These Are Stories About Our Bodies: Collective Memory Work and the Pedagogical
Imaginaries of Our Teacher Bodies

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Erin B. Stutelberg

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Cynthia Lewis, Adviser

June 2016

i

Acknowledgements

This dissertation was made possible by scores of people, too many to name, but all are a part of me and are woven through the pages of my work.

Thank you to the faculty and staff in the department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Minnesota, with special thanks to Kristina Pearson who was always there to answer every question along the way.

To Katie Henderson, for whom I will always save a seat.

The Center for Exponential Goodness opened in Peik 60C in the fall of 2011; however, good work preceded the existence of the Center and continues today, despite its institutional eviction in 2014. I owe a great deal of gratitude to the well-springs of that goodness: Annie Mason, Shannon McManimon, Heidi Jones, Angela Coffee, Maggie Struck, and Jana LoBello. Thank you for supporting me and embodying goodness in all the places you go and things you do.

Another important Center, the Center for Writing, employed me, inspired me, challenged me, and cultivated the teacher in me. I am grateful for Katie Levin, Kirsten Jamsen, Debra Hartley, and the rascally cast of characters at the C4W who do what I believe is some of the very best work at the University and quite possibly in the known universe.

Doing research with my classmates/colleagues was an important way I learned to be a scholar. Thanks to Steph Rollag Yoon for working on a high school writing center with me, Maggie Struck, for doing critical collaborative self-studies turn pedagogical projects with me, Angela Coffee, Colleen Clements, and Erin Dyke for exploring collective memory work with me, and the bad-ass Hayward Collective for queering teaching, learning, and research with me.

To the A and the C of ACE: I said I never wanted to do anything as an individual ever again, and you two stepped right up to the challenge! For our first class together, road trips to conferences, and every Friday afternoon we spent writing, laughing, and crying together—I simply can't imagine graduate school, or now my life, without you. We might be wedded to the struggle, but I'm sure glad we're wedded to each other, too.

Jon and Marie, thank you for 16 years of friendship and counting; there has been nothing better than growing up with you two by my side. Some beautiful serendipity allowed us to spend the last five years on the UMN campus together, and I am hopeful for what the future holds for us.

For my parents, brothers, and sisters-in-law. For my littles: Matthew, Micah, Brayden, Melea, and Holden, who occupy the best places in my heart. I love every story I get to write with you.

Thanks to Jean Ketter and Kara Lycke for teaching me to be a teacher, and to all the amazing teachers I have worked with, most of whom still do incredible work with students in classrooms every day.

To Cynthia Lewis, my advisor: I could easily write about how you have inspired me with your scholarship and mentored me into the academy, but what I am ultimately grateful for is your humanity and love. Thank you for believing in me, trusting me, and helping me keep it all in perspective. I see in you the kind of mentor and person I aim to be.

I am so thankful for the patience, trust, care, and guidance from my dissertation committee:

Timothy Lensmire, for standing atop a mountain with a sword and wielding it against the voices (usually my own) that tell me I'm not good enough. For cheering on my feminist critique of the research gap and reminding me that, if it's 50/50, I should probably *not* go for it.

Mary (Fong) Hermes, for the Hayward Collective, a place to be queer, walks through the woods and underground tunnels, and your constant, steady support. I will always keep an ear out for someone whizzing by on a bicycle yelling "Stutelberg!" and I will hope that it is you.

Bic Ngo, for asking me to do hard work and your whole-hearted belief that I am capable of doing it. Writing for you has made me a more curious and courageous scholar.

And to the crow, perching on the windowsill and cawing at me during my oral exam, who demanded that I pay attention to it, to always pay attention.

Dedication

This dissertation is a collective work of radical vulnerability. It would not have been possible without the creative, critical, brilliant, and loving insight of eight women English teachers, my participants (our collective).

Justine, Jaquinetta, Kristin, Tali, Sara, Kristen, Kathryn, and Kelsey: every day you do impossible, beautiful work—you teach. This dissertation is dedicated to you.

Abstract

Much of the current work on bodies in schools and classrooms is, appropriately, focused on a critical examination of the docile bodies (Foucault, 1995) of students and the violence inflicted on them. But teachers' bodies are also subjected to surveillance, management, and control by larger systems of power, and thus get marked, erased, and constructed in precarious and oppressive ways. These systems harness teachers' bodies to normalizing narratives of individualism, the hetero-patriarchy, white supremacy, and the Cartesian mind/body binary. As a result, teachers are left feeling disembodied, and yet, our teacher bodies—discursively and materially—still "come up" in the classroom, often in unsettling, painful, or surprising ways. Our memories of our teacher bodies become stories that we use to tell ourselves into existence and they continually shape our pedagogies, practices, and relationships with students.

In this study, eight beginning women English teachers and I took up a feminist post-structuralist methodology called collective memory work (Haug, 1987, 1999; Davies & Gannon, 2006) to access, analyze, theorize, and challenge our memories of our teacher bodies. Through our analyses of these memories we critically engaged with theories of teaching and learning and identified and (de)constructed narratives of race, gender, sexuality, and age that are reproduced in our classrooms every day. This study reveals how, if teachers are asked to engage in research that is collective, critical, and participatory, we build new pedagogical imaginaries through which we can learn from our own bodies and the bodies of our students.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter One: Introduction

The Problem

The landscape of teaching is shifting and contentious. It is flooded with dominant narratives of neoliberalism, standardization, and individualism that subsume and erase our stories of care, justice, and collectivity. When I listen closely to teachers' stories of teaching and learning, I also see how the landscape is littered with bodies: being objectified, colliding in the hallway, disappearing and reappearing, standing on the edge, being watched, studied, monitored, and whistled at, hugging each other, feeling ignored, and being sexual and sexualized. Hilary Hughes-Decatur (2011) characterizes the state of bodies in schools as "body-not-enough-ness." The way we are taught to read the body as a text, she says, is as either normal or deficient, enough or not enough. In this era of standardization, neoliberal market-based reforms, and competitive and punitive policies in schools, students' bodies have been reduced to test scores, data, categories, and demographics, and all of these ways of labeling and imagining bodies puts them in a state of perpetual "not-enough-ness" (Hughes-Decatur, 2011). Further, students' bodies, particularly Black and Brown bodies, get constructed as perpetually broken, wounded, too this, too that, damaged by skin color and shape, inscribed with trouble and problems, having "gaps" or being "at risk." In schools and classrooms, students' bodies are either denigrated or ignored. Teachers participate in the brokenness-of-bodies discourse as they regulate and manage the bodies in their classrooms, follow discipline ladder protocols, and enact racist, classist, and sexist school policies and practices. But teachers' bodies also get marked, erased, and constructed in precarious and oppressive ways.

In *The Teacher's Body: Embodiment, Identity, and Authority in the Academy*,
Diane Freedman and Martha Holmes (2003) remind us that there are "palpable moments
of discomfort, disempowerment, and/or enlightenment that emerge when we discard the
fiction that the teacher has no body" (p. 7). While much of the current work on bodies in
schools is, appropriately, focused on a critical examination of the docile bodies of
students and the violence, management, and control inflicted on them, teachers' bodies in
schools and classrooms are also subjected to surveillance, violence, and control by a
larger system of power and normalizing narratives of gender, sexuality, race, (dis)ability,
age, and social class. This system renders teachers' bodies invisible, only becoming
visible when they are somehow "remarkable": disabled, pregnant, raced (as not white),
working class, queer, too young or old, accented, or foreign, to name a few (Garland-
Thomson in Freedman & Holmes, 2003, p. xii). These marked teachers' bodies
experience a sense of precarity and vulnerability in different ways than a cis-gender,
heterosexual, middle class, white woman teacher does. But all teachers' bodies—both
remarkable and mundane—are pedagogically important and complicated. Scott Andrew
Smith (2003), who writes about teaching and dwarfism, insists that bodies *are always*
pedagogical and curricular. He writes:

> "Perhaps what we carry into the classroom physically—our way of carrying
> ourselves about also the ways in which our bodies have carried us or let us
> down—is just as important as the books and syllabi that we carry in our hands and
> the theories and ideas we carry in our heads. Perhaps the body, as it has been for
> many of us in the study of our own lives, is the most important text of the course"
> (in Freedman & Holmes, p. 32-33).

The denial, erasure, and invisibility that teachers' bodies experience are inscribed as powerful stories, stories that contribute to a very particular construction of what makes for legitimate teaching, learning, pedagogy, and curricula.

In *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), bell hooks writes, "the erasure of the [teacher's] body encourages [students] to think that [they] are listening to neutral, objective facts, facts that are not particular to who is sharing the information. We are invited to teach information as though it does not emerge from bodies" (p. 139). hooks continues, "we must return ourselves to a state of embodiment in order to deconstruct the way power has been traditionally orchestrated in the classroom, denying subjectivity to some groups and according it to others" (p. 139). hooks notes that her Black teacher body, marked and made visible by race, was also (e)raced in the classroom when positioned against powerful traditional conceptions of knowledge and learning. We cannot separate the expectations and limitations placed on the teacher's body from the pedagogy, curriculum, instruction, and moment-to-moment interactions that happen in the classroom and how power circulates through all of it. A theory of embodiment, then, must consider the subjectification of *all* bodies, taking into consideration the intersections of identity through which power moves and positions bodies differently, so that we might understand the precarious and contradictory experiences of teachers' bodies.

When teachers acknowledge their own bodies in the classroom and seek to honor the bodies and embodied knowledge of their students, they violate the convention that docile, schooled bodies ought to be invisible, neutral, and denied. Perhaps this is the most resistant and radical work that teachers can do: to be and remain in their bodies and to find openings for bodies to be vibrant material in the classroom. And when they do come

up (because they will) to honor and learn from them, rather than denigrate or ignore them. Collective memory work and post-structuralist/post-qualitative theories and approaches to research have provided me with the space and opportunity to do the disruptive work of bringing back teachers' bodies. A researcher could take many different methodological approaches to study teachers' bodies. For this study, I have chosen to learn about teachers' bodies in collaboration with the teachers themselves through a process of memory writing and collective analysis called collective memory work (CMW). In order to do this work, my participants and I played with and deconstructed language and discourse, challenged traditional methodologies and pedagogies, and as the subjects of our own research, we all participated in the production and analysis of our memories. As researcher, I was also open and vulnerable during this process to engage collectively with my participants—to learn about and be in my own body and collaboratively explore its subjectification. My experience participating in research in this way has developed over time and through my beliefs and commitments about the purposes and pedagogies of educational research.

My Commitments

I believe that stories serve as humanity's respiration—what it means to be human lives in the stories we tell one another and the very act of telling them. Much like breath—in and out—we tell stories and stories tell us. As a high school English teacher and now a secondary English teacher educator, my philosophy of teaching values and legitimates narrative ways of knowing and being, centers the (de)construction of stories, and interrogates language and other modes by which stories are told to discover how power, privilege, and oppression operate in and through them. I engage my students with

questions about stories like: Whose story is this? What narratives or perspectives does it reproduce? Whom does it leave out? I know that all stories are partial and that stories can be dangerous. But we tell them anyway because, like breathing, our lives depend on them. As a researcher, I remain committed to stories as powerful sources of knowledge that help us learn about the world, make meaning in our lives, build our identities, and transform social systems and practices. Therefore, the research I do seeks out stories, rewrites old ones, writes new ones, and engages others in the construction and analysis of stories as ways of producing new scholarship.

Next, I believe in doing research that is "with and for" students, families, teachers, and communities, not "on or about" them. This means my research extends from the concerns of individuals and communities and privileges their involvement in the asking and answering of important questions. By extension, my work is participatory and collective. I strongly believe in the power of what Richa Nagar (2014) calls co-authorship, of groups coming together to do activist scholarship and de-territorializing work together, of voices getting muddied and muddled as a way to work against relations of power, violence, and oppression. This feminist approach to research rejects the patriarchal and Western individualist focus of most traditional research paradigms that reifies the unified self, instead embracing the messiness of identity, solidarity, and responsibility through collective action.

Further, as a researcher who aims to investigate our racist, hetero-patriarchal, and classist education system, I reiterate Erica Meiners' (2007) argument that it is "increasingly important to study up," and I seek out critical, collective, and feminist methodologies that study up, examining teachers' and teacher educators' participation in

a culture of power instead of studying our marginalized or minoritized students (p. 43).

As teachers, we are positioned in a system with histories, regulations, policies, and discourses that produce and reproduce racism, classism, (hetero)sexism, and ableism. In this system we play a role that is precarious and contradictory: we "mask racist and sexist exclusionary educational practices" in schools by adamantly opposing such injustices, while also participating in a system that reaffirms them (p. 43). Teacher educators participate in these paradoxes, too, perhaps looking for cracks in the system, ways outside and beyond the limitations and reproduction of oppression, ways to be both/and—but rarely finding them. It is my hope that my research processes, including collective memory work, can reach outside and beyond the constraining discourses and normalizing narratives in schools and open up space for teachers to produce counter-stories and new narratives that resist violence and oppression against our teacher bodies and the bodies of our students

My Research Trajectory

In the summer of 2012, I participated in a self-directed independent study with three other doctoral students from the University of Minnesota (Colleen Clements, Angela Coffee, and Erin Dyke, and supervised by Dr. Timothy Lensmire), in which we read and explored feminist theories and perspectives on education. As part of this work, we were introduced to Frigga Haug's (1987) collective memory work (CMW) methodology through her collective's published work, *Female Sexualization,* and then began our own exploration of the methodology. In the fall of 2012 and spring of 2013, the four of us developed a workshop model that engaged participants in a 60-90 minute session of CMW, writing and analyzing memories based on the prompt, "Write about a

time when gender mattered in school." We presented this workshop at several local conferences and collectively wrote about its potential as a feminist pedagogy and methodology.

In the spring of 2014, Dr. Mary (Fong) Hermes led a doctoral course on feminist and queer research methodologies in the department of Curriculum and Instruction at the U of MN. In this class, the four of us (myself, Erin D., Angela, and Colleen), three additional Ph.D. students (Keitha-Gail Martin-Kerr, Shannon Dahmes, and Jenna Cushing-Leubner), and Fong formed a collective, and together we designed the course, including the syllabus, readings, assignments, meeting times, and plans for each session. One of our goals as a group was to take up collective memory work together, and we did much of that work during a weekend retreat in Hayward, Wisconsin. Our memory-work processes varied from Haug's (1999) methods, but centered on the common prompt, "What life experience feels incredibly relevant to your academic experience and yet excluded, dangerous, or impossible in academic spaces." In April of 2015 we presented our work from this CMW research experience on a panel at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) annual meeting.

Additionally, Angela, Colleen, and I have continued to take up collective memory work together as we've worked to explore our own experiences as white women teachers and teacher educators. Working with the prompt, "Write about a moment related to teaching when you became aware of your precarious, vulnerable, and undeniable white teacher body," we have collectively analyzed our memories of being white women teachers in classrooms with both white and non-white students, in the public school classroom, the higher education classroom, and the teacher education classroom. A

portion of this work (a detailed analysis of one memory titled "Precarious and Undeniable Bodies: Control, Waste and Danger in the Lives of a White Teacher and her Students of Color"), co-authored with Dr. Timothy Lensmire, will be published in *White Women's Work: Examining the Intersectionality of Cultural Norms, Teaching, and Identity Formation in Urban Schools.* Further, we presented this work at the International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry and the National Women's Studies Association annual meetings in 2015. We continue to develop manuscripts about the two additional memories we produced and analyzed together, most recently completing a manuscript which is under review for publication titled: "Scratching the Itch: Legibility, Social Class, and the Precarity of White Women Teachers."

This is all to say that these varied experiences using CMW methodologies with my classmates, colleagues, and professors at the U of MN have allowed me to carefully consider the possibilities, tensions, and challenges of the work. As I entered into my dissertation study, I was buoyed by these experiences, while also tentative about forming a new collective—one that wasn't constructed organically from shared interests in the methodology, and would not be afforded as much time to develop trust, care, and compassion the way my doctoral collectives were. As a researcher attempting to queer and question traditional notions of knowledge production and push the boundaries of what qualitative research might entail, I returned to my own collectives with my concerns and questions, continually grappling with and pushing back against the processes that can be liberatory and can also reconstruct dominance and normalizing discourses.

My Role/Our Collective

The term "participant observer" only begins to characterize my role in this research project. In some ways, all members of our collective were participants and observers, though only I am writing a dissertation about our work together. As the creator and facilitator of the group, researcher, and former instructor or supervisor of my participants, I was undoubtedly viewed as their "teacher" in some regard, but I also participated fully in the CMW process, not just observing but engaging in the work with the teachers collectively. During these sessions we were co-researchers. I was ever mindful of my authoritative position in the group as one of the oldest members who carried with her the institutional authority of the University and personal power from our previous relationships. However, it was also because of our relationships, which began and developed at the University, that I felt warranted in asking these new teachers to dedicate their time, energy, and resources toward the formation of a collective that would do this work together. The members of our collective did not all know, trust, and care for one another when we initially convened as a group, but they all had a relationship with me and were known, trusted, and cared for by me. Throughout our work together, we also developed a genuine sense of purpose, trust, and compassion for one another. This was evident within the first few weeks of working together, when a member of the group needed to leave our next session early to attend her student's football game. Rather than email me to ask permission to do so, she emailed the whole group with the request, knowing that her absence would impact us all. This attention to the collective continued as participants shared details of their lives with one another and prioritized the functions of the group over any individual in it. As I write this chapter, though the group's work

with memories has come to an end, we continue to meet socially and a smaller group of us has worked together on a theatre project related to our stories. While I am the author of this dissertation study, my participants had a greater hand in the research than happens in most qualitative research—both producing empirical materials (written memories) and conducting analysis of those materials with me. Thus, I draw on Richa Nagar's (2014) concept of co-authorship to help me think about how, through our lived experiences, we brought this research into existence together.

In the methodology of collective memory work, the process of analysis relies on the group's members to be, as Nagar (2014) writes, "radically vulnerable" with one another (p. 12). That is, if we assume that complicity with violence accompanies our actions, as well as the ways we remember and tell stories about those actions, then our research methodologies must allow us to be vulnerable with one another about those complicities, while also recognizing that our ability to know or see these aspects of our actions or memories will always only be partial. In other words, during the CMW process, I must feel that I can point to places in a memory where normalizing discourses or problematic narratives are being reproduced, as easily as I can commend the ways in which the author of the memory is pushing back against dominance or challenging oppression. The relationships created through this radical vulnerability are unlike those forged through more traditional qualitative research methods and rely on feminist ways of being and knowing in the world.

I use the notion of co-authorship, then, to characterize my role and our collective work in this study which reflects Nagar's (2014) approach; in order to forge a path that is both activism and scholarship we must be radically vulnerable together, and collective

memory work can afford us one opportunity to do so. It is my aim that a scholarship of co-authorship is reflected in this dissertation. Our collective alliance lives in this document, and while I am responsible for the labor of writing this dissertation, we all worked diligently to write and analyze our memories, identify and grapple with our complicities, build stronger connections between and among us, and remain in process together as we became students and teachers of one another. Throughout this dissertation, I will most often refer to the group as "our collective" but also occasionally with the pronoun "we." When I use "we" in this way, I refer not to a larger, unspecified population, but to the nine of us, unless otherwise indicated.

Overview of Chapters

The following summaries provide an overview to each chapter of this dissertation. While the full text or excerpts from the memories appear in several chapters, Appendix A contains all nine memories in their entirety.

Chapter Two: Review of the Literature. In this chapter, I first explore and review the methodology of collective memory work (CMW), including its theoretical underpinnings, variations (collective biography and memory-work), uses, and strengths and limitations. Then I examine several feminist and post-structuralist perspectives on embodiment that construct a theory of the body in non-binary, discursive, and material ways and look at research in education that has utilized embodiment theories to understand teaching, learning, and literacies. This section also includes a powerful critique of the study of embodiment, which I take the time to respond to. Finally, I bring together collective memory work methodologies and embodiment theories to make an

argument for why I have chosen to use the two in tandem to study the lived and

embodied memories of women teachers in this dissertation.

Our Collective Memory Work. Here, I briefly introduce our process of

collective memory work in order to provide context for the analysis chapters that follow.

A more thorough description of the methods, processes, and practices of the study

appears in Chapter Six.

Chapter Three: This Is a Story About a Blue Line. This chapter centers on a

single story from the study—Justine's memory. I chose her memory as a starting point

for the analysis chapters in this dissertation because our discussion was especially rich

and exemplifies the CMW process. We began by talking fairly superficially about the

particularities of one individual teacher's (Justine's) experience when her body comes

into physical contact with a student's body. As our conversation evolved, we built on that

initial analysis, drawing on larger discourses of race and gender to explore social,

historical, and political narratives about the bodies of white women teachers and their

students of color. This chapter takes the reader through the process of collective memory

work, and explores how CMW reveals the ways we construct our self through memory

and how the self (and others) are constituted through larger narratives that shape us.

Justine grapples with dangerous and contradictory narratives of race in her memory that

also live out in her teaching as she struggles to simultaneously ignore and acknowledge

race.

Chapter Four: "Is it good or bad if they think you're hot?": Teaching,

Hetero-normativity, and The Male Gaze. In this second analysis chapter I explore how,

through the collective analysis of three of our memories, we came to understand how

school is a place where women teachers are watched, monitored, and sexually objectified. This monitoring is both built on and reproduces the heterosexual matrix and affirms a complex and contradictory set of rules and norms for white women teachers. Our memories and subsequent analysis serve to both reproduce these norms and make attempts at disrupting them. These three memories focus on individual moments in which our students take up the male gaze to police, objectify, or harass us, their women teachers. In this way, male students are learning how to perform a brand of masculinity that watches and controls women's bodies and the expression of their sexuality. But the presence of the male gaze is systemic as well as individual. In the discussion section, I explore how the male gaze functions in tandem with normalizing narratives of teacher control and classroom management, examine how the presence of the male gaze complicates our desire for more progressive pedagogies, and discuss how the male gaze creates both silence and scripts that ultimately alter the kinds of relationships that women teachers can cultivate with their students.

Chapter Five: Teaching as Invasion: Emotions, Boundaries and Entanglements. In this chapter I theorize and interpret three memories using post-humanist perspectives (Barad, 2007; Davies et al., 2013) and drawing on Ahmed's (2007) theory of the politics and sociality of emotions. In these three memories, our encounters with students, non-human objects, discourses, and spatial landscapes build entanglements and construct teaching as the construction, invasion, and re-fortification of borders and boundaries. In particular, we build, respond to, and challenge boundaries within our teacher-student relationships, while we grapple with our feelings and expression of emotions (or not) in these moments. With and through our collective analysis of these

moments, I look closely at how nonhuman objects in the memories facilitate or inhibit an invasion of boundaries and how our conceptions of emotions as either individual and autonomous or social, cultural, and political shape the possibilities we see for teachers to enact particular roles, experience emotionality, and build relationships with their students.

Chapter Six: The Study. In this chapter, I assert my commitment to feminist, collaborative, participatory, and post-qualitative research—that is, research that attempts to move beyond a traditional, individualist, and humanist paradigm—as I describe the processes and practices of the study. This chapter appears later here than in more traditional qualitative dissertations in order to highlight the problem of an over-reliance on qualitative methods, which are becoming increasingly positivist through mechanisms of coding, measuring, triangulation, and member-checking. Elizabeth St. Pierre (2015) argues that, in post-qualitative research, our methods come at the end—too late to help us—and so I have symbolically placed this chapter toward the end of this dissertation. Chapter Six outlines the who, what, and how of the study—it includes information about my research questions, the process of collective memory work (Haug, 1999), how I brought the members of my collective together, an outline of the work sessions we engaged in together, and a description of the empirical materials we produced and collected.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion. Finally, I end this dissertation with a conclusion that elaborates on lessons learned from the study and draws implications for teachers, teacher educators, and education researchers related to the insights our collective gained about teaching, learning, the reproduction of normalizing narratives in classrooms, and

how our bodies matter in school. Included in these implications is an exploration of how this study, as an attempt at post-qualitative inquiry, contributes to research in education that has taken up collective memory work/collective biography as methodology. Here I consider the possibility of CMW as a pedagogical tool for pre-service and practicing teachers to learn more about themselves and their practice and to *do* critical literacy. The remainder of the conclusion serves as a reflection and remembrance of the study, including its limitations and possibilities, and a consideration of the future directions I/we might take this work.

Conclusion

My greatest hope for this research dwells in the lives, bodies, and classrooms of the eight women English teachers who participated in this process with me, co-authored the memories and our group analysis, and built a collective with me whose aim was to confront the problem of the disembodied teacher. I was confident going into this project that together we would find interesting things about bodies to explore based on our written and oral memories, and I assumed, from my own understanding of teacher education and the histories and politics of women teachers, that our memories would speak both to and against narratives of teaching and learning, race, class, gender, sexuality, and (dis)ability, among others. Part of the work of women teachers is to work through and against the history of the woman teacher. To do this, I believe, we need to draw on intersectional feminist politics, anti-racist activism, post-structuralist and postcolonial theories, deterritorializing research methodologies, critical whiteness studies, queer theory, and critical disability studies. It requires us to turn a critical eye the stories we tell about our own lived experiences and the normalizing narratives that grab ahold of

us over and over again as we work to make ourselves in the world. Until our collective

worked together to construct a writing prompt and then write our memories into textual

existence, I could not know which of those movements, discourses, approaches, and

theories would serve us, or me, best. But I believed that, regardless of what theoretical

directions we would go, the aims of the process, as Haug et al. (1987) write, would

present each of us with the "opportunity to learn," to "move closer to some form of

liberation," to "escape individual isolation," to "live a life of resistance," and to "change

the world lovingly" (p. 282-283). I hope that readers of this dissertation see those

outcomes in these pages as well.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

In this chapter I explore scholarship on collective memory work (CMW), and its variants, and feminist post-structuralist perspectives on theories of embodiment. Important to my work are the ways in which these two—CMW and embodiment—can intersect and interact in generative ways. Kathleen Gallagher (2015), in her forward to *Methodologies of Embodiment: Inscribing Bodies in Qualitative Research*, asserts that most qualitative work "continue[s] to treat bodies (subjects/participants) and knowledge (representation) as separate entities" (p. xiv). However, she continues, "embodied experiences, in the hands of careful methodologists, are the very ground from which knowledge can be discovered" (p. xiv). While our bodies are not reducible to objects of study wherein "precise methods can discover specific meanings," they are living, breathing, and material and they inhabit and produce social, historical, and political discourses (p. xiv). I don't study bodies in order to produce evidence or findings, but I listen to, explore, live in my bodies in my research in order to open up what counts as knowledge and to find new ways of knowing and being in the world.

This review of literature begins with my evaluation of CMW scholarship. The research studies utilizing collective memory work and conceptions of memory that I review here stretch across many disciplines and have been applied methodologically in very different ways. In order to consider the possibilities, limitations, and tensions of this methodology, I examine memory work research out of many fields including sociology, psychology, environmental studies, gender and women's studies, and political science, as well as the ways CMW has been used in educational research. Next, because the topic and central questions of my study relate to the use of memories as empirical materials to

understand teachers' bodies, I explore, through pertinent literature, several ways that the body has been theorized, especially attuning to work that has conceptualized the body in relationship to teaching and learning, pedagogy, and literacies. For this section of the chapter, I limit my review to sociocultural, feminist, post-structuralist scholars whom I feel best help me conceptualize the body in ways that align with the theoretical framework for CMW and are therefore useful during the CMW process. By reviewing both the literature on CMW and theories of embodiment I aim to answer the question: Taken up together, what do theories of embodiment and the methodology of CMW offer to researchers, teacher educators, and teachers, and our understanding of teaching, learning, and our bodies?

Collective Memory Work

This section of the chapter is a review of collective memory work (CMW) research (Haug et al., 1987, 1999, 2008) and its variations, including memory-work (Crawford et al., 1992) and collective biography (Davies & Gannon, 2006). This exploration includes *Origins*, in which I describe the historical and theoretical underpinnings of the methodology and take a close look at its practices and processes, primarily through the work of Frigga Haug and her collective in West Germany. Next, in *Evolutions* I trace the movements and changes in the methodology through the influential work of Crawford et al. (1992), and Davies & Gannon (2006), as well as through the inquiry of dozens of scholars from various fields who have experimented with, reimagined, and modified CMW methodology for their own research purposes. Drawing on the published use of CMW (and its variations) in social science research over the last

twenty-five years, I will explore both the *Affordances and Challenges* of the methodology. Practitioners of CMW have catalogued these extensively.

Origins

"And now here we are proposing to throw another [methodology] book into the mounting pile, as if it weren't large enough already, as if it didn't already obscure our view of so many different questions" (Haug et al., 1987, p. 29).

It is 1972, and in the Institute of Critical Theory in West Berlin the office of the independent academic journal *Das Argument* is abuzz with the movement and voices of men: anti-nuclear and anti-militarization protestors, left wing social democrats, students, communists, splinter groups, and Marxist socialists. The political, intellectual, and philosophical enthusiasm of the time was the impetus for a return to Marx and a heyday of activism, particularly among students.

But this year, the office of *Das Argument* will expand to include, for the first time since its founding in 1959, a female co-editor, Frigga Haug. Prior to Haug's involvement with the Institute, only about ten percent of the journal's contributors were women, and issues related to women, including the role of feminism within socialism and Marxist thought, had only been tangentially addressed in the journal. Haug's work as co-editor included establishing an autonomous women's editorial board that challenged the male-dominated history of the Institute and slowly began to bring about change. Haug, along with the Socialist Women's Association, successfully gained control over the content of two of the six annual issues of *Das Argument*, took charge of one topic area of the review section on each issue, published conference reports, and worked to include more feminist pieces in those issues not specifically concerned with questions relating to women. The aim of the all-female editorial group, Haug et al. (1987) write, was to "inscribe feminism

into the Marxist framework" (p. 23). This became a dual task of reconstructing "scientific" work along feminist lines *and* remodeling Marxism to open up space within it for the issues of women (p. 23). Haug and her female comrades broke with most feminists who were generally uninterested in writing from a socialist perspective and rarely engaged with socialist positions. By the early 1980s, the all-woman editorial board of *Das Argument* had also become an entity that worked collaboratively to develop a research methodology in which the lived experiences of women were treated as legitimate forms of knowledge. They called this methodology collective memory work (CMW).

Haug, et al. (1987) write, "our first attempts at developing a method for collective memory work are outlined in our first volume, *Frauenformen*. Here, women write stories based on their own lives, stories of events in which they have learned to behave in 'feminine' ways. The whole project arose out of our fundamental unease with all the theories of socialization previously developed within psychology and sociology" (p. 24). On one hand, girls were said to be accounted for by those theories—and yet they barely made an appearance. On the other hand, when girls did appear in the theories, they surfaced only as objects of various institutions—the family, the school, and so on—which acted upon them and forced them into particular roles. In opposition to the flat and passive representation of girls within these theories, Haug et al. developed CMW as a new method to study female socialization, based on theories of social constructivism and drawing on the lived experiences of women themselves. The collective hoped to use this methodology to challenge the separation between scientific knowledge and everyday

experience, and complicate the oppositional categories of victimhood and agency and the Cartesian duality of mind and body in order to better understand female subjectivity.

In the process of developing the methodology, Haug et al. (1987) learned to conceptualize themselves as active agents, not simply stamped with the imprint of social relations but also implicit in and unconsciously participating in their own social formation. It was a complex and sometimes contradictory conceptualization of socialization. Ultimately, Haug et al. were interested in the process whereby women are constituted as a part of society. This includes the study of women's capacity (or incapacity) for action and for happiness, and the study of society's structures and how they might get a grip on them. The collective was "opposed to tolerating conditions that produce suffering," so their work was focused on social transformation and change; they viewed CMW as an active intervention that might lead to social transformation (p. 33). The writing and analysis of memories could be an endless process—so their aim was to make the process itself the purpose of the research. There is no end-point to CMW, no ultimate place the collective is attempting to reach—only a process to follow toward liberation and toward a greater understanding of self, society, and socialization.

In *Female Sexualization* (1987), their second volume of work, Haug et al. explored socialization in relation to female sexuality, including the ways in which the female body is made as a socio-biological entity, how women live in bodily terms, and the relationship between women's bodies and other human beings and the world (p. 30). Based on these collective goals, Haug et al. decided to write what they call "stories of the body" (p. 30). Their collaboration on projects around *Das Argument* gave their group work a common theoretical foundation—Marxism, and critical approaches to

psychology, culture, and ideology. Their work with these theories also became the work of reconstructing these theories, as approaching them through a feminist lens inevitably changed them. Foucauldian theory was important to their work because it allowed them to challenge dominant theories of sexuality based in psychology and sociology (Freud, Jung, etc.). Foucault's work on discourse led Haug et al. to shift the focus of the object of their research from sexuality to the discourse that constitutes sexuality—the system of language, objects and practices that construct what we come to think of as 'sexuality.' In other words, a Foucauldian approach hypothesizes that sexuality exists only within discourse and through its mediations; it has no stability, but changes in accordance with social conditions (p. 191). So, our discourse about sexuality, including the memories and stories we tell about our bodies and their relations to others bodies and the world, construct it as an object. Therefore, in order to understand female sexuality, one must explore and interrogate the discourse of female sexuality. Haug et al. set out to conduct this discourse analysis on their own memories and stories of their female bodies. The following section is an account of this process based on a methodology the collective described in *Female Sexualization* (1987) and Haug's more detailed rendering of CMW in her "Memory-work Research Guide" (1999).

Evolutions

Memory-work.

"There was a real revelation for some of us in confronting a feminist theory that was more than a critical analysis of existing society, one that incorporates its own method for empirical research" (Crawford et al., 1992, p. 4).

In the mid-1980s, Frigga Haug travelled to Macquarie University in Australia to take a position as a visiting scholar. There, three participants of her memory-work workshops were members of a collective of women psychologists and academics at the

University. These five women had come together around their similar interests in critical and feminist psychology and their shared experiences of isolation and marginalization as women in academia. While they brought varying research interests to the group, they shared a desire to participate in methodologies that took on explicit feminist political orientations, were collective in nature, disrupted and collapsed subjects/objects and theory/method, and questioned dominant notions of legitimate knowledge production (Crawford, Kippax, Onyx, Gault, & Benton, 1992). In their search to be radically empirical, and inspired by Haug's work and teaching, they decided to take up memory-work—putting the method before the research question. Eventually, they settled on studying gender and emotions.

Also inspired by constructivist theories of subjectivity, Crawford et al. (1992) believed that the memory-work methodology would likewise reveal and complicate the processes of the construction of emotion. In their collective text, *Emotion and Gender*, Crawford et al. (1992) take time to demarcate the modifications and elaborations they made to Haug et al.'s (1987) CMW methodology, as well as the differences between memory-work and other qualitative research methods like case study. First, Crawford, et al. frame memory-work under the theoretical lens of hermeneutics: "Whereas empiricism is essentially atheoretical and claims that knowledge is self evident," they write, "a hermeneutic approach is theory-laden and acknowledges that knowledge depends upon interaction" (p. 41). Hermeneutics does not observe the positivist imperative of the separation of the subject from the object of knowledge, and this collapsing of the 'knower' and the 'known' sets aside a space where the experiential can be placed in relation to the theoretical, in a reciprocal and mutually critical relationship. The

hermeneutic lens allows Crawford et al. to conceive of memory-work as a radical disruption to empirical research and the Cartesian mind/body dualism.

While Haug (1999) has since commented on memory-work led by a group facilitator in her "Research Guide," at the time Crawford, et al. (1992) were working on memory-work methodology, there was no discussion of memory-work led by a facilitator. In addition to Crawford et al.'s own collective work, they led workshops for other groups who wanted to take up memory-work, and even took turns as single facilitators of other groups. Crawford et al. admit that a facilitated group is not the preferred option for memory-work, but that a skilled facilitator might help a group work through a topic that is particularly difficult, or with a group that is struggling to cultivate cohesion. In these groups, however, Crawford et al. were always aware of the problems created by their presence; "the facilitator became the leader and the sense of collectivity in the group was diminished" (1992, p. 44). Contrary to Haug's suggestion that CMW groups be limited to 12, Crawford et al. insist that four, five, or six persons make an ideal group size for the work. Crawford et al. also prefer to set up groups based on "some homogenous criterion" like age, or sex (p. 44). But unlike Haug (1999), Crawford et al. were not only open to male participants in their groups, but also helped to establish single-sex groups of men to conduct memory-work research together.

The process of writing and analyzing memories that Crawford et al. (1992) took up closely follows the process of CMW that Haug et al. (1987) describe in *Female Sexualization*. Crawford et al. make one change to the rules of memory writing, and that is in response to each 'trigger,' or prompt, the writer should write one of his or her *earliest* memories. Crawford et al. adopted this tenet because they were interested in

capturing the processes involved in the construction of emotions, something thought to occur early rather than late in life. In terms of analysis, Crawford et al. adhered to Haug et al.'s guidelines for analysis. Haug's (1999) attention to language and discourse in her "Research Guide" was an elaboration of the earlier analysis process of her collective. Thus, Crawford et al.'s guidelines include the examination of clichés, generalizations, contradiction, cultural imperatives, and metaphors but fall short of including the study of verb usage or grammatical analysis at the word/syntactical level as in discourse analysis. Finally, the last step in memory-work, the rewriting of memories, proved difficult and unproductive for Crawford et al.'s collective. They attribute this challenge to the source of their memories being from their early childhoods. So, rather than take the time to rewrite and share revisions, the group instead worked on continued theorizing of their memories, development of new prompts and more memory writing, and the collective analysis of transcriptions of their group discussions (p. 51).

Haug's (2008) response to Crawford et al.'s work was mixed. On one hand, Haug was thrilled with the group's enthusiasm for the methodology and impressed by their research using memory work to examine anti-AIDS campaigns. On the other hand, there was something about the documented work in *Emotion and Gender* that troubled Haug. She "found that this group of authors were concerned with teasing out individual memories in order to interpret them and give them a meaningful and coherent conclusion" (p. 537). In other words, there was too much "figuring out what happened" in their work, and Haug felt that it strayed from her conception of what memory work should be; that a search for truth, even versions or approximations of it, is a hindrance to the work. That said, Haug continued to work with Crawford et al.'s collective,

particularly Sue Kippax, who, as Haug writes, had been "seized" by the methodology. Together they developed the methodology, despite their interpretive differences.

In the discipline of psychology the mainstream definition of 'research' would exclude the memory-work inquiry that Crawford et al. (1992) employ in *Emotion and Gender*. Just as Haug et al. (1987) aimed to "inscribe feminism into the Marxist framework," Crawford et al. worked to enrich feminism within psychology, where traditional psychology is recognized as individualistic, biological, positivist, and empiricist in orientation. Crawford et al. believe that memory-work can offer a new paradigm for the study of psychology that will open up space for theories and methods aimed at the very question of subjectivity—who and how we are. These theories include constructivism with a strong sense of agency, and an explicit feminist framework. In this way, the academic discipline of psychology does not have to be disregarded; memory-work makes Crawford et al.'s work both/not/and—within, not, and beyond the discipline of psychology all at once.

Collective biography.

"We are interested, in our research, to understand the processes of selving, rather than to discover particular details about individual selves" (Davies et al., 2006, p. 7).

Also present at Haug's CMW workshops in Australia in the late 1980s was Bronwyn Davies, an educator and scholar whose work centers on gender studies and post-structuralism. Davies' collective is international and interdisciplinary, but all members are interested in developing post-structuralist research in the social sciences. Inspired by Haug, the group gathered biannually for four years to conduct weeklong memory work retreats using a variation on Haug's methodology they called "collective biography." Those years of research—with researchers as subjects and subjects as

researchers of their own lived experience—have been gathered together into the book *Doing Collective Biography* (Davies & Gannon eds., 2006) with the aim to lay out for a wide readership the collective's manner of work and the conceptual/analytical work around the particular topics and themes that they interrogated in their workshops together (p. ix).

As post-structuralists, Davies et al. (2001) seek methodologies that engage with human participants but resist the positivist paradigm. In autoethnography (Ellis, 1994), the gap between memories and the interpretive analytic work of research is narrowed. Davies & Gannon see collective biography as a strategy that shares a similar agenda—to capture the "richness, subtlety, and complexity of the researcher's own embodied thinking and being in the world" through an analysis of memory and language (p. 3). Since memories are always already part of qualitative research, collective biography seeks to make remembered lived experience the central focus of the method. Collective biography does not position memory as 'the truth,' but rather uses the technologies of writing, telling, listening, and analyzing our own and others' memories to produce truths in relation to what cannot actually be recovered—the moment as it was lived (p. 3). Further, these are not totalizing truths but particular, local, and situated truths. They are truths that help us to understand how we are socially constructed and discursively constituted through the moments we remember and the ways we retell those memories. This methodology brings theory into collision with everyday lived experience. It is the unreliability of memory that enables this close discursive work (p. 3).

Davies & Gannon's (2006) work is not rooted in the tension between feminism and Marxism (Haug et al., 1987) or feminism and psychology (Crawford et al., 1992).

Instead, their framework for the method of collective biography is explicitly feminist poststructuralist. It is their hope that by making the ordinary objects and subjects of daily life—our memories—worthy of close inspection, we can question the very discourses and constructs that hold their apparent certainty into place. Collective biography texts, Davies & Gannon write, "can make visible, palpable, hearable, the constitutive effects of dominant discourses," and those effects, while real, are not taken to be inevitable (2006, p. 5). By examining the ways discourses work on and through us, we open up both ourselves and the discourse to the possibility for change.

Sound much like Haug et al. (1987) and Crawford et al.'s (1992) work thus far? It is. Davies & Gannon and their collective chose to write explicitly about their processes in the telling, writing, and analysis of memories, writing nearly as much about the methodology as they did responding to their research questions. The first, and most obvious difference in their work is its name: "collective biography." Susan Gannon, Davies' co-editor, addressed this name change in 2001. Gannon writes that the change in terminology is controversial because the word "biography" in its everyday sense reflects a coherent "life story" and implies a humanist self whose "life unfolds in a more or less rational way," flying in the face of social constructivist theories of identity (2001, p. 788). But Gannon actually prefers the term because it clearly describes the method of collaborative work on personal stories, and the oxymoronic juxtaposition of the individual-ness of biography and the collectivity of the work serves to "highlight the tension between self and individual that is at the crux of the method and is a source of its dilemmas" (p. 788). Others have since chosen to use the terminology of "collective

biography" in order to align themselves with Davies & Gannon's (2006) work, particularly their relationship to post-structuralist thought (more on this to come).

Another difference between Davies and her collective's work and Haug and her colleagues' is their nuanced responses to the potential "therapeutic outcomes" of the methodology. Haug et al. (1987) wrote that their central aim was political, but dedicated much response to the work as an experience of therapy for women who were seeking a greater understanding of their emotional responses to their past experiences. Davies et al. take care to insist that their work is not "doing therapy"—that it is transgressive, and potentially transformative, but it is research. Any focus on therapy, they write, reaffirms the concept of the individual, which the process ultimately attempts to deconstruct. Further discussion of the role of therapy in CMW, including my attempt to complicate and question the notion of "therapy" can be found in the tensions/limitations section of this chapter.

Next, Davies & Gannon (2006) differentiate collective biography from Haug et al.'s (1987) CMW by asserting their commitment to post-structuralism. But just how far from post-structuralism was Haug's version of the methodology? Though Foucault and the post-structuralist discursive turn clearly influenced Haug and her colleagues (they use Foucault explicitly in their book, *Female Sexualization*), ultimately, because they were feminists and Marxists in the late 1980s, Davies & Gannon believe that they were not Foucauldian scholars. Haug et al.'s work was also infused with post-structuralist skepticisms of 'reality' and the scientific method as a means to uncovering 'truth.' Additionally, Haug's later (1999) attention to discourse as it constitutes 'reality' through our lived experience in her "Memory-work Research Guide," and her return to Foucault

to assert a theory of language and ideology, positions her as a post-structural theorist. Nevertheless, Davies & Gannon use the term collective biography to signal their theoretical shift away from feminist Marxism and toward post-structuralism. Finally, Davies & Gannon think differently about the way collective biography as method interacts with theory. While Haug et al.'s process sought mainly to generate theory from the study of memories, Davies and her collective begin, proceed, and end with an explicit focus on theory (as they understand it through the lens of lived experience, with bodies and memories as sites of theoretical knowing). Davies et al. acknowledge that our bodies are always in theory and that theory-making is the work of the body. Collective biography gives them the space to examine that work by enabling a process of collectively unraveling the "discursive nets within which our bodies and our ways of understanding lived experience are constituted" (Davies & Gannon, 2006, p. 14).

So, Davies & Gannon (2006) take up collective biography methodology with and beyond Haug et al.'s (1987) original conception of CMW and Crawford et al.'s (1992) modifications to the memory-work process. Their collective biography proceeds in intensive workshop formats, usually lasting about a week, where the process of telling, writing, and analyzing memories is completed. There is advanced reading of the method of collective biography and theoretical work on the topic to be explored before the start of the workshop. The writing prompt(s) are also determined ahead of the first meeting so that participants can begin to reflect on their memories ahead of time. Davies and her collective utilize a step they call "memory-telling" where each member of the group has the opportunity to orally tell memories and stories while the others listen, ask questions, and respond with their own memories in a "brainstorming and bodystorming" session

(Davies & Gannon, 2006, p. 10). The writing and analysis process to follow closely

mirrors Haug et al.'s (1987, 1999) and Crawford et al.'s (1992) processes. Afterward,

either one member of the group takes on the role of author and writes a paper based on

the workshop, or the group writes a collective paper (though this collaborative writing

can be a fraught and chaotic process, Davies & Gannon admit).

Other variations and possibilities. While Haug et al. (1987, 1999), Crawford et

al. (1992), and Davies & Gannon (2006) are positioned as the mothers of this

methodological process of collective memory writing and analysis, dozens of scholars

from a diverse set of fields have taken up some variant of memory work to explore their

own research questions. They use variations of the methodology in university classrooms,

to train teachers and counselors, to explore masculinity with all-male groups, as a way of

interrogating racialized experiences and whiteness, as a component of participatory

action research (PAR), to explore researcher positionality and reflexivity, with

adolescents, in one-day workshops and in long-term collectives like those already

described. What follows is a brief catalogue of some of the imaginations, modifications,

and new possibilities presented in the research.

Deleuze and Guattari. First, building off of Davies et al.'s post-structuralist work

is the influence of theoretical concepts explored by Deleuze and Guattari in an approach

to CMW (or its variations). Davies and Gannon (2006) begin this theorization in *Doing*

Collective Biography and other scholars have followed suit. One way collective

biography has been framed theoretically with Deleuze and Guattari is by being

characterized as "rhizomatic" research. As post-structuralists, Davies et al. see their

work, theory, and construction of texts as Deleuzian rhizomes—ever open, creating new

linkages, moving and realigning, shaking things up (p. 5-6). The concept of rhizomatic

research is a reaction to linearity and dominant binary notions of progress and the

construction of knowledge. Rhizomes have no beginning or end—they are perpetually in

the middle—likewise, collective memory work (or its variations) has the potential to be

ongoing, with multiple entry points, a lack of hierarchical structure, and a breakdown of

binary categories, particularly the Cartesian duality of mind/body.

Gannon, Walsh, Byers, and Rajiva (2012) continue to work with Deleuze and

Guattari's theories in framing their approach to collective biography as a

"deterritorializing" methodology (p. 181). They cite Patti Lather, who identified

collective memory work as a "productive emergent methodology for…allowing groups of

people to analyze how their own modes of thinking and being in the world have been

colonized by dominant patterns of thought" (Lather, 1991, p. 95, as cited in Gannon et

al., 2012). "Deterritorializing" of the self as a researcher is defined by a nomadic subject,

perpetually engaged in reflexivity, dynamic, embodied, where binaries dissolve, where

taken-for-granted connections rupture (Gannon et al., 2012, p. 181). Gannon et al. (2012)

see collective biography as a way to deterritorialize the self by disrupting the "I-ness" of

a story, so that what emerges is what Deleuze and Guattari call "interbeing" (p. 183).

This disruption comes in the form of what Gannon et al. call "interventions"—after

completing the memory-writing and analysis steps of the collective biography process,

they experiment and "deterritorialize" the written texts of memories by constructing non-

print responses, usually in the form of Image Theatre or photography (p. 182). While

third person narration and the collective analysis process already destabilize the "I-ness"

of the memories, the collective works to further disrupt the "I" through their work with

bodies, movement, and visual images. These multiple genres of text and representation moved Gannon et al.'s group to new interpretive spaces that felt more connected, less linear, and less hierarchical in nature. The methodological evolution of response beyond writing as the "final" step in CMW is one area where scholars are experimenting and where more experimentation needs to be done. Beals et al. (2013) write, in theorizing CMW with Deleuze and Guattari's (1988) "lines of flight," that in deconstructing dualisms with creativity and play, new possibilities emerged. They took up a Deluzean notion of "becoming"—a fluid and flexible performance that continuously develops, grows, and emerges (p. 421). Deleuze and Guattari will continue to be important theoretical figures in the evolution of collective memory work, as they are in many other post-structuralist approaches to qualitative research design as well.

Whiteness. A second possibility evolving in the methodology is its use to interrogate other subject positionalities besides gender/sexuality, in particular, race. One example is a project involving memory work as a way to work toward a "doubled" research practice—working both with and against dominant narratives (in this case, racialized categories) in order to destabilize those categories theoretically and politically. Berg et al. (2008) focused their memory-race-work on the unmarked category of "whiteness" after their failed attempt to research the lives of "ethnic minority women" in Norway. They quickly realized that they did not have a clear conception of what it meant to be an ethnic minority person, nor had they interrogated their own racialized identities as white Norwegian women. So, they used memory work as a way to explore their racialized selves—their memories became the data they analyzed to better understand their positionality as researchers. Berg et al (2008) write:

We wanted to create openness and locate our knowledge production through

articulation of whiteness as racialized experiences and as categorization.

Experience is never authentic in the sense that it would be innocent, clear-cut, or

straightforward. Experience is always involved in connections that may be

embarrassing, sudden, and complex. The aim of focusing on experience is to be

able to connect and engage in collective action of many kinds. It is about

(im)possible encounters and connections, about possibilities of making a

difference in terms of better knowledges and better politics (p. 218).

Since their task was to write about whiteness, and confront it directly in order to expose

its "naturalness" in Norwegian culture, Berg et al. worked with the writing prompt, "a

point where I experienced myself as white" (p. 219). However, they also admit that

investigating an identity marker that is generally invisible makes for a slow start to the

process—it is difficult for some members to construct a memory of "realizing" their own

whiteness because some of them had never been confronted with their own racialized

identities. They also struggled with the essentializing use of identity markers and the

ways that those markers restabilized, rather than disrupted, categories of race. Finally,

Berg et al.'s (2008) work establishes CMW as a methodology for exploring researcher

positionality and reflexivity. It is possible that groups of researchers could form

collectives around their own work in the field in order to produce memories about

research and start to untangle the subject position of the researcher when conducting

more traditional qualitative research, such as ethnographies or case studies.

Similarly, Mulvey et al. (2000) struggled with issues of race in their collective

work to explore how they had experienced "silencing" as young girls, and how it had

occurred. The group consisted of all-white New Zealander women who attended the same all-girls school in the 1960s. Through their stories of silence, the women often analyzed the theme of relative privilege, including social class and ability tracking in school. However, their whiteness as a source of privilege was largely ignored. When Hamerton, the group's facilitator, attempted to discuss race discourse as it appeared (or did not appear) in the memories, she was met with resistance from the group and was often overruled. Neoliberal and humanist discourses took center stage in regards to the group's discussion of race. Hamerton suggests that if the group facilitator, or any group member, wants to talk about race, then the group should begin by talking about race. Using other questions or prompts to "get at" the socialization of race and whiteness did not prove fruitful for her collective (Mulvey et al., 2000). Whiteness, while a viable topic to be explored through the memory work process, presents a different set of challenges, tensions, and possibilities that CMW researchers must theorize, address explicitly, and work to collectively understand. Just as much work on whiteness serves to reaffirm and reconstitute white supremacy, there is danger in memory-race-work around whiteness, but also an opportunity to crack open subjectivities and constructions of white racialization, if the collective is willing to confront it—and themselves—critically.

Men and masculinity. A third possibility for memory work in the evolution of the methodology is its use with all-male collectives, especially in the exploration of masculinity. Johnson, Richmond, and Kivel (2008) used collective memory with focus groups of men to explore how leisure consumption of media influenced their intersecting social identities of masculinity and race. Johnson et al. were imaginative in their use of the methodology, as Haug et al. (1987) encouraged. They used it pedagogically in

classrooms and took up topics and subjectivities that had not been explored before through CMW. Unfortunately, there is a real dearth of methodological theorizing in their work. Johnson et al. (2008) do not address how memory work differs when used with men—who experience their subjectivity and socialization differently than women, nor do they explore the subject position of "men" and how that gender category is essentialized and constituted through discourse. They also do not employ a close analysis of language as a part of their collective analysis process, focusing instead on comparing broad themes and individual experiences. Further, their pedagogical process was not delineated—and because it was a course assignment, the memory-work groups did not build collectives dedicated to investigating common questions together. Students who participated in the focus groups were essentially doing the work for a grade and class requirement (not required, but one of several choices). After the focus groups, Johnson and his colleagues did further analysis work of their students' memories in order to produce the research report, which fundamentally shifts both the purpose and process of the collective methodology. Further work with CMW and men will require a more rigorous attention to how changing the methodology alters its practice, more theorizing about the category of "men" and "masculinity," and the experience of using CMW as classroom pedagogy.

Classroom pedagogy. Fortunately, many other scholars have experimented with CMW as classroom pedagogy and have been more forthcoming about how this use of the methodology alters the research. Purohit and Walsh (2013), for instance, were interested in studying the school discourses around gender and science/math in order to better understand how the discourse constructs both the subjects and gender identities in ways that exclude girls. They used collective memory work—which they also called disruptive

fiction writing—as a "curricular interruption" that called the very discourses of math and science education into question (p. 172). They explored, with middle school students, the way school itself—curriculum, pedagogy, systems and structures, subject matter, and knowledge—is constructed as gendered. Purohit and Walsh (2013) believe that CMW translates well from research methodology to classroom pedagogy. With middle school students, CMW was integrated into writer's workshop activities and served as an extension of the writing process. This is not to say that the students' analysis of their stories was unproblematic. By asking students to examine the male/female binary in their writing, the teacher was essentially reaffirming this binary discourse. Further, traditional, liberal humanist discourses often found their way into the students' discussions, like the "opportunity" discourse of "girls can do anything!" (p. 180). Discourse analysis can provide us with a way out of the trap of humanism by allowing us to deconstruct the 'opportunity' discourse and attempt to disrupt it, but the middle school students in this particular study did not make that discursive move.

Palmer's (2009) study, also centered in math education, sought to interrogate what it means to construct oneself (or not) as a "maths-person." Palmer used memory work as a pedagogy and methodology in a 10-week course on teaching mathematics for early childhood education teacher candidates. The underlying theoretical frame of the course was toward deconstructing binaries-- theory/practice, mind/body, science/art, mathematics/aesthetics that have dominated Western, individualist thinking—and working toward a both/and framework for conceptualizing mathematics education. Palmer writes that in this work, "narratives about mathematics were collected as teaching material and data for my research throughout the entire course period, to be used as a tool

in collaboratively deconstructing students' attitudes and mathematical subjectivities (p. 394). Because of this large-scale use of the methodology as pedagogy, Palmer was able to collect 150 written memories over the course of two years. However, Palmer is also careful to note that the work is "inspired" by CMW methodology developed by Haug et al. (1987) and Davies et al. (2006). While students did some analysis work of memories in class, the structure of the collective did not reflect the process as outlined by Haug et al. (1987). In the end, much of the analysis was based on Palmer's individual work with the students' texts.

A third example uses CMW to investigate classroom pedagogy. This project, designed by Lesko, Simmons, Quarshie, and Newton (2008), was conducted with graduate students enrolled in a common doctoral preparation course at Teachers College, Columbia University. The new course was designed to "initiate [students] into the competing theoretical, epistemological, and paradigmatic complexity of contemporary educational research" and students responded to it highly charged emotional ways (p. 1541). When student interviews did not elicit the kind of information that Lesko et al. were hoping to gather for their action research, they decided to try using CMW with small groups of doctoral students, having them write memories of their experiences in the course and then collectively analyze those memories. While the small groups followed Haug et al.'s (1987) process, the formation of the groups and the presence of a faculty facilitator changed the dynamic and sense of trust in the groups. Only one of the three groups worked well enough together to choose to come together to share their re-written memories (an optional step). While most of the analysis was conducted by the faculty facilitators after the CMW groups were done meeting, Lesko et al. did feel that the stories

and memories they gathered through the CMW process indicated a different kind of data than the performed responses from the interviews. The memory stories, Lesko et al. (2008) write, allowed for contradictions, gaps, silences, and ambivalence (p. 1569).

Kaufman, Ewing, Hyle, Montgomery, and Self (2001) write that "classroom communities can be powerful sites for practicing new ways of seeing and being in the world," they position memory work as one possible "new way" (p. 360). Collective memory work as classroom pedagogy offers up a way of learning and utilizing new theoretical approaches, to bring lived experiences into classroom practice as a valued and legitimated form of knowledge production, and to experience and work on new forms of consciousness in a supported, collaborative way. That's not to say that memory work in the classroom won't also be fraught with emotion, pain, discomfort, and conflict. It also lives in conflict with the dominant narratives, expectations, and discourses of "school"— hierarchies of power and authority, hetero-normativity, white supremacy, capitalism, Western individualism, and patriarchy. The classroom is always already a highly charged space, and the methodology, no matter how disruptive, will be shaped by that space. But in the spirit of Haug et al. (1987), we need to take imaginative action in order to transform the oppressive discourses and pedagogies already operating in classrooms. Despite its challenges, we mustn't rule out CMW as classroom pedagogy—just move forward with radical care for the methodology and for our students and ourselves.

Data representation. Finally, a place for possibility, evolution, and tension that many researchers have identified in the CMW process is in the representation of data for others' consumption. Most scholars represent memory stories as they were written in the group process. In *Female Sexualization*, Haug et al. (1987) publish memories in part or

full as they work through their analysis and findings. Crawford et al. (1992) and Davies et al. (2006) do likewise in their texts. Some researchers experiment with writing composite stories together (Beals et al., 2013) or give participants pseudonyms to further disrupt the unitary self (Crawford et al., 1992). The memories are often given positional and spatial priority in the write-up of the research. By experiencing these stories in their entirety, the reader can also "participate" and enter into the experience of the memory work process.

In their work exploring the formation of their own subjectivities in relation to their educational experiences, Connor, Newton, Pennisi, and Quarshie (2004) employed an innovative approach to the elusive last step of memory work—the rewriting of memories. After conducting group analysis as described by Davies et al. (2006) each group member rewrote her memory as a poem. The group met again to look across the poems and it was then that they noticed for the first time that all of their memories took place inside classrooms. This led the group to question what constitutes a classroom and the ways in which the discourse of classrooms is a "complex tangle of many elements, including rules, regulations, spaces, intentions, behaviors, and language(s), all competing—clashing, overlapping, and intersecting within an arena largely shaped by societal expectations, dominant cultural practices, and historical legacies" (p. 506). Whether they were childhood memories, or more recent recollections, the poems represented ruptures (when bodily boundaries were crossed) in the construction of the classroom space. All of the stories represent the regulation of bodies in the classroom and the role that power plays in the regulation of bodies in school spaces. In representing their data, Connor et al. (2004) presented many of the poems in full and they write extensively

about how the poetic form opened up new analytical possibilities for the group in their collective work.

The representation of data follows the elusive last step of memory—the "now what?" question that plagues many groups. This is a key place for imagination and experimentation in the methodology. Part of "deterritorializing" the methodology is to rethink normative ways of representing data. Experimentation with performance, image, music, and dance can help us consider what it means to share data and for others to "read" our work. Gannon et al. (2012) have begun that experimentation with their Image Theatre work, based on performance studies. When sharing such work with larger communities, we must ask ourselves how it is intelligible to others and what we might gain and lose when we move away from textual representations.

Affordances and Challenges

It is my responsibility, as an educator, a researcher, and an activist, to seek to understand—to whatever extent possible—the complex conditions of our mutual construction and socialization. This includes my role in this formation and the work I do that contributes to the creation or withholding of possibility for others and myself. Davies et al. (2006) urge us to ask ourselves how we are implicated in constituting the viability or non-viability of the lives of others. Teachers, researchers, and activists use the power of discourse to speak to the world about what is right, good, true, or legitimate. When we take up dominant or normative discourses, we habituate a belief that we know what's going on; we position ourselves and get positioned as someone with the narrative authority to tell the story, to assert the correctness of our views. Collective memory work and its variations provides us with what Davies et al. call an "ethical reflexivity" that

enables us to get beyond the "reiteration of habituated knowledges" and to "see, feel, touch, and hear our own and others' ongoing vulnerability to those normative discourses and practices" (p. 182). In the classroom, the field site, the community center, and in our own homes, what roles do we play in granting or withholding recognition of ourselves? Of the other? How can CMW serve as a methodology disruptive to those roles? In the following section I will explore some of the affordances and challenges of collective memory work methodologies.

In an attempt to parse out the affordances and challenges of the methodology of CMW (or its variations), I rely on the work of Davies et al. (2006) who take care to outline (in their view) the "methodological advantages" of memory work, as well as the work of the dozens of scholars who, over the last twenty years, have worked on and with the methodology in many ways (p. 11-14). The affordances of CMW help us to situate it methodologically in a qualitative paradigm and also disrupt that very paradigm—to speak back to some of the dilemmas that ethnography, case study, action research, participatory action research, and narrative inquiry, among others, drum up. This disruption is particularly important now, when qualitative research increasingly emphasizes counting, coding, and measuring data, and has been described as neo-positivist and humanist (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013). The tensions, limitations, and challenges of the methodology are likewise valuable to the continuing evolution of the methodology and perhaps its role in the post-qualitative turn in research. If CMW is to be used, and of use, to post-structuralist researchers, then it must be interrogated and problematized. Those of us who care deeply about its purposes and processes need to question it and to theorize its ethical, methodological, and political tensions.

Collectivity. Generally categorized as an affordance of the CMW methodology is the vitality of the collective, which allows the group to bring their knowledge(s) together in their shared writing and analysis. Members of Haug et al.'s (1987) group worked as sociologists, psychologists, teachers, musicologists and natural and medical scientists; they called upon the ideas of each of these fields to theorize fruitfully together. The interdiciplinarity of Haug et al. (1987), Crawford et al. (1992), Davies et al. (2006), Kaufman et al. (2001) and other groups is fruitful as it brings together many disciplines and knowledge systems to the common topic for exploration. Alternately, groups with a more similar disciplinary background (Beals et al., 2013, Jansson et al., 2008, Johnson et al., 2008) might have a greater shared focus on understanding and interrogating their common discourse community. Conducting this research as a collective also reflects theoretically one of the central aims of CMW—the disruption of the construct of the individual as a unitary subject. Haug, et al. contend that the state constructs individuals through its institutions—it is not a group or a family but each individual that becomