfortable that they weren't speaking -- that maybe they weren't getting much out of it, or they weren't comfortable themselves. And it really was me, I think it was more me that was uncomfortable about them not speaking.

And I said something to one of the girls afterwards, to the effect of 'Marissa,22 is there something that you wanted to say that you didn't get to say? I'm kind of concerned about everyone being able to express their opinion.'

And she said something to the effect of 'Why would you think that if I had something to say I wouldn't say it?'

I was like, 'Wow, that's a big assumption on my part.' But it was kind of neat. That wasn't an issue for her. If she wanted to say something she was going to say it. Basically she was saying, 'I don't need you to create that space for me, I'll jump in.'

---

21 When Shannon recounted this story to the group we had been discussing the role of silence among various groups and our, perhaps White, middle-class assumption that it was important to "speak up" and have one's voice be heard.

22 Not the student's real name.
Shannon thought about the irony of imposing her expectations on her female students. As a feminist, this presented an interesting conundrum. Shannon had experienced a type of feminist awakening in college. As a student at University of Cincinnati, she had proudly displayed a button on her backpack that read “Don't Call Me 'Girl'!” in bold letters. However, her experiences working with women in a variety of settings, including a shelter for women who were physically battered and emotionally abused, heightened her awareness of the complexities surrounding a discourse on “women’s issues.”

The seeds for these realizations had been planted, in part, by one of her professors at UC, Patricia Hill Collins. Collins’ critique of feminist theorists who wrote about women’s issues as some type of unified set of concerns, while speaking from their identities as White, upper-middle class, academics, still resided in Shannon’s mind. She recalled the conversation from one of the focus group discussions in which Doreen had challenged some of the assumptions being made by several of the feminist theorists the group had been reading and who had been part of the panel discussion at AERA.

...I consider myself a feminist but I would say that, compared to where I heard the voices on the tape, and some of the comments being made [coming from] ...I thought by contrast, my God ... I ought to think of myself as a post-feminist. I... hope that I have moved on from the point at which they were sort of stuck in... how they were defining the world.

---

23 While Shannon did not use the language of critical feminists and talk about her role in “emancipating” the young women in her classes, this was an underlying theme. In recounting this situation, she identifies the contradictions in her own thinking - can we, as feminists, impose our concerns on others and still be true to what we claim feminism means?

24 The AERA panel discussion (Martin & Noddings, 1997) generated considerable debate regarding the definitions that were used both by panelists and by those in the audience, as well as the assumptions about what was happening in public schools that were conveyed.
Shannon thought about her own definition of feminism and realized, "My self-definition has changed a lot. I mean, I think I came into college not thinking about it too much. And then, kind of getting involved in women's programs and services and then blaring it... And now, not feeling so much of a need to say, 'I'm Shannon Tuzzi-Paletti and I'm a feminist; nice to meet you.'" A small part of her wondered if she had lost some of her passion. "But it's still very much important to me."

Shannon recalled part of a reading the group had discussed a couple of weeks earlier. They had talked about how each of them defined feminism in their lives. She identified with the words of Nancy Wolf, as they appeared in an article by Lynda Stone. Shannon agreed with the definition of feminism Wolf presented:

![Image]

Shannon also recognized that there was another element to her feminism, and it was this part of her identity that led to her exchange with Marissa. "As a social studies teacher, just historically in terms of civics and citizenship, the contributions, the abilities of women, the absence of women in certain discussions, all of that is very important to me and

---

25 The process of defining feminism in our lives provided an opportunity to identify some of our connections, as well as the diversity within the group. Of all the members, Doreen seemed least comfortable with the term feminist. This was, in part, due to her general reluctance to embrace an label that is so broad it may be meaningless, or so wrought with stereotype that it is damaging to those who are labeled.
I try to bring it out, discuss it.” There were many contradictions embedded in feminism.

While Shannon bristled at the Rush Limbaugh “femiNazi” stereotype, she did not necessarily want to embrace the brand of feminism that cast all men into the same category because of a penis.

That feminism needs theory goes without saying (perhaps because it has been said so often). We need a theory that can analyze the workings of patriarchy in all its manifestations — ideological, institutional, organizational, subjective — accounting for not only the continuities but also for change over time. We need a theory that will let us think in terms of pluralities and diversities rather than of unities and universals . . . We need a theory that will enable us to articulate alternative ways of thinking about (and thus acting upon) gender without either simply reversing the old hierarchies or confirming them. And we need a theory that will be useful and relevant for political practice. It seems to me that the body of theory referred to as poststructuralism best meets all these requirements” (Scott, 1994, p. 282).

Shannon smiled as she remembered the group’s attempt to define their own definitions of feminist. Leanne, her hair neatly coiffed and clad in a jumper, had concluded:

... When I think of myself as a feminist, I think of just, I don’t think I’m a radical by any stretch of the imagination . . . I just think of a feminist as someone who believes in equality regardless of sex — that your gender should not determine what you may or may not be allowed to do.

The definition fit Leanne: it was straightforward, to the point, and yet steeped in complexity.

Nancy’s articulation of what feminism meant to her had been longer and reflected some of the internal conflicts she felt about who she had been, who she was, and who she wanted to be:
I'm not real clear about my definition. I call myself a feminist, partly because I think that word has been so misused and abused that I'm willing for people to get nervous about it. And I'm much more comfortable about that than other things, probably.

But the thing that I think about when I think about feminism is power. It's just the theme that comes up for me and I don't really have a definition . . . But it has to do with the whole issue of power and redistributing power. And that, for me, is part of the reason it would align itself with . . . classist struggles or racial struggles or ethnic struggles . . . because they have sort of the same agenda. So the redistribution to power and the access to power seem like the biggest thing.

Ironically, I think my feminism could be more active. It's become very personalized for me these past couple of years, which sort of makes sense. It's sort of growing inside ready to evolve at some point. And in the classroom, I see it as a chance to role model being a strong woman and not being nasty about it, and not being defensive, and not being chicken.

Nancy's comment had taken the group into a rather lengthy discussion of how they introduced this dimension of their identities to students.

Like many first year teachers, Shannon sometimes struggled with where the lines should be drawn with her students. She tended to be rather careful about what she shared regarding her personal beliefs, particularly given that the community in which she was teaching leaned toward the conservative end of the continuum. Her affiliation with the Democratic Party, on the other hand, had started at the tender age of five, when her parents awakened her in the middle of the night with tears in their eyes to tell her George McGovern had lost his bid for the presidency.

"Do you define yourself as feminist to your students?" she had asked Nancy.

"Yeah, I do. They ask me every once in a while."
“When my kids ask me,” Leanne chimed in, “and I can’t even remember an exact example, but I know when my kids have asked me or I have said ‘I’m a feminist’ it’s one of those looks like, ‘You are?’ Leanne’s voice had taken on the tone of incredulous teenager. “And then I go ahead and tell them what I think being a feminist means. And it’s not at all what they thought.”

“Well,” Nancy offered, “you’re not a lesbian. For some reason, my students always think only lesbians are feminists.”

“What do your students think it means?” Dawn asked.

Leanne explained: “. . . I have asked, ‘What did you expect me to act like?’ Well, first of all, they think because I’m married, that I don’t need to be a feminist. I guess they assume that my husband will take care of me so I don’t need to concerned about women’s issues any more.” The group laughed. A frequent topic of conversation among the group was the pleasure they took, whether in a relationship or not, from their independence. Leanne continued:

They just . . . think of a feminist as someone who is a bra burner, you know like back in the 60s, when the whole movement was new. And you were saying, Nancy, you thought your feminism was just there, ready to evolve, and I feel like mine is maybe the opposite. I feel like my activist years are probably over and that might have a lot to do with our ages26 but I can remember being a, not a radical, but sort of – for the time, a radical – and I can’t see myself doing that now. I’m more willing to sit back and maybe with some finesse get my point across rather than with being aggressive. Maybe I’ve gone from aggressive to assertive as far as feminism is concerned.

---

26 In their fifties now, Leanne and Doreen were just beginning their teaching career in the late 1960s and 70s. This historical perspective on the women’s movement played an important role in our discussions.
Leanne had paused for a moment, lost in thought—perhaps of those younger, more radical years. Her hesitation lasted only a moment, but when she started again, her tone had changed and her voice sounded more forceful, more determined.

But sometimes I really am concerned about the feminist movement when I hear my high school kids talk. It really bothers me and I just want to say, 'Damn you, kids! You need to go back and see what it was like.' Well, you probably can't remember a lot of it (turning to Doreen) but you can.

I graduated from high school with my father saying, 'Why do you want to go to college? Even if you do finish, you'll just get married.' . . . I have raised my daughter to believe that, regardless of her gender, she needs an education, she needs to be articulate, she should never hold herself back because she is a female and my high school kids that I have taught for maybe the last ten years just don't see it that way. You know, the girls are quite willing to step back and let the boys be the BMOC (Big Men On Campus). That bothers me, because I don't know what it's going to be like in 50 years. Of course, I won't be around to see it, but for my grandchildren, I have a concern.

Shannon thought, for a moment, about her parents. They had always encouraged her to go to school; in retrospect it seems that the possibility of ending her education after high school had never occurred to her. She realized how quickly society had changed and wondered if Leanne might be right about old habits returning if, as a society, we
weren't careful. She thought, again, about Marissa and, with Leanne's admonition in mind, wondered why the girls in the class seemed content to sit back and let the boys dominate the discussion. "Is it right for me to impose my expectations on them?" If she didn't push them to speak, however, would they fall back into the traditionally passive role assigned to women? To a large extent, this was about values and how we determine what is important in society. Doreen had challenged some of the ideas the feminists they had been reading and listening to had presented:

(W)hat if, for instance, you were sort of coming of the age, out of the 60s perhaps, in which your sense... was to fight against society the way you saw it. To want to be more open, to want to raise a feminist consciousness. But the truth is that the world had long since changed. And I'm not saying it has, but what if the world had changed so that you've now implanted ideas in people's heads in which no girl ever saw that she couldn't do these things? Now you've just said to her, "Wow, did you ever stop to think that you were perhaps targeted by this particular curriculum and this kind of thing?" and she never saw herself at all. It would be like religions who define themselves by using the word "mankind" and using male pronouns in the text and women never thinking they weren't part of it because that's not the way they were raised.

A silence had befallen the group as they considered Doreen's statement. After a moment or two, Dawn responded:

...I was raised to believe that I could be anything. And if I wanted to be a doctor or a lawyer or an engineer, that was great. I was bright, I did well in school, but nobody encouraged me to be a teacher, certainly not to be a preschool teacher... (M)aybe as a society we've 'grown up' and these things don't seem to be an issue but I think it's just there in more subtle ways. Nel Noddings was the woman on the tape who said, basically, 'What we've done is we've said, Ok, we want to be equal, but that means we want girls to be everything that boys can be.

Leanne jumped in, "But we haven't said boys can be..."
“Exactly!” Dawn agreed, excited that Leanne had seen the point coming.

We haven’t said that. And so we’re still buying into what has been the male value system of what should be high priority.

“What is successful,” Shannon added.

“Yeah, successful,” Dawn agreed.

And so. . . I knew I could be anything but in a way I was also told what I wanted to be. When was I going to be successful it was if I was all of these things and I remember walking into my advisor’s office when I made the switch from wanting to go to law school to becoming a teacher. And when I told him my decision, the first words out of his mouth, ‘But you’re so bright. You have a 4.0, why would you want to do that?’ It was clear that this was ok for me and this wasn’t because this was important and this wasn’t. And so how have we defined that as a society? Maybe it is still an issue because we’ve bought into how it was defined in the old way. We’re just saying women should buy into that too instead of really turning things on its head.

Doreen nodded her head and continued the discussion:

Yeah, but is that more of a function of how society defines success -- meaning income producing? Rather than, nurturing is not as good as something else. Teaching boys to be this is as valid as teaching girls to be these things. I’m not so sure that we don’t value homemaking we just see it as not income-producing. Therefore, the definition may not -- although it does -- have as much to do with gender roles as it does with what Americans think they’re going to get out of life.

Dawn wasn’t convinced.

But we’ve attached economic value to things for a reason. One of the statistics that you’ll read is that we pay people more to park our cars (valet services) than to watch our children (preschool teachers) . . . Now, we’ve assigned that value: we’re willing to do that . . . But, I understand what
you're saying, it's hard to tell whether it's the economic value that's driving us or this is the value, the intrinsic value of nurture versus whatever it is that is produced. But how do we as a society let those things evolve like that? 27

In the end, no one had been able to answer the question. It was, after all, a complex blend of social, moral, economic, and political values.

Suddenly, Shannon was aware of the ticking sound of the clock over the door in her classroom. Her heart sunk, it was already close to five and she had promised Steve she would be home early tonight. She wrestled the piles of papers into her black bag and scurried towards the parking lot. Shannon, small and thin, was perched atop a pair of clunky black shoes with high platform heels that had been purchased on a shopping spree in Poland with Doreen and Leanne. She loved the shoes, in part because they reminded her of the trip they had all taken together as part of a project with OSU, and in part because of the additional inches they added to her height.

Several hours later, Shannon leaned back from the task at hand. The clunky shoes and "teacher" clothes had been strewn across the bed in her hurry to put on appropriate attire for her other work, her job as assistant carpenter, painter, designer, and general fixer-upper. She and Steve had purchased a house in the fall and spent most of their spare time tearing out cupboards, putting in flooring, and spreading fresh coats of paint on the walls. "Now, let's talk about resisting gender stereotyping," thought Shannon, as she examined the callouses that had developed on her hands. While Steve clearly had

27 There was some debate in the group about the relationship between feminism and classism. I argued that it was difficult to separate the two, given the disproportionate number of women living in
more knowledge, and perhaps higher standards, regarding the renovations on the house. Shannon tried hard to do her fair share of the work. Steve, a perfectionist by nature, noted details about the craftsmanship that she felt sure would escape most people.

Shannon could hear Steve still hard at work in the next room. Her shoulders ached a little and she was thinking of the ungraded papers shoved into her bag. She quickly calculated how much time she needed to finish reading her students' essays and turned most of her attention back to the sander. “If I start grading at ten,” she thought, “I think I can be finished by midnight.” While her hands and back muscles focused on the vibrations of the sander on the floor, Shannon’s mind wandered back to the members of the group and their definitions of feminism.

Responding to Leanne’s concern about the lack of concern for feminist issues among her young, female students, Nancy had emphasized the importance of providing strong role models. Sometimes, she suggested, students found such mentors in their parents. “When I think of my most outspoken and assertive female students, I realize most of them have mothers who are active in the community, who are successful in their positions at work or in the home, who exude confidence and demand respect.”

“But what happens to the young women who don’t have those types of mothers?” Shannon wondered as she moved the sander to a new spot on the floor. “Is it then the responsibility of teachers to be these models?” She thought about the typical social studies curriculum and thought, not for the first time, of the extent to which women are excluded or marginalized, particularly in textbooks. “People think it’s better because now

poverty in the world (Maghadam, 1998). Doreen, on the other hand, argued that feminism’s failure to respond to classism would be its eventual demise.
some women are included in the books, but they are almost always reduced to the 'Highlights' sections which read more like 'Footnotes to History.'"

"Ok," thought Shannon. "Maybe Marissa would talk if she had something to say, but I'm still left wondering why she doesn't feel as if she has something to say!" She considered how the curriculum could be changed to make it a more accurate reflection of women's contributions. She pictured Doreen, seated at Dawn's kitchen table with a coffee cup in her right hand and her glasses sitting slightly askew on the top of her head.

When we were talking before about history of women and feminism, I mean, what is the only consistent, I guess in my view point, frame of reference for women's history that we continue to find but now, now we've marginalized it to the left, it comes only out of the left, is labor history. It's the only consistent source of women's history that seems to be...emerging and always good quality scholarship, always many voices, cuts across classism, and yet, where do we teach that in schools?

The rest of the group had agreed with Doreen. Nancy pointed out the contradiction including this aspect of women would present to the society:

It goes against the notion... the cultural icons; it goes against that whole hypothetical notion of women not working. That's part of the reason it's never made it into the mainstream of textbooks and things like that. All the things that I use that are labor oriented in economics is either anecdotal, whether or not it's true - like narrative, or it's very supplementary.
"It's not just part of history, though," Dawn contributed. "I think of my mom and the difference she makes in people's lives through her work with Wheeled Meals, the Hospital Guild, the Church, and other organizations that are all dominated by women. But we don't talk about those things with our students."

"Right," added Nancy, "because they're not rewarded like male activities."

I noticed that with my parents. My dad is in Civitan and he does all this stuff and gets all these awards. And he does wonderful things. He raises lots of money and he gets all these foundation people to donate money to worthy causes. But that is something they will fly someplace to take care of and my mother's stuff never got that kind of recognition -- within the family or outside of it. And when you teach about associations, kids look at you . . . like you've lost your mind. We started to talk about Jane Addams and Hull House and that whole social movement and they don't have a context for it, which shows that it's been skipped over and over again.

Shannon turned off the sander and surveyed her work. Of course, it was nearly eleven; once again she had underestimated the time a task would take. She knew she hadn't done the job the way Steve would have done it but it didn't really matter as long as things on the house progressed. Perhaps feminism was a little like that. There was a lot of work to be done and everyone would approach it in different ways -- identifying their own priorities. And if people quit working on it all together, it wouldn't just stay where it was; it would be like leaving the house halfway renovated -- eventually the gains would be lost because no one was there to pay attention to the finishing touches.

Before beginning the trek up the stairs to get her papers, Shannon's eyes passed over the house. The kitchen floor needed to be tiled; an empty space waited where the cupboard
was supposed to hang; the shadow of the moldy deck that needed to be stripped reflected in the window; and a floor covering lay in the living room for when the walls would eventually be painted. "Yes," Shannon muttered under her breath. "There's a lot of work to be done." She wasn't quite sure whether she was thinking about the house, the grading that waited upstairs, or the future of feminism.

Indeed, contestation is central to the feminist enterprise, and many feminists agree with Julie Hartley that feminism's main responsibility, as well as its most effective and powerful strategy, is to engage in perpetual contestation, critique, and deconstruction. If women have a role to play, it is only in assuming a negative function: reject everything finite, definite, structural, loaded with meaning in the existing state of society. A feminist practice can only be developed with what already exists so that we may say that it not only and that it still exists. (Kristeva, 1980; Hirschmann & Di Stefano, 1996, p. 12.)
Act II: Transgress
Scene I. “I’m Not Sure I Want to be ‘Mother’ to 150 Kids”: Blurring the Boundaries between Public and Personal

Doreen’s keys jingled in the early morning air. She crawled around the back seat of her new, blue van, carefully maneuvering around the piles of papers, books, magazines and newspapers. Her back seat had become an extension of her dining room table, which was an extension of her desk at school. Earlier in the week she had joked with her “feminist focus group” about the “laying on hands” routine in which she finds herself touching each pile periodically — ostensibly because she’s looking for something but, perhaps, also to insure that they are all there.

Her balance was precarious as she juggled her coffee cup, the chosen pile of materials, and her constantly stuffed book bag and made her way across the thin sheet of ice which covered the school parking lot. This morning she hoped for a school cancellation and then, remembering the superintendent was from Minneapolis, realized she may have had her last snow day. Her car had been the first one in the parking lot for almost thirty years, after all, and she thought this may be her last superintendent.

As Doreen pulled open the door to her classroom and turned on the bright florescent lights, her eyes quickly scanned her domain. The atmosphere of Doreen’s classroom was a hodge-podge of — well, of life, or rather lives. The cupboards in the back of the room were stuffed with costumes and vintage clothing that were pulled out for various skits, school productions, and the Renaissance Faire she organized each year. The posters on the wall were an eclectic mix of faces from Lenin to Martin Luther King, Jr. In addition to the standard classroom collection of desks and tables, a few pieces of furniture collected from antique shops and garage sales were scattered about the room.
She recalled the focus group discussion regarding whether or not "home" was an appropriate metaphor for schools. "Ah," thought Doreen, "if only I had this much open space at home!" visualizing her older, two-story home filled with relics, treasures, antique furniture and, of course, stack and stacks of books.

On the tape they listened to before their meeting, Nel Noddings suggested schools should be like homes—nurturing, caring, safe.28 Doreen could hear Nancy’s response to the metaphor.

Well, they talked about the whole metaphor and I was thinking about how she had, in fact, stated overtly that she was leaving out the bad parts of home. She said metaphors typically do not include everything that is bad or include the whole. It just seemed to me really odd because it was so idealistic. If you're going to define home that way and then put that into schools, it’s going to be idealistic in the schools as well.

To some extent, Nancy’s comments echoed Doreen’s questions about the metaphor. However, for Doreen, the nagging feeling went deeper. Had home ever been a nurturing, caring, safe place? She thought of her own childhood. She was the product of the era so fondly remembered by political conservatives yearning for the period when family values reigned supreme. Her family life had been loving, but in no way resembled the Cleaver household.

28 The prospect of applying the concepts of "home" and "care" to education is a common and recurring theme in Noddings' work. She challenges feminists to move beyond defining ourselves and our successes in terms of masculine hegemony. Noddings (1991) posits that, instead of pointing to women’s mathematics deficiencies, we might ask why men lag behind women in elementary school teaching, nursing, and full-time parenting. Given current conditions of poverty, crime, and child neglect, Noddings argues, society should reconsider the negative connotation of "women’s work."
Doreen was the child of immigrants and raised in a large, industrial, mid-Western city. She thought of her students’ homes. As a high school teacher, she was certain few of her students talked at home. “It’s a developmental thing.” She had explained during the focus group discussion.

It’s a sense of independence, you keep your thoughts to yourself as a teenager. I mean you don’t talk at home . . . when I think of my colleagues who have high school children (and) how upset they get when kids talk freely at home because they think their values have not been transmitted. And these aren’t people who are right wing or people who are ultraliberal, they’re not in any category, they just find — it’s human nature to find yourself uneasy when you’re kids are having their own opinions. So maybe home is a place for safe discourse when you’re a child but not a teenager.

Doreen spent the next thirty minutes organizing her day. Slowly, the rest of the building came to life. Students started straggling into her classroom. Some of them were supposed to be there first period; others just wandered in for a few minutes and then exited, not really acknowledging her formally but noting her presence.
Doreen checked the clock: twenty minutes to spare. She reached for her bulging book bag and burrowed through its contents. Inside, Doreen found what she had been seeking. Dawn left three articles on her doorstep yesterday afternoon. The note attached explained that the focus group members should read one of the articles before their next meeting. Dawn briefly described the three pieces and her rationale for choosing each. Doreen would read them all, eventually, but with only a short time before class she wanted something short. The Lynda Stone piece looked wonderful, but too long and philosophical for a quick read. Amy Gutmann’s chapter didn’t grab her, either. And then she saw the essay from bell hooks, entitled “The Homeplace.”

“Interesting,” Doreen muttered to herself in the quiet of the empty classroom.

These connections between the public domain of schools and the intimacy of the home were wrought with seeming contradictions, yet intriguing consistencies. Doreen thought about some of her students. “God knows they don’t have much of a place to claim in the political process.”

Hearn (1986) explains that the public sphere is “conducive to the free ebb and flow of discussion... where people have an effective voice in the making of those decisions which vitally affect them, where the power to make such decisions is publicly legitimated and where those who exercise this power are publicly accountable” (Carr & Hartnett, 1996, p. 186.)

As she read through hooks’s discussion of the role of the homeplace in the African American community, Doreen’s mind turned to the phrase “cultural citizenship” which had been used so frequently in the audio taped discussion. When she listened to the tape, she’d felt as if she’d been dropped into the middle of something. Cultural citizenship was a new concept for her -- though she’d often questioned how effective
schools were in cultivating a sense of belonging among students. "How do we help students feel connected to a community?" she wondered.29

The description of the way in which bell's mother created a homeplace was particularly poignant for Doreen. Doreen's mother had died when she was in her early twenties. She was a hard-working Hungarian immigrant who nurtured not only her own family, but maintained strong ties to her homeland and other Hungarian immigrants in Cleveland.

Doreen reread the passage several times. She could sense the children's relief at seeing their mother, as well as the strange mixture of fatigue and joy their mother must have felt as she walked through the door. This was one of those "safe cultural spaces" the focus group had discussed a couple of weeks earlier.

---

29 One of the most consistent patterns in our discussion was the extent to which we focused on connections: our connections to our students, their connections to each other, our connection to the community, their connection to the community, and so on. As part of this discussion, the issue of sharing parts of our identities with students emerged. While the definitions of our "public" and
Was it possible for teachers to give that same sense of security to their students? Could we, as women social studies teachers, play a special role in creating a homeplace for students? I think female teachers, if they were teaching citizenship, have to be retaught as to how they would teach citizenship . . .

I think they have two sets of children and they don't equate them. I see them having their children at home and other people's children that they have in that . . . world of otherness, about which they don't care. The school kids do not rate. I don't often see female teachers extending the dignity or modeling or self-respect that I would want to think that my child was being given in school by his or her teacher.

And that's a terrible overstatement, and I don't know how true that is in other schools . . . I often wonder if there is a difference between elementary school — where citizenship is part of how you model life from playing with your blocks . . . to something that happens with secondary women that maybe we mirror too much what we see men do. It's the instructor, there's a distance, there is not a nurturing . . ."

Doreen realized this seemed particularly true for single mothers, who were so overextended in their own lives that they are unable to provide the type of nurturing the group had been talking about in relation to citizenship education. "Everything at home becomes part of school and everything at school, I can only imagine, becomes part of home. But instead of seeing this as an opportunity to create safe spaces, this creeping in of our personal lives becomes a negative thing."
"As we know, the sharp distinction between the two ('private' life and 'public' life) breaks down under analysis, but the tradition that sustains the separation is still dominant. Surely if we had started with private life, the school curriculum would be very different from the one actually developed. Instead of the emphasis on citizenship, there might be one on family membership and homemaking... We should indeed teach the practical elements of homemaking... We should teach homemaking in such a way that students become competent homemakers and also so that they can see both the personal and global tragedies of homelessness..." (Noddings, 1992, p. 235).

As Dawn had observed during their meeting, "It goes back to whether or not we can just take the idealistic part of home as a metaphor for schools... It is home, all over again, but home isn't always such a great place or something we necessarily want to recreate."

"Yes," Doreen had agreed, "and if there are lessons in the definition of citizenship... or there are values, then they have to be articulated so that they are drawn out consciously to say, 'These are values that you need to model'... and then, again, women in social studies may have a very unique place in negotiating and promoting it... and I don't mean to imply that some sort of

---

30 What would happen, I wonder, if all teachers stopped trying to be "blank space" on which no identity is written? I remember one of my older colleagues at the school in which I taught being appalled when she learned I had shared my first name with my students. In her mind, being Dawn, a more personal, intimate being, would give me less "authority" with my students.

150
testosterone overload is creating a hostile and awful place for children. We just seem to be dancing around the question of whether or not there is anything different about women as social studies teachers and their roles."

"Arguing that women's moral judgments emerge through commitments to relatedness and care and to the specific contexts of the situation, Gilligan offers a rationale that would designate women to be the agents who might rescue the classroom from the common culture and the rule of ethics" (Griffin, 1997, p. 15, citing Gilligan, 1977).

"What was it that Leanne had said?" Doreen sorted through her recollections of the discussions. "Something about social studies teachers at the secondary level. Oh, yes." Leanne's voice played in the back of Doreen's mind:

... I think that elementary teachers teach kids and secondary teachers teach information. And that makes all the difference right there. I think you have to make a conscious choice as a secondary teacher, "I'm going to teach information to kids." To me, social studies teachers should be, not that every secondary teacher should not be a model of the good citizen, but social studies teachers more than any other group should be the group that teaches people rather than just teaching information.

"In the early years of schooling... children learn in the semiformal ways reminiscent of the mother's way; they learn to live together in play, song, dance, art, and story. But from third or fourth grade on, the curriculum becomes discrete - separated into well-defined subjects - and the children learn "to master the language, the rules, the games and the names of the father" (Noddings, 1989, p. 234, citing Madeline Grumet)."
Doreen’s mind tried to wrap itself around the image of a high school filled with teachers who felt it part of their moral responsibility to create spaces and a sense of community and belonging in their students. “Would that be like the best parts of home?” she wondered. Doreen remembered Leanne’s rejection of using home as a metaphor for schools if it implied that, as a teacher, she was supposed to become a mother.

“I’m not sure I want to be ‘Mother’ to 150 kids! I have a hard enough time being a good mother to the daughter I gave birth to,” Leanne had exclaimed.

Doreen knew Leanne had a point; there was a difference between their public (teaching) lives and their private lives. Doreen sometimes wondered, however, if women did not allow their identities in their “private” lives to be dictated by “public” rhetoric about motherhood and relationships. In addition, boundaries in Doreen’s life were fluid; they had to be or she could never move in and out of her various roles so successfully. Her identity as activist permeated everything she did, and everyone she was: spouse, teacher, partner, friend, community member, mentor. Part of Doreen’s motivation came from what might be considered the “public” sphere – wanting to preserve parts of the city’s history, striving to affect change for better schools, challenging civic leaders to be true to the democratic principles they espoused.
There were other reasons which kept Doreen going, even on those nights when meetings were stacked three in a row and the rest of her life was lived in the ten minute snatches she managed to grab as she traveled from one site to the other. These motivations were more personal: hoping to create a better place for her students to learn and to live, carving out parts of her own history as she struggled to keep local stories alive, searching for other souls who understood what it meant simply to be. "What would happen," she wondered, "if teachers really lived where they taught. Not just in the sense of where they reside, but in terms of who they are, how they think, what they value?"  

In describing Dietz, Phillips (1993) explains, "(S)he conceives the power of democracy 'in its capacity to transform the individual as teacher, trader, corporate executive, child, sibling, worker, artist, friend, or mother into a special sort of political being, a citizen among other citizens.' Citizenship is about transformation, getting beyond one's immediate environment" (p. 84, citing M. Dietz).

She checked her watch and realized it was time to get started. The students were meandering their way into the classroom with the panache that only the naivete of being seventeen can produce. Doreen smiled a little as she thought about the prospect of being "mother" to the variety of faces in her class. Then, as she had done every day for most of her teaching career, she mentally pushed aside the readings, the agendas for the meetings

---

31 Doreen's emphasis on the importance of teachers living in the communities where they work reminded me of *The Dreamkeepers* (1994) by Gloria Ladson-Billings. The teachers she writes about in...
she would attend later that day, and the projects left unfinished on the dining room table;
she turned her attention to her students. When she announced the
assignment for the day, there was the usual assortment of groans and complaints. “Ok.”
she said, in her quiet, soothing voice, “let’s all whine together for fifteen seconds and get it over
with. Then, let’s get started.”

"All this means, I think, that teachers must find ways to
be with their students, to talk with them (and not at
them) about their own lives and about great intellectual
ideas, to solve problems with them rather than merely
setting the problems to share cultural delights with them
without testing the joy out of the shared event.
There are, of course, natural separations that we need to
maintain to keep relations genuine. The teacher bears
the authority of expertise and the burden of seeing
things through both expert and novice eyes; the teacher
sets the student free to pursue his or her learning.
(Noddings, 1989, p. 192)."

this book also demonstrate the ways in which they are tied to the community, making them more
successful in creating a sense of belonging for the students in their classrooms.
Scene II. “Who’s Part of the ‘Out’ Group?”: Interrogating Issues of Identity

Nancy settled into the couch in her living room, stretching her slightly over six foot frame into an almost horizontal position. Her eyes closed and she felt the sun streaming through the window to the south. The warmth of the sun and the relaxing sound of a room without high school students edged her closer to sleep. “I can’t do this,” she told herself assertively and forced her body into an upright position. “I promised my kids they’d get their papers back on Monday.” Having fought her way from the slippery slope of a “quick nap” that could potentially turn into a lost Saturday afternoon, Nancy stood up to arm herself. She returned to the couch with a tall glass of water, some snacks, and her favorite pen for grading. Ellie, her tabby cat, protested the change in plans, “Meow.”

“Yeah, well, don’t you have the life?” Nancy responded. “You can nap all you like; you’re not going to have 120 kids complaining to you if their papers aren’t finished.”

Nancy was in her sixth year of teaching and had promised herself that this year would be better than last. The previous year, her first at the high school level after teaching four years in the district’s middle school, had been a rough one.

The transition to the high school, where her colleagues in the social studies department placed a strong emphasis on content and demonstrated less enthusiasm for exploring creative ways to teach the content, had been more difficult than she had anticipated. Nancy admired the knowledge these men possessed, for they were, in fact, all men, but missed the camaraderie she had experienced at the middle school level. Teachers of pubescent seventh and eighth graders were a special breed, members of a group who survived only by their wit and ability to empathize with the rapidly changing
creatures for whom they were responsible. However, while Nancy missed the charms of middle school students — the smelly feet, the changing voices, the farting noises — her high school students supplied a sufficient number of juvenile pranks to remind her of the pitfalls of living with young adolescents each day. Besides, she thrived on the more sophisticated content of the high school curriculum. She enjoyed the opportunity to teach Economics again, it had been her major as an undergraduate at Duke University.

As Nancy organized the various stacks of paper in front of her, each representing a different class period, she discovered the envelope Dawn had left a couple of days earlier. The envelope had been propped against her door in the wee hours of the morning. The note attached to the collection of three readings was scrawled in Dawn’s familiar handwriting. She asked the group to read one of the pieces, though Nancy usually tried to do more. She found the readings interesting, and sometimes challenging. The issues raised in the readings, as well as through the group’s discussions, seemed particularly relevant to Nancy at this juncture in her life.

Nancy had made other transitions the previous year. About a year and a half earlier, she and her husband of four years had separated. The divorce process had been long, painful, and difficult. When the divorce papers had been filed in the spring, Shannon and the other women in the feminist focus group had planned a “Celebrate

---

32 The logistics of coordinating the readings grew cumbersome. I waited until after each of our discussions to identify readings for the next meeting, letting the connections to the literature emerge as the discussions progressed. It was important to supplement our discussions with the theoretical literature, sometimes reinforcing our conclusions and sometimes looking for information that contradicted what we had said. However, this meant that I needed to transcribe the discussion, conduct a preliminary analysis, identify appropriate readings, and get the readings to the other participants in time for them to read before our next meeting. Given that most of our meetings occurred one week apart, I found myself struggling to maintain the schedule.
Nancy Night” and invited her friends from school. Nancy appreciated this group for their support as friends, as well as for their commitment to teaching.

Perhaps it was the move to the high school, or maybe the changes in her personal life, but Nancy had spent a lot of time during the past year reflecting on who she was and where she belonged in life. She discussed her feelings of restlessness, as well as her various options with the women in the group last week. Her quandary about finding a place to belong was not unlike the topics they were addressing that week. Most of the discussion had centered on issues of identity, both individual and group, and the impact of identity on citizenship.

For weeks now the group had been struggling to define what they wanted citizenship to mean. In the previous week’s discussion, they spent considerable time on the concept of “voice” – Who had it? How did they get it? Can you “give” voice to someone else and, if so, what are the implications of doing so? Does everyone want to have a voice? Nancy recalled one of Doreen’s comments:

> You know... when we first mentioned citizenship as voice and... we decided to define this more as we go along, I decided to pull books, literature that I felt reflected some aspect of citizenship. Without doing anything except going with sort of a gut reaction, I found myself pulling books or pieces of literature that in some ways spoke to a 1) questioning and 2) a sense of belonging. And for me, that started to... narrow (it) a bit. It was the process and then, regardless of the resolution... I got back to that idea of making sense of place and a place making sense.

Nancy thought about that phrase: “Making sense of place and a place making sense.” She considered her own position in life for a moment. Nancy wasn’t sure if she had made sense of her life as a teacher yet. In her sixth year, she found herself thinking more and more often about looking for a new position in another school or possibly going back to graduate school and starting a Ph.D. program. She wondered whether she wasn’t
able to make sense of the place or if the place didn't make sense. "Whew!" she exclaimed to Ellie, "this may be too complicated for a lazy Saturday afternoon!"

Nancy was intrigued, however, by the issues raised in the readings Dawn had left. The group had been discussing the tensions that existed between multiculturalism and citizenship. On the one hand, they had been searching for an inclusive way to talk about citizenship, on the other hand, they acknowledged the difficulty of doing so in a society that claimed to value diversity. Part of the challenge, they seemed to agree, was the challenge of talking about other groups without reinforcing stereotypes.33

... When I think of multicultural education . . . I think it's important to acquaint kids with types of people, that sounds really tacky and I don't mean it to sound tacky, but types of people that they would not ordinarily know anything about. But I think we tend to stereotype when we say don't stereotype. You know, when we come up with a checklist - so and so people are like this and this and this. When I think we would be better off, and I don't know how we would go about doing this necessarily but I think we would be better of if we didn't give characteristics.

Leanne paused for a moment.

33 This discussion was particularly interesting to transcribe. We all seemed painfully aware of our language, wanting to challenge some of the ideas associated with multicultural education yet not give the impression of being racist or "anti-diversity." In the notes I took during our conversation I wrote, "I wonder how this conversation would be different if we had included an African-American in our discussion group?" Later, I wished that I had asked the group this question.
You know, 'All African Americans are da-dat-da-dat-da-da-da,' because of the diversity of the African American community, or the diversity of the Hispanics, or any other groups. But I don't think we talk about that. I don't think most schools -- I can't -- Have you ever heard of 'A World of Difference?' I remember when I took that course, and I was in a pilot group, they kept saying, and I thought about that I think when I doing the reading for tonight . . . whoever was the leader of our group, kept saying, 'Now, you can't stereotype, however...'

Nancy thought for a moment about her students and wondered whether or not they were able to comprehend the complexities of diversity. She wondered if, to some extent, these simplified ideas about race, gender, and ethnicity had emerged as an unintentional consequence of the multicultural education movement. "In order to teach about something, we needed first to be able to defined it. Unfortunately, in doing so we often tend to break things into the smallest parts. Maybe the problem is that we don't put it back together very well."

"What were the smallest parts of culture?" Nancy thought of the checklists about various cultures that the group had discussed. "I wonder what would be included on a checklist for Whites?"

"The thesis is that our identity is shaped partly by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. Nonrecognition or misrecognition can indicate harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being." (Taylor, 1994, p. 24)
Nancy was well aware of her position in the dominant culture. Raised in the South as the only daughter of fairly traditional parents, she had been aware of issues related to race and gender at a fairly early age. She also realized that there were other layers of identity, those less obvious than gender and race. During the last discussion, classism had reared its ugly head:

Given the fact that I can accept "secure cultural context," I love that phrase, as part of my God-given rights . . . if I accept that then I am not as easily miffed by reverse racism that I sometimes see as pervading society, or that people want to leap on. The question the discussion doesn't center around is classism and I am less freaked by pluralistic societies interacting with each other in these secure or insecure contexts and feminist interpretations of male ascribed language, which I think is good to question . . . than I am by the fact that there doesn't seem to any discussion of classism. Do we really think of the person who is homeless in the street as a citizen in the same way that we think of a person with two and a half children and two cars in the garage as a citizen?

Doreen had been referring to "secure cultural context," a term included in Amy Gutmann's piece on multiculturalism and the politics of identity. Nancy understood her point. She was very aware of sensitivities, her own and her students', to issues of race, ethnicity, and gender. However, she realized classism was often pushed under the rug, particularly in the affluent district where she taught.

"They have more currency of citizenship and they probably exercise it differently," Nancy observed.

Shannon added, "That comes out in class all the time, not in so many words, but in the concept of who counts and who is a citizen and who is doing important things in their community."
She recounted a class discussion in which students started to throw around the term “trailer trash.” Before she had a chance to call them on the slur, one of her students, a popular, good-looking, football player stood up in the back of the room and yelled, “Hey, I live in a fucking trailer!” Shannon publicly rebuked the student for his language but explained that she had quietly cheered him for calling the others on their flippant use of such a derogatory term. She thought that many students, residing in one of the most expensive areas in the state, had assumed everyone lived in six or seven bedroom houses.

“Much of Western European history conditions us to see human difference in simplistic opposition to each other: dominant/subordinate, good/bad, up/down, superior/inferior. In a society where the good is defined in term of profit rather than in terms of human need, there must always be some group of people who, through systemized oppression, can be made to feel surplus, to occupy the place of the dehumanized inferior. Within this society, that group is made up of Black and Third World people, working-class people, older people, and women” (Lorde, 1995, p. 532).

Shannon had also described a book she’d heard of in a session at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies they had all attended several months earlier. “One of the books she brought up that I’d been wanting to read is The Redneck Manifesto. Have you heard about it?” No one in the group knew anything about it. “It’s this young man, I think he’s in his early twenties . . . who believes that his culture, that of the one group that it is still universally acceptable to make fun of, rednecks, is a valid culture with lots of important aspects to it, historically and everything else. And goes in defense of living in trailers and having black Velvet Elvis paintings on your walls and it
goes from there. But he's really, really angry and it's written from a . . . perspective of
"Why is it ok to make fun of this culture?"

Nancy realized her own students were much like Shannon’s. She wondered how
they would respond to studying the culture of "rednecks." "Where do we draw the lines
for who is part of the 'out' group?" she wondered. Doreen’s phrase about making sense
of a place and a place making sense came back to her. Why did citizenship, as a place,
make sense for some people and not for others?

Dawn had recounted one of her early childhood memories about how her
understanding of citizenship, as a place, was developed:

... I thought immediately not just of
questioning and a sense of belonging but
questioning our sense of belonging. This seems to
be an interesting way for people from the dominant
culture, people who have been part of the way
we’ve defined citizenship in the past, to question
why they assume they belong. Earlier someone
mentioned the American Legion and I thought of
my grandfather, who was very active in the Legion.
As a kid I remember going with him to the
cemetery on Memorial Day and walking around this
very small town, rural cemetery looking for the iron
stars that designated the graves of veterans and
putting an American flag in them. I couldn’t have
been more than four or five, and we did that from
the time I was a toddler until he passed away at
ninety-four. That was just his job. I don’t know
that he ever questioned his sense of belonging in
the United States. He was a property owner. He
was a veteran. His son was a veteran. He firmly
believed to his very core that he had a sense of
belonging in the United States but was never asked
to question that or where that came from.

"I was thinking about your sense of belonging and that your grandfather never
questioned it," Shannon said quietly. "It makes me think about the reaction that many
veterans have when something like controversy over the Enola Gay exhibit is brought up and whose perspective and what's history and what isn't and what's valid? If it isn't that sense of belonging that's just jerked or made uncomfortable, that causes such pain for people and controversy.”

Nancy realized the snack she'd prepared for herself was still sitting on the table next to her. “Funny, who would think you get lose your thoughts in the politics of identity?" It wasn't as if the group had reached any kind of consensus. Near the end of the discussion, Doreen had summarized their quest in relation to the readings and their discussion:

"It's almost as if to define it (citizenship) you need a new term for it.³⁴ Not just a new definition but you need to not even use the word citizen any more. I thought this article on 'feminist contributions to citizenship, coupled with the reading on multiculturalism, was interesting because it was a really good argument for the questions that are raised about how much identity you can have and yet become a citizen, in terms of your own background and perspective. And I really liked the notion... that people have the right to a secure cultural context in order to define themselves as much as they have the right to other basic things in citizenship. I've always been intrigued about why people are threatened whether there is a hyphen or a space between the hyphen. And, ah, that suddenly made sense to me as a way to articulate that.

Nancy thought about the connections Doreen had made between Lynda Stone's postmodern definition of citizenship and Amy Gutmann's argument that secure cultural

---

³⁴ The possibility of creating a new term for "citizenship" came up more than once. My own resistance to the idea, I'm sure, played a role in rejecting this option. I resist the appropriation of terms by others. For example, many of my friends are reluctant to identify themselves as "feminists" because it "carries so much baggage." However, the negative connotations associated with the word have been inscribed by others and, it seems to me, we must challenge those who redefine us.
context should be considered one of the “primary goods, basic to most people’s prospects for living what they can identify as the good life.”

Nancy knew, however, that it wasn’t so simple. “Do you think they were seeing citizenship as a panacea? Citizenship education as a panacea for all of the hatred or all of the problems in our society? Because that would make it meaningless if we saw it as the universal panacea because there is no universal solution to these problems.” Nancy thought about the focus group discussion scheduled for the following night. She suspected they would not resolve the question of identity, how to define it, how even to describe it. But, somehow, she looked forward to the discussion anyway. In the process of talking about the politics of identity for Others, she was learning a lot about “making sense of a place and a place making sense” in her own life. After all the changes in her life, in who she was, she felt ready for the rather uncomfortable endeavor of questioning her sense of place.

---

Act III: Invent Possibilities

Scene I: “Why Can’t Care Be A Political Concept?”: Revisioning Citizenship

The group was gathered around the kitchen table. The coffeepot sputtered in the background and a bottle of wine stood in the center of the table. They all seemed to be in that strange place between wanting to relax with a glass of wine and wanting to dump caffeine into their systems with a strong cup of coffee. In other words, it was late spring and they were high school teachers.

During their few last meetings, they had struggled with how they could define citizenship in a way that addressed issues of identity. Some in the group expressed concern that the discussions may have been reduced to wordsmithing and semantics. Nancy reminded the group of a quote from one of the first articles they read:

"Given the fluid, multiple identities of postmodernism and their resultant momentary associations, perhaps ‘citizen’ is an outmoded notion – perhaps the idea of the primary identity of person and nation-state is passe" (Stone, 1996, p. 173).

“Well, I love that,” Nancy stated emphatically.

“The problem is that’s going to come into conflict with things like: You have to pay your taxes, what’s going to happen if we go to war, you happen to live in a nation-state that still defines itself that way, along with the 100 and whatever other nation-states in the world. It’s like it’s almost way ahead of its time. And, if you’re going to define citizen in a different way that isn’t allied with this whole idea of a nation-state, I don’t think anyone’s going to agree with you except for some people like us. (Most of the group nodded in agreement.) I say that’s a great idea but I have no power or very limited power. Certainly not enough power to change this.
Dawn was bothered by the helplessness that seemed implicit in Nancy’s statement. She tried to explain to the group the power she saw in the language that was used to describe citizenship.

If you think of yourself as a global citizen, how does that affect the way you think about trade agreements - things that are still nationally based or locally based - and I think you change that if you shift that concept in your mind, it changes the way you think about things. It’s that idea that if kids understand pollution or global warming on a global scale it will affect the way they evaluate their decisions about national policies or local recycling programs, those kinds of things... I agree that we can’t just sit around this table and we’ll all say ‘Ok, so we’re going to change the definition of citizenship’ and the world suddenly changes but our world changes because we’re looking at it differently and we’re using different words to describe it and we’re seeing things from a different perspective.

Dawn struggled to describe what she meant. The group had been “playing” with postmodern concepts without using all the language usually associated with the paradigm. She continued:

I think that’s part of the whole notion of postmodernism. Patti Lather is a professor at OSU and in our research class she would say, "It's learning to think without the very things that we think we can't think without." That really changes things: it’s sort of the process I had to go through with designing this research study. I had all these ideas about research was supposed to be but what if I learned to think without all those things... and said, "What is the most appropriate way to get people to think about this issue?" which is what I really wanted to do. And so, what happens if you learn to think without this idea of citizenship as a citizen of the nation-state...?
The group had discussed the dangers of moving away from one definition and into a realm of binaries, where we defined global in opposition to nation-state, feminist in opposition to masculine, and political citizenship in opposition to cultural citizenship.

"In doing that," observed Shannon, "it's as if one always has the power and the other is the alternative, like you have to reject one to accept the other."

Dawn nodded, "Right, and my goal isn't necessarily to contradict definitions of political citizenship, because I think there are dimensions of that, lots of dimensions of it, that I think students need to know. What I'm curious about is what are all those other things that part of being a citizen or belonging to a community that aren't part of that definition."

"Well," Nancy jumped in, "we oversimplify those or we assume they're going to be taught outside of school or we, well, we denigrate them. We ignore them or we talk about cultural citizenship or different kinds of traditions, or different types of civic action but people will say, 'Oh, yeah, but that's not in the curriculum.' You know, it's seen as additional. I wonder what the trade-off is for redefining citizenship the way we're talking about?"
There was a pause, each person reflecting on the implications of embracing a new definition of citizenship. Doreen volunteered, “I wonder if the trade-off is that you go there alone. You can trade it off but nobody follows you.”

The group heaved a collective sigh.

Nancy, always prepared to see the best in a situation, posited, “Do you go alone without power though?”

“Yeah, yeah you do because it’s like you’re in a big rowing yacht or something and you decide you’re going to stroke the other way. Well, the problem is that everyone is still moving down the stream and you’re just now fighting them and the current. Because I think about taking some of our arguments... to the mainstream and I think the argument is lost. It almost gets down to the Wally Cleaver, Leave it to Beaver family.® We accept certain things with such voracity, whether they’re true or not, that to have the insight or the knowledge to say it’s not right doesn’t matter, it really doesn’t. You might as well be Demosthenes out there looking for an honest man.”

“Maybe that’s it,” Leanne offered. “Maybe we don’t really teach citizenship – at least the way we’re talking about it here – in a social studies class. Maybe it’s too hard to work against all of the preconceptions social studies teachers have, at least until we start changing those ideas in teacher education programs or someplace.”

“Maybe you’re right, maybe it’s not as hopeless as I seemed to paint it,” Doreen concluded. “I was thinking about whether you could define citizenship with your students through literature,
because we had talked about literature at some point last week. And I thought about it again when I read the piece by Joan Tronto, the one called “Care as a Political Concept.” Doreen flipped through her stack of papers.

I was thinking about how we could introduce this concept of care into classrooms. She (Tronto) says:

“Care is a species activity that includes everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our ‘world’ so that we can live in it as well as possible. That world includes our bodies, our selves, and our environment, all of which we seek to interweave in a complex, life-sustaining web” (Tronto, 1996, p. 142).

Doreen continued, “I thought about the power of literature in helping us to see multiple perspectives and to see care as a species activity. And I wondered, if we said we were going to set up a course on teaching citizenship and we were going to use primary source or literature based pieces, would that, in effect, define what we thought of as citizenship?” The group brightened a little at the possibility. They’d spent a lot of time talking about how the definition of citizenship had been constructed and how traditional definitions reflected all the biases and hierarchies embedded in society.

Doreen shifted in her seat. She paused for a moment as she moved her spoon carefully around the inside of her coffee cup.

36 Here Doreen was referring back to our discussion about whether or not “the family” with the two parents, two kids, two car garage had ever really existed or if it was an example of Baudrillard’s use of simulacra, where the simulation of the real becomes more real than the real itself.
A couple of months ago... I pulled a lot of things out of an old American literature book... and there was a section there... from "I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings." One of the students asked me about that because I kept saying, 'Oh what a great book' because it had really been an opening experience for me when I was younger. And so she read it and she is a white child, poor, Appalachian background, the only one in her family to graduate from high school. She has every strike going against her. And she came to me, maybe about three weeks ago, with... tears in her eyes and said, 'I searched the Internet, you know she never wrote anything else. Because,' she said, 'that's me, that's me in that book.' You know and it was just such a real testimony to it and I was so glad she had picked it up. And I though if I had to use a book on citizenship, it goes back to the classism thing, I'd use that book.

"That's interesting," Dawn remarked. "Maybe you're right. Maybe students learn care through empathy and that's what we create through literature. I thought it was interesting to push Tronto's notion of care as a political concept up against Jane Mansbridge's chapter about 'reconstructing' democracy." She reached for her cup, relished the taste of the strong coffee for a moment, and continued:

Her goal isn't to have a democracy based on emotion, but she argues that you can't ever separate the emotion out of it. That's where we've fallen apart... because emotion has been relegated to the 'feminine' domain, we're not supposed to think about emotions, that shouldn't be a factor in our decision making process. She's saying a) it's impossible that it
isn't a factor, and b) it shouldn't be the only factor either. Where was that section? Oh yeah here it is:

“If one feels awkward bringing up a fact or causal analysis that runs counter to prevailing sentiment, the ratio of emotion to cognition in the deliberative setting is probably too high (Mansbridge, 1996, p. 125).

This reminded me of the backlash to the 'political correctness' issue, that people are apologetic or afraid to raise issues that might provide interesting opportunities for discussing what democracy means in a diverse society. Because it's become so emotional... I don't know if I really want to take the emotion out of it, but I'd like for us to find ways to communicate about such issues.

The rest of the women nodded their heads. They had discussed the complexities of talking about difference – particularly when one was a member of the dominant culture.

Nancy interjected, “I didn't have a chance to read Bloom’s article, 'The Politics of Difference and Multicultural Feminism: Reconceptualizing Education for Democracy' but I thought it looked interesting. What did she say?”

“For much of the Bloom article I was annoyed with her,” Doreen started.

“I was annoyed with the style, I was annoyed with what I thought was a pedantic way of sort of belaboring the issue. But the part that I agreed with the most... and I was thinking, 'Now, here we have it, the nucleus of where the whole thing' is when she talked about democracy as evolving. You always think of it as having been there and you don't accept the fact that it's going to change, then you're doing no one any service if it doesn't change, and I thought that came as close to sort of answering the question as anything.”
Shannon nodded her head vigorously. "Yeah, I think it's useful to think of democracy as evolving. I disagreed with her premise – and I'm curious to see if you thought the same thing – it seemed to be that teaching about democracy or civics is some kind of rah-rah, this is some kind of just and perfect system and I don't know that any of us approach teaching government from that perspective..."

"It depends on what you mean by 'rah-rah.' If you mean that she implies it's taught as some kind of unquestioned patriotism, I would agree that she underestimates what's happening in social studies classrooms," Dawn offered.

Doreen agreed:

Yes, I think it's much more a reflection of how it's taught than the rah-rah... unless you're in some kind of private school where you see democracy as part of the extension of God's chosen people... I've written a lot of things, but suppose it's not being articulated often... then it's not of much use. If you're not doing it consciously, it's not of any use. I'm consciously out to show that democracy is an evolving and changing and inclusive process... I suppose I am teaching it in kind of an exclusive way? And it does need to be articulated.

Dawn had thought about this issue often. While she knew this group was exceptional in some ways, she hated to believe they were the only social studies teachers critically analyzing how citizenship has been traditionally framed. She was, however, also painfully aware that much of the contemporary work in civic education continued to promote a somewhat narrow interpretation of what that might mean.

I agree that that probably isn't how a lot of teachers teach it but, when you look at the civics standards, it's a relatively untroubled, unchallenged notion of democracy and where the historical roots are and it's not necessarily described as an evolving process. It's 'Here are the ideas that have held true since the late 18th Century and they come from Rousseau and Locke, and so these are the foundation of our democracy...
So, I don't know that it is necessarily considered an evolving process. Because a lot of teachers take their cues and their curriculum materials from those kinds of documents, I'm not sure - I think good teachers probably do teach it differently but I'm not sure a majority do.

Doreen responded, “Well, I think in that case teaching democracy or teaching civics becomes part of that whole postmodern morass. What comes after the Enlightenment? Once you’ve set yourself up to be enlightened and you’ve taken these wonderful 17th Century ideals, where are you going with it then? Especially if it turns out that it wasn’t very enlightened after all.”

Leanne spoke up tentatively, “The ReEnlightenment?”

“Not a bad phrase,” Dawn thought to herself and jotted it in the margin of her notes.

Leanne continued,

“We were talking about how democracy is evolving and I certainly agree with that, but I think that a lot of times, government teachers – and that’s not necessarily civics teachers – pride themselves on the document that we call the Constitution by saying, ‘And it has hardly changed in low these many years.’ And that it was so concise, and written so well that the people who did it incorporated all these wonderful things and had such vision, that it’s only had to be changed 26 times in all these years. And if we follow the concept that – or if we embrace the concept that democracy is evolving, then, perhaps we might think that the Constitution hasn’t kept pace.

For Doreen, this was part of the problem. She frequently bemoaned the lack of preparation new teachers received before walking into the classroom. While concerned about pedagogy, she also argued adamantly for teachers to be rich in their content area.
This was part of her rejection of the term “social studies” which, in her mind, implied a watered down version of the disciplines.

“Well, it’s interesting that you should bring that up because that may speak to the lack of preparation of teachers who teach social studies because we could easily say it’s only changed 26 times in the history of 200 years but we ignore the fact that court cases have changed it daily -- in other words we don’t know our own government well enough to point out the obvious thing which is that interpretation happens on many levels ... And, given the history of this country, if we teach that civics and democracy are evolving, it puts us in the political stead that are products of the civil rights years. Who is the next group to be somehow liberated by us and that we extend the rights down one more level? So, in other words, it isn’t something that can be discussed easily without immediately putting you in some kind of political realm that could be taken issue with by parents, by students.”

“And who is the ‘us’?” Leanne offered in support of Doreen’s conclusion.

“But any discussion of politics is going to be political,” Dawn objected.

Doreen responded, “Well, I don’t think we do a very good job, and I don’t know how one does a good job, but ... just what is inalienable? If it stems from some of these suppositions then what the hell do they mean to begin with and how do you prove inalienable rights? In a way, that’s about as leap of faith as any religion would have you take ... By the time I got to the end of the article nothing had been made any clearer regarding what this might mean to the classroom — except to raise the issue. But that is one of the good things; she brings it up. It is continually raising the issue.”

“And it makes things debatable. And I think that what she says in theory makes sense but how do you put it into practice?” Leanne asked.

37 The group spent a lot of time drawing distinctions between government class and how we were defining civics. However, many “civics” classes dedicate the bulk of their time to studying the functions and forms of local, state, and federal governments.
Shannon had been quiet during the evening. She had been thinking a lot about her civics class during the discussion.

I came to the same general conclusion that some of this was hard to translate into practical use in the classroom. Some of the points she made about why it’s so uncomfortable for us to talk about differences I thought were well made. Like the one point that “there’s a universal fear of letting go of universal ideas and accepting difference because to admit the differences between us as other than equal variations on a single theme is to admit that injustice born out of these differences is not an aberration.” Which I think is a good point. It kind of went “bing” when I read it. I thought that kind of hit—there are lots of reasons why it’s uncomfortable—but I thought that makes a lot of sense.

“Care (as a political concept) does challenge the modern notion of formal abstract equality; however, it also opens up the opportunity for a richer, more genuine, and more pluralistic account of equality and democratic life” (Tronto, 1996, p. 149).

Shannon’s comments triggered something in Dawn’s mind. She thought about the lively discussions in which she had participated with various Polish educators about the meaning of democracy, the role of schools in preparing citizenship for a democracy, and the tensions between individual and group rights. “We not only haven’t really come to an answer on these issues but we’ve quit having the conversations. We don’t think of these ideas as controversial any more.”

Leanne’s head nodded up and down in enthusiastic agreement.
"And that's because I don't think we are challenged. I don't think we're challenged to revisit them. I think that we are, 'the Great We,' (with a touch of sarcasm in her voice) are so apathetic because we have taken everything for granted for so long because we've always had it. When we were at a conference last year someone asked, I've forgotten the exact question, I think it was, 'How has visiting Poland and talking to people in Poland changed your attitude and the way you teach?' and it has. I think it has made me remind kids that all that we take for granted is very fragile, and I don't think that kids think of it that way.

"Well, no," Doreen's voice filled with her passion for history.

"Because and it gets back to the European history bias, and if you major in European history the bias is always against American history, and it's always summed up by a short sentence about how we do it: 'American History is a short, boring success story.' ...It's not just taking for granted what our rights are or how they were won but we assume because it's a short, boring success story that whether we participate in it or not, it will eventually happen. The franchise widens, rights are provided, so we can sit back and wait for it to appear on a video with a theme track behind it like Eyes on the Prize and then feel very nostalgic and good about our part in it. That we lived through those years, whether we did anything or not ... somehow by the fact that we have lived in the same era, at the same time, hundreds of miles away, we were part of that. So we assume it's always marching toward success, and we don't teach it as having had drawbacks so, in respect to what you were saying, because in a way, to extend the conversation about problems too far is to admit that they are not just an aberration, that they are really real.
“But as teachers, I think we have a responsibility to show our students that it can't always continue,” Leanne concluded. “We should think about it and talk about it as something always changing, always evolving – which means their roles as citizens are constantly changing.”

“I agree with you but it isn't just about what we teach. It's about how we do it. I am really profoundly affected by the Polish experience, that if we're going to raise the question, then we should do it in a context where the methods fit it, rather than just raising the questions. Otherwise, then it's still just talking heads,” Doreen’s observation was unanimously supported by the women sitting around the table. They had often discussed their experiences with Polish educators, how hard they worked, how poorly they were paid, and how seriously they took their roles as educators.

Dawn asked, “Do you think there's something about their socialist past that makes them feel more responsible to the whole society? Maybe that's part of what emerged during the communist era that was positive - that somehow society was supposed to recognize caring for one another as part of the political domain. Ironically, as the government failed to do this, it seems that an underground civil society developed that did.”

There was a long pause until Dawn finally said, “So where do you think that leaves us?”

Doreen chuckled a little, “Let's see, we seem to say that there is something that comes out of a socialist, Marxist tradition that we'd like to adopt for our definition of democratic citizenship. I'd say we're someplace in that postmodern morass I mentioned earlier!”
Scene II: “What Happens Next?”: Reclaiming the Conversation

Dawn heard the rap on her door and checked the clock. 6:15 a.m. Nancy’s face peered through the glass, much as it had on the night of the first focus group discussion. Dawn’s eyes darted to the pile of transcriptions, journal articles, and books stacked around her computer. She visualized the calendar the way it was portrayed in old movies – with months blowing off and being carried away by a gusty wind. She suppressed the urge panic and hurried to unlock the door for Nancy. Only Nancy would agree to walk at such an early hour. “At least it is warmer, now,” thought Dawn as a warm breeze entered the kitchen with Nancy.

“How ya doing?”

Nancy was careful not to be too specific in her inquiries of Dawn these days. She knew her friend was feeling a lot of pressure with work, the dissertation, and plans to move across the country in a couple of months. Nancy remembered when Dawn had shared the news about the offer from Washington State University. The group, Dawn included, had mixed emotions. To some extent, it was inevitable that she move on; it was part of life as a graduate student. This reality, however, had managed to elude them over the past couple of years and now, the time was drawing nearer for their little group to separate. In addition, their bond had grown stronger in the process of sharing their experiences and discussing the readings related to citizenship, identity, places that make sense, and care. During one of their meetings they’d joked about what to call themselves.


Leanne responded, “But we don’t sew.”

“No,” thought Dawn as she slipped into her shoes, “we eat desserts.”
Dawn finished tying her shoes and stood up, “I’m ready when you are.” She and Nancy headed out the door and went south, into Victorian Village, an area in Columbus lined with old homes, many of which had been renovated in the past fifteen years. The trees were flowering and created a fragrant canopy of color over their heads.

“I hope the group continues to meet,” Nancy said as they settled into their usual brisk pace. Two days earlier, the group had completed its last “official” meeting. They had plans to get together at least one or two more times before Dawn left in August. She hoped to take advantage of their meetings to share her progress on the story. The group processing was more or less complete and now it was up to Dawn to craft their tale.

“I’m sure we will. And I’m sure you’ll get together even after I leave,” Dawn offered. “Besides, we’ll all be at NCSS in the fall.” She was referring to the annual meeting for the National Council of the Social Studies. The group was going to make a presentation at the conference about their discussions.

The two women slowed their pace as they stepped gingerly across a section of the sidewalk covered with petals that had fallen from the trees. The rain from the night before left a slippery film over the flowers. “I know,” replied Nancy, “but it won’t be the same.” Dawn seemed relatively relaxed this morning, though the turn in the conversation about her pending departure left both of them feeling a bit melancholy.

After a moment of silence, Nancy ventured in a different direction. “So, how is the dissertation going? What happens next?” The look on Dawn’s face led her to believe this new topic was not necessarily a welcome one. She described her struggles with writing a story that reflected their conversations and the angst she felt as she moved
back and forth between the transcriptions of their conversations and the contexts she created for each scene.

"I keep coming back to what we've done and I wonder what it means. I know what it means for me, and I think I know what it means for all of you, I just wonder what it offers to the field." This question was fresh in Dawn's mind; her adviser posed it to her during their last meeting.

One hour and four miles later, they were back at Dawn's house. The skies were threatening a repeat of the previous night's thunderstorm so Nancy scurried to her car while Dawn hurried to the shower. She hoped to get in a full day of writing today. Talking to Nancy motivated her to work. As she rinsed the shampoo from her hair she heard Nancy's voice in her head, "What happens next?"

"That's kind of the question, isn't it?" she muttered to herself as she stepped out of the shower. She thought about where they had started their discussions that first night, each of them locked into a way of thinking about citizenship that reflected the traditional conception of political citizenship. As their interpretations became more inclusive, they had debated whether or not they were still talking about citizenship. Finally, in their last meeting, they had concluded that citizenship should be discussed as an evolving concept — something that could never be defined outside of a given context and moment. "Very postmodern," mused Dawn as she looked over the transcripts from their discussions.

However, the group had also concluded that their evolving definitions of citizenship, and for that matter democracy, did not fit into existing curriculum frameworks and could not be assessed on the state's proficiency tests. "These ideas don't
come all neatly packaged with the 'correct' response ready to be bubbled in on some computer graded test,” Doreen noted.

“No, they certainly don’t,” thought Dawn as she read through the transcripts again. For her, this process had been about generating ideas, pushing her thinking, creating possibilities for where social studies education might go. She realized, however, that to some extent, she lived in a different world than the rest of the group. As classroom teachers, they were barely given enough time in the day to swallow down their lunches and go to the bathroom, let alone spend time wading around in the quagmire of what citizenship means in a postmodern world.

“What can this discourse contribute to such a world?” she asked herself as eased into the chair and turned on her computer. The chair squeaked in reply. It was old and an ugly green color that didn't really match the rest of the room, but it was familiar and comfortable so she kept it. She leaned back and the chair groaned again. “Maybe the traditional definition of citizenship is like this chair. It doesn’t necessarily fit its surroundings any more but we’re attached to it anyway.” Dawn laughed at herself. Everything in her life had become a metaphor for her research; last night it had been peeling a potato, though in the morning she couldn’t remember why that had seemed appropriate.

She picked up the copy of Dewey’s *Democracy and Education* she had tossed on the top of the pile the night before. Thumbing through the book, she came across a section she had highlighted several years earlier. In the margin she had written, “Dewey understood democracy, and the citizenship upon which it rested, to be ‘a mode of
associated living, of conjoint communicated experience.""³⁸ Dawn recopied her notation on to the page she was typing. She realized that this was, in essence, what she had been thinking about when she designed the study. One of the challenges in presenting the study had been the extent to which the methodology and the substantive focus of the study had become so intertwined in her mind. While she had not articulated it clearly, she knew she wanted to create a study about democratic citizenship that cultivated that very sense in its participants. The process created through the group discussions was a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experiences. They had created a microcosm of a democratic community in which they were all citizens – and their citizenship had nothing to do with rule of law or voting. It had to do with voice, with belonging, with care.

Dawn read through each of the scenes she had started. She heard the frustrations of the teachers’ voices as they described the constraints that prevented them from cultivating new and exciting possibilities for citizenship. She also sensed their determination to look for cracks in the systems through which they might push their innovations. Maybe through integrating select pieces of literature in their social studies classes . . . maybe through summer institutes for students . . . maybe through their involvement in the Social Studies and Global Education Professional Development School . . . maybe through our continued association . . . maybe through presentations or publications we might create. Maybe we could reclaim the conversation about citizenship, reinvigorate it by introducing it as a controversial idea – an evolving vision that depended on multiple perspectives and voices from all groups in our society.

Dawn knew that this was the response to Nancy’s “What happens next?” The conversations needed to continue, with different groups, in different places. “What more appropriate method for discussing what citizenship means for the new millenium than a public discourse?” Her mind started to whirl as she thought about the possibilities through technology. “Maybe a website or a listserve would work!” Dawn lost herself in the data – recreating their conversations and creating places and details for the story.

Hours passed. She looked at the clock, the empty can of Diet Coke, and the almost empty bag of Ranch flavored Doritos at her feet. The room was filled with the soft light of a late spring evening. Another day had passed and she still had not finished this scene. She was tired and her stomach screamed for something more substantial, and more nutritious, than the chemical ridden corn chips and soda that were currently battling in her abdomen. She clicked “save,” then “close,” and finally “exit.” She’d come back to this in a few days, when she had another break for working on her dissertation.

Two and a half months passed before she opened the file again. In the interim, she had revised the first three chapters numerous times and finished the scenes in the other acts – and that had been the easy part. In addition, she had packed her belongings into a U-Haul, driven almost three thousand miles, unloaded everything in Pullman, Washington, and started a new position in the Department of Teaching and Learning at Washington State University. When she read through the first part of the document, she laughed out loud.

“What’s wrong?” her positivist partner called from the next room. He was standing amidst the still unpacked boxes.
“Nothing,” replied Dawn. “I'm just glad we decided to get rid of the old office chair.” She stretched back in the new chair and smiled. Instead of the old “skwweek,” she heard a “krraah.” “It's a start,” she thought. She clicked back into the other file she had open on her computer. Her course syllabus appeared; in two days she would start teaching the “Introduction to Teaching and Learning” course. She scrolled back up to the top of the page and, under course objectives, added: “Students will engage in an ongoing discourse about what it means to educate citizens in a democratic society from a variety of perspectives.” She hit “save” and “print.” Then, she smiled. After all, the conversation had to start again somewhere. “Why not here?”

“Crucial to this democratic project is a conception of the political that is open yet committed, respects specificity without erasing global considerations, and provides new spaces for collaborative work engaged in productive social change” (Giroux & Shannon, 1997, p. 9).
A Postscript . . .

The "Ladies Auxiliary Dessert Club and Terrorist Society" continues in our efforts to "disrupt, transgress, and invent possibilities." In November, 1998, everyone but Shannon was able to meet at the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Conference in Anaheim, California. At the conference, we conducted two sessions in which we raised many of the issues addressed in this document. In the near future, we plan to celebrate women's issues with a trip to Seneca Falls. Finally, we continue to reexamine our experiences in an effort to understand and challenge ourselves, as well as each other.

Our discussions, and our friendships, continue to evolve and grow in spite of the distance that separates us.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The story in the preceding chapter was presented in an organizational framework based on a challenge from Fine (1992) which called for those concerned with women's issues to "disrupt, transgress, and invent possibilities." This final chapter provides a brief discussion of the disruptions and transgressions represented in the story. In addition, I consider possibilities that emerged from the study by identifying specific recommendations for change. As stated in the Introduction, this study had a substantive and methodological focus. As a result, this project has implications for the field of social studies education, as well as for educational research.

Implications for Social Studies Education

Numerous scholars in social studies education are calling for increased attention to substantive women's issues (Bernard-Powers, 1996, 1997; Bloom, 1998; Crocco, 1995; Hahn, 1996, 1998; Noddings, 1995; Stone, 1996). There seems to be almost unanimous agreement among this group regarding the importance of moving beyond an additive approach to women in social studies curriculum in order to integrate women's thinking, lived experiences, and genuine contributions to the history and ongoing development of democracy in the United States. These scholars join a chorus of other feminist voices in

The recognition of the connections between feminism and postmodernism comes at a crucial time for social studies education in general and citizen education specifically. David Broder, in a recent article published in the Washington Post explains that “two recent reports show why reviving civic spirit in America is probably the only cure for rampant public cynicism – and why that is going to be devilishly difficult” (p. 12). He goes on to describe two analyses on the condition of civic involvement, one from the National Commission on Civic Renewal (developed by Sam Nunn and William Bennett) and the second from a series of National Issues Forum reports entitled, “Governing American: Our Choices, Our Challenge.” Both reports, one from political leaders and the other from grass-roots organizations, concluded that the need for community involvement was on the rise, and the extent to which both adults and children were participating in such activities was on the decline.

While these findings may seem disheartening, that the issue is being discussed in a public forum can be considered promising. Increased attention in public schools to service-learning projects reflects a similar interest in creating opportunities for young people to assume a more active role in their communities (Battistoni, 1997; Carver, 1997; Kraft, 1996). Without vision, however, these efforts may result in superficial actions that fail to create the very sense of commitment and connection proponents hope to generate.
Revisioning "Citizenship"

One of the most powerful and recurring themes in the literature and our discussions was the need for a new conceptualization, and perhaps even a new definition, for citizenship. Emile, the "ideal citizen" promoted by Rousseau in the 18th Century is not an effective model in a postmodern world, particularly given the extent to which Emile's success in civic virtue rested on the back of Sophie, his housekeeper, cook, and wife. In addition, if we accept Bloom's (1998) premise that democracy, and the citizenship upon which it relies, is a constantly evolving entity, we can no longer confine our discussions to neatly proscribed categories. As Stone (1996) suggests, citizenship in the postmodern era must be multidimensional, reflecting "difference over sameness, multiplicity over singularity, fluidity over stasis" (p. 51).

Challenges to definitions of citizenship which are limited to membership in nation-states (Patrick & Remy, 1980) or rights to voting and public office (Center for Civic Education, 1994), call for a fluid conception of a "citizen" as one who dwells in the chasms which exist between the ideals of democracy and the realities of their lives. Giroux (1988) explains, "For educators the modernist concern with enlightened subjects coupled with postmodernist emphasis on diversity, contingency, and cultural pluralism, points to educating students for a type of citizenship that does not separate abstract rights from the realm of the everyday, and does not define community as the legitimating and unifying practice of a one-dimensional history and cultural narrative" (p. 26).

Giroux's call for a citizenship which challenges the binary between "abstract rights" and the "realm of the everyday" echoes the call from feminists to challenge the
binary of public and private. Ackelsberg and Shanley (1996) explain, "Privacy is not something natural, prepolitical, or extrapitical, but a politically constructed and contested good" (p. 213). Feminist reconstructions of democracy also challenge "the tendency in any democracy for members to assume away the needs and perceptions of subordinates" (Mansbridge, 1996, p. 117). Moving away from unidimensional conceptions of identity which prioritize gender, feminists working within postmodernism recognize multiple identities and advocate for a democratic society which provides spaces for negotiation among these identities (Mansbridge) and the power of care as a political concept (Noddings, 1994a, 1995; Tronto, 1996).

**Reconceptualizing the Role of Citizenship in Teacher Education**

In addition to revisioning citizenship, the group's discussion often focused on the importance of integrating discussions about the meaning of citizenship and democracy into teacher education programs. The new visions of citizenship discussed above are not cultivated through specific content related to the forms and functions of the government. While it is often assumed that civic involvement and civic awareness is embedded in Government and Civics classes in secondary schools, this can only be the case to the extent that such classes also model democratic pedagogy. If educators wish to prepare students for democratic citizenship, a call echoed by many in the "democratic schools" movement, (Apple & Beane, Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991; Goodman, 1992; Sehr, 1997, and Shor, 1992), it is essential that those associated with schools initiate a discourse about the meaning of democracy, citizenship, and the role of schools. Teachers need to be prepared to take a leading role in facilitating and promoting this ongoing dialogue.
Usher and Edwards (1996) explain that in carrying out this role, educators become "cultural workers and education a form of cultural politics. They cite Giroux’s concept of "border pedagogy" to support this revisioning of the role of the teacher:

Border pedagogy is attentive to developing a democratic public philosophy that respects the notion of difference as part of a common struggle to extend the quality of public life. It presupposes not merely an acknowledgement of the shifting borders that both undermine and reterritorize different configurations of culture, power and knowledge. It also links the notions of schooling and the broader category of education to a more substantive struggle for radical democracy." (as cited in Usher & Edwards, p. 215)

In fact, the participants in this study concluded that this role is not limited to social studies teachers, all teachers have the potential to be “cultural workers” in the project of democracy. In order to achieve this, however, inservice and preservice teachers must have opportunities to engage in a discourse similar to the one initiated in this study.

Inservice programs, often devoted to technocratic skills related to specific ideas (cooperative learning, assertive discipline, multiple intelligences) should not occur in a vacuum. Instead, the faculty and staff in each school should define its democratic mission through a process of public discourse which involves students, parents, and community members. This process may not result in a neatly packaged statement of a “Democratic Ideal” to which all participants feel committed. However, once the dialogue is initiated, all aspects of school life should be considered in the context of that conversation.

Preservice teacher education programs need to be reconsidered. While virtually all students enrolled in a teacher education program in the United States is required to
complete coursework in multicultural education, the role of the school and teacher in a
democratic society is rarely discussed. This statement is not intended to diminish the
importance of multicultural education, in fact, I would argue these courses are essential.
However, beginning teachers may reduce the multicultural course to lists of
characteristics which result in reinforced stereotypes when information about difference is
presented in isolation of the impact of difference on our democratic society. Without an
appreciation for the extent to which a “secure cultural context” (Gutmann, 1994) can also
be considered a right within a democratic society, multicultural education may be
perceived as “political correctness” and the mantra of “left-wing liberals.”

Carr and Hartnett (1996) concur:

The need for an approach to educational studies which reinstates
the notion of teaching as a theoretically based and morally
informed profession has been made all the more urgent because of
... reforms (that) have reduced the professional autonomy of
teachers to a limited technical discretion with a restrictive
framework of bureaucratic inspection and technical control ... This has been achieved by eradicating from teacher education any
reference to those shared traditions of educational thought which,
by helping to expose the taken-for-granted political assumptions
and educational values governing contemporary practice, served to
animate a critical debate within the educational professions about
what the values informing their work should be. (p. 196)

To a large extent, these possibilities may be most effectively initiated at the
university level. While the participants in this study agreed that individual teachers
could, and do, attempt to integrate democratic ideals into their classrooms, without the
support of school and district administrators, such efforts were limited in their success.
Consequently, in addition to teacher education programs, the preparation of future educational administrators provides a powerful venue for raising these issues.

Finally, although the classroom teachers in the group were not familiar with the concept of feminism as it related to "critical pedagogy" (Luke & Gore, 1992) prior to our discussions, they raised many of the same concerns regarding issues of "empowerment" often addressed in the literature (Ellsworth, 1997; Gore, 1993). Interestingly, though very few of our Polish colleagues use the term "feminist" (in fact, it has a very negative connotation in Poland and is met with enormous resistance), our group concluded there were powerful parallels regarding questions of resistance and assumptions surrounding emancipation. Consequently, it is important to revisit the connections between pedagogy and conceptualizations of citizenship.

**Recommendations for Social Studies Education**

These conclusions warrant specific suggestions regarding their potential impact on social studies education:

1. **The integration of courses related to the role of schools and teachers in democratic society in teacher education courses.** These courses should not, however, rest on the hegemonic interpretations of democracy. By integrating historical, feminist, postmodern and international perspectives on the meaning of democracy, the "foundations" of a democracy can be reconstructed. Such an analysis does not necessarily predicate a rejection of modernist conceptions of liberal democracy. Instead, the intention of the courses should be to revitalize the public discourse surrounding the rights and responsibilities of all citizens. While certainly these
courses should be included in the preparation of social studies teachers. I posit that all preservice teachers would benefit from reflecting on their future roles as cultural workers.

2. **A reconceptualization of inservice programs.** In one of the last focus group discussions, Doreen noted that “teachers don’t have the time to be philosophers.” I suggest this is due, in part, to the increased emphasis on the technical dimensions of teaching. The skills-based approach to education is often reinforced through inservice programs organized around sharing “information” but not “ideas.” For example, instead of an all-day inservice on integrating multiple intelligences into the classroom, why not an all-day inservice in which teachers are engaged in responding to the question: What is your role as a teacher in a democratic society and how is that role shaped by your identity? Clearly, this contradicts current trends toward holding teachers accountable through their students’ performance on standardized tests. However, such an opportunity may create a forum for reconsidering the content of those tests, what the tests actually measure, and what we learn from their results.

3. **A revision in existing social studies curriculum.** Most social studies programs are based on Tyler’s curriculum model in which students move from the basic to the most complex. The assumption in social studies has been that local government represents the starting block for understanding civic participation and the interaction between the state and the citizen. This may, however, be an erroneous assumption. Particularly given the trend toward service requirements for high school service requirements for graduation, moving the study of local government and community to the high school
level seems plausible. In this way, service learning requirements could be met in conjunction with students' analysis of the issues, people, and power structures affecting their community.

Implications for Educational Research

The implications of this study for educational research are twofold. The first concern is an expanded definition of collaboration in educational research. The second implication relates to the use of alternative forms of data representation.

Professional Development through Collaborative “Theory” Research

The term “collaborative research” in the academe has come to imply that participants share in the writing process (Hafernik, Messerschmitt, & Vandrick, 1997). This may, however, limit possible collaborative arrangements, particularly between classroom teachers and university-based educators. At what point does the expectation that classroom teachers write in order to be considered part of a collaborative process become an imposition of the values promoted in the academe – an arena from which many teachers feel isolated and patronized? In this situation, for example, the teachers who participated in the study were not interested in creating a writing team. They did, however, play an integral role in the questions posed, the direction of the study, the readings, and the (re)conceptualization of what it means to educate citizens in a democratic society. Instead of forcing participants into a predetermined definition of collaboration, this process allowed each participant to determine how her individual, intellectual development might be promoted through her interaction with the group.
In addition, definitions of teacher-researcher projects or action research which limit teachers' to the consideration of specific classroom-related issues do a disservice to teachers' intellectual acuity and the importance of a practice well-grounded in philosophy and theory. Why should the intellectualization of ideas be left to those residing in the "ivory towers"? What impact does it have on the theory/practice binary when, instead of grounding the theory in practice, we are grounding the practice in theory? The participants' involvement in this study and their conclusions that engaging the theoretical literature challenged their daily practice suggests that, indeed, theory and practice may be a "two way street" on which one may move in either direction. The key, however, is in the participants moving back and forth on the street of their own accord.

**Alternative Forms of Data Representation**

Pinar (1998) suggests that the field of curriculum "will not progress beyond a certain primitive point unless we support a sector of theory . . . that perhaps most in the field cannot fully understand initially" (p. xiii). In an ironic twist, those who wish to respond to Eisner's (1998) call to transform "the contents of our consciousness into a public form that others can understand" (p. 4) may, in fact, find themselves on the fringes of the field described by Pinar. Moving toward a more public form moves researchers away from the mainstream of educational research.

Part of my goal in initiating this study related to my desire for teachers not only to be involved in the process of generating the data, but for the "results" to be presented in a manner that was accessible to the public. This issue of accessibility, however, was not related to language -- as critics of postmodern and poststructural claim -- but to the
content. For educational research to be meaningful, it needs to challenge our intellect, broaden our thinking, and embed itself in our lives. Goodson (1998) points out, however, that personal narrative without the social and political context results in being “divorced from any sense of the politically and socially constructed nature of the ‘circumstances’ in which lives are lived and meanings made” (p. 10). The story, therefore, provided a vehicle for contextualizing our discussions and making connections between the ideas we discussed, the social and political context for our discussions, and the lives we were living.

This approach does, however, raise questions about the standards – both ethical and scholarly – by which such work ought to be judged. Both of these issues are addressed at some length in Chapter 2. As the researcher, I am left with feelings of uncertainty regarding how this work will be received; there are few examples for me to judge their success and/or failure. If we are to proceed in this direction, as Pinar (1998) and Eisner (1997) suggest we should, the educational research community will need to open itself to the ambiguities created in these new spaces.

My conclusions regarding the use of research as professional development and the implications of using alternative forms of data representation suggest the following recommendations.

**Recommendations for Educational Research**

1. **A broader conceptualization of collaboration.** Current collaborations between school and university educators tend to fall into two models: one in which the university educator is invited into the world of the teachers, and the second in which the teacher
is invited into the world of the university educator. Depending on the individuals and
the goal for their collaboration, either of these models – or a combination of the two –
may be enormously successful. However, this study suggests that there may be a third
space in which collaboration may occur, a space that recognizes that these two groups
operate under different expectations and possess different needs. Extending the
definition of collaborative research to include studies which promote the professional
development of all participants, though in different ways, provides a more equitable
approach to such arrangements.

2. **The need for additional work in alternative forms of data representation.** Any shift in
paradigm creates a period of chaos in which old standards no longer apply and new
standards have not yet developed. While scholars are working toward a new
definition of “worth” and “validity” for alternative forms of data representation
(Eisner, 1997; Lather, 1986, 1992; Scheurich, 1992), clearly defined criteria have not
emerged. Indeed, “the postmodern moment” may mean that such delineated
guidelines may not serve the educational research community well even if they were
developed. This means, however, that the merit of each study becomes a negotiation
between the author(s) and the reader(s). This process will be facilitated by learning to
“read” research in new ways, a skill – or perhaps an art – that cannot be developed
without practice. Research which “invents possibilities” through the use of stories,
readers’ theater, poetry, film, and other non-traditional vehicles will provide all of us
with an opportunity to “think without the very things we thought we couldn’t think
without” (Lather, 1993).
Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to discuss the possibilities that emerged from this study. The unique design of the study necessitated that both the substantive and methodological implications be explored. Finally, in considering this story and its implications, I borrow from Jim Scheurich in saying, “I will, like anyone presenting a paper, use cunning strategies of logic and rhetoric to make my story sound like a story you might want to embrace. I believe in the story I am telling in this paper; I believe that is worthy of your consideration and, even, your agreement” (p. 2). If you find that you cannot agree, I hope, at least, I have made you think.
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APPENDIX A

Application for Exemption
from Human Subjects Committee Review

Summary of Proposal
by Dawn M. Shinew

This study has both a substantive and a methodological focus. The main focus is substantive. The study explores the implications of feminist literature and interpretations for reconceptualizing the notion of citizenship in democratic societies. This substantive issue will be addressed, however, by a less than traditional methodology; hence the methods themselves will also be a secondary focus of the study.

The participants will include myself and four female teachers. Participants have been identified based on their interest in the topic and a form of collaborative research. We will be involved in a series of five to seven focus group discussions in which I will assume the role of a participant. Discussions will be open-ended, though always connected to readings and experiences related to the concept of citizenship. Each of the focus group interviews will be audio taped and transcribed verbatim. In addition to the focus group discussions, I will conduct individual interviews with each of the four participants in order to conduct “member checks” on interpretations of focus group discussions.

The study's design promotes a collective, collaborative, self-reflective, critical analysis which will result in participants' articulation of a rationale or philosophy of practice. Each participant, myself included, has identified specific goals she hopes to reach through her involvement in our discussions. These praxis-oriented objectives range from specific plans regarding grant proposals and curriculum projects, to more general aspirations related to personal growth and development. The group has agreed to facilitate each other's goals through a collaborative process in which we contribute materials, information and support.

The collaborative nature of the study makes it distinct. The four participants have expressed a wish to waive the right to confidentiality in order that their contributions to and participation in the study may be recognized. The issues to be discussed are not personal or controversial. In addition, disclosing their identities will not damage their financial standing, employability, or reputation.

As the report is developed, participants will review each draft to insure validity and reliability. If a participant expresses discomfort with information or interpretations included in the study, revisions will be made to insure a) the information or interpretation is valid and, b) the participant feels she has been represented fairly. Until these criteria have been met, the report will not be shared with others.
APPENDIX B

Consent for Participating in Social and Behavioral Research

I consent to participating in research entitled:

(Re)Considering Citizenship: Disrupt, Transgress, and Invent Possibilities

Dawn M. Shinew explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits and risks of the study have been presented to me.

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 my consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

In addition, I have asked that my right of confidentiality be waived. In the report of data gathered during this study, I request my real name be used in order that my participation in and contributions to the study be noted. Dawn M. Shinew has agreed to submit the final written report for my approval.

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

Date: _____________________ Signed: ________________________________

(Participant)

Signed: ________________________________

(Principal Investigator)

Signed: ________________________________

(Witness)
APPENDIX C
APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE REVIEW

All research activities that will involve human beings as research subjects must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate human subjects review committee, or receive exemption status, prior to implementation of the research.

Principal Investigator: Herryfield, Harry
(Not to OSU Faculty) Last First Initial (Signature)

Academic Title: Associate Professor Phone No. 292-6314 Fax No. 292-7695

Department: Language, Literacy, and Culture Department No. 1275

Campus Address: 138 Arts Hall Room Number 1945 North High Street Building

Co-Investigator(s): Shinew, Dawn M. Last First Initial (Signature)
(Typed name)

Protocol Title: (Re)Considering Citizenship: Disrupt, Transgress and Invent Possibilities

The only involvement of human subjects in the proposed research activity will be in one or more of the exemption categories listed on the back of this application.

Category: (Check one or more) 01 02 X 03 04 05 06

Source of Funding for Proposed Research: (Check A or B)

A. OSURF: Sponsor RF Proposal/Project No.

B. Other (Identify) Personal funding from Dawn M. Shinew (doctoral student)

Exemption Status: ✓ APPROVED — DISAPPROVED**

Date APR 1 1998

Chairperson

**Principal Investigator must submit a protocol to the appropriate Human Subjects Review Committee.

Important Notice to Investigators: Exempting an activity from review DOES NOT absolve the investigators of the responsibility for ensuring that the welfare of human subjects in the activity is protected and that methods used, and information provided, to gain subject consent are appropriate to the activity.
Appendix D

March 2, 1998

Dr. James M. Siddens
Assistant Dean, Graduate College
250 University Hall
230 North Oval Mall
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dear Dean Siddens:

This letter of petition relates to the dissertation guidelines established by the Graduate College. The guidelines indicate, “Standard 12 or 10 point font size and standard fonts are preferred, but non-standard fonts and size may be used if they are fully legible and acceptable to the dissertation committee... Once selected, the font and size should be consistent throughout the document...” (Guidelines for Preparing Theses, Dissertations, and D.M.A. Documents, p. 5).

I am writing to request these guidelines be waived for my dissertation in Social Studies Education. I understand the left margin must be a minimum of one and one-half inch and all other margins at least one inch. However, in order to illustrate the complexity of the methodology and the collaborative, multi-voiced nature of the data, I propose altering the font, point size, and margins (within the minimum margins identified above) in the “Report of Findings” chapter.

The fonts, size and margins will vary greatly within this chapter, though I will avoid fine or scrolling scripts which are difficult to reproduce on microfiche. The text will represent participants’ voices, excerpts from the literature, and my analysis. In a sense, I attempt to create a visual “readers’ theater” in which not only the content but the presentation of the data demonstrates the discursive process through which the ideas emerged. I value the symbolic representation of using varied styles of text. I believe social studies education should reflect the multiplicity of theories, voices, and ways of knowing which abound in education and the social sciences.

I have attached the signatures of my committee members and the School of Teaching and Learning Graduate School Coordinator, indicating their support of my petition. In addition, you will find a sample of the formatting I propose. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions (292-3540 or <shinew.1@osu.edu>). I appreciate your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Dawn M. Shinew
Committee Members:

Merry Merryfield, School of Teaching and Learning & Educational Policy and Leadership, Committee Chair

Robert Donmoyer, Educational Policy and Leadership, Committee Member

Mary Leach, Educational Policy and Leadership, Committee Member

Marilyn Johnston, School of Teaching and Learning, Graduate School Coordinator
Sample: The Homeplace

Doreen's keys jingled in the early morning air. She crawled around the back seat of her car, carefully maneuvering around the piles of papers, books, magazines and newspapers. Her back seat had become an extension of her dining room table, which was an extension of her desk at school. Earlier in the week she had joked with her "feminist focus group" about the "laying on hands" routine in which she finds herself touching each pile periodically—ostensibly because she's looking for something but, perhaps, also to insure that they are all there.

Her balance was precarious as she juggled her coffee cup, the chosen pile of materials, and her constantly stuffed book bag and made her way across the thin sheet of ice which covered the school parking lot. This morning she hoped for a school cancellation and then, remembering the superintendent was from Buffalo, realized she may have had her last snow day. Her car had been the first one in the parking lot for almost thirty years, after all, and she thought this may be her last superintendent.

As Doreen pulled open the door to her classroom and turned on the bright florescent lights, her eyes quickly scanned her domain. She recalled the focus group discussion regarding whether or not "home" was an appropriate metaphor for schools. On the tape they listened to before their meeting, Nel Noddings suggested schools should be like homes--nurturing, caring, safe. Doreen could hear Nancy's response to the metaphor.

Well, they talked about the whole metaphor and I was thinking about how she had, in fact, stated overtly that she was leaving out
the bad parts of home. She said metaphors typically do not include everything that is bad or include the whole. It just seemed to me really odd because it was so idealistic. If you're going to define home that way and then put that into schools, it's going to be idealistic in the schools as well.

To some extent, Nancy's comments echoed Doreen's questions about the metaphor. However, for Doreen, the nagging feeling went deeper. Had home ever been a nurturing, caring, safe place? She thought of her own childhood. She was the product of the era so fondly remembered by political conservatives yearning for the period when family values reigned supreme. Her family life had been loving, but in no way resembled the Cleaver household. Doreen was the child of immigrants and raised in a large, industrial, mid-Western city. She thought of her students' homes. As a high school teacher, she was certain few of her students talked at home. It's a developmental thing. She had explained during the focus group discussion.

It's a sense of independence, you keep your thoughts to yourself as a teenager. I mean you don't talk at home...when I think of my colleagues who have high school children (and) how upset they get when kids talk freely at home because they think their values have not been transmitted. And these aren't people who are right wing or people who are ultraliberal, they're not in any category, they just find—it's human nature to find yourself uneasy when you're kids
are having their own opinions. So maybe home is a place for safe
discourse when you're a child but not a teenager.

Doreen spent the next thirty minutes organizing her day. Slowly, the rest of the
building came to life. Students started straggling into her classroom. Some of them were
supposed to be there first period; others just wandered in for a few minutes and then
exited, not really acknowledging her formally but noting her presence.

Doreen checked the clock: twenty minutes to spare. She reached for her bulging
book bag and burrowed through its contents. Inside, Doreen found what she had been
seeking. Dawn left three articles on her doorstep yesterday afternoon. The note attached
explained that the focus group members should read one of the articles before their next
meeting. Dawn briefly described the three pieces and her rationale for choosing each.
Doreen would read them all, eventually, but with only a short time before class she
wanted something short. The Lynda Stone piece looked wonderful, but too long and
philosophical for a quick read. Amy Gutmann's chapter didn't grab her, either. And then
she saw the essay from bell hooks, entitled "The Homeplace."

As she read through hooks's discussion of the role of the homeplace in the African
American community, Doreen's mind turned to the phrase "cultural citizenship" which
had been used so frequently in the audio taped discussion. When she listened to the tape,
she'd felt as if she'd been dropped into the middle of something. Cultural citizenship was
a new concept for her—though she'd often questioned how effective schools were in
cultivating a sense of belonging among students. How do we help students feel connected to a
community?
hooks's description of the way in which her mother created a homeplace was particularly poignant for Doreen.

She paused for a moment and wondered about her colleagues with children at home, particularly single mothers.

Did they celebrate with their children when their work for the day was completed? Doreen doubted it; these women often seem harried and, well, bitchy, at school. And what about their students? Was it possible for teachers to give that same sense of security to their students? Could we, as women social studies teachers, play a special role in creating a homeplace for students? Teachers would need help in this; it had implications for preservice education.

She checked her watch and realized it was time to get started. As she had done every day for most of her teaching career, she mentally pushed aside the projects left unfinished on the dining room table, and turned to her students. When she announced the assignment for the day, there was the usual assortment of groans and complaints. Ok, she said, in her quiet, soothing voice, let's all whine together for fifteen seconds and get it over with. Then, let's get started.
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Ms. Dawn M. Shinew  
Mershon Center  
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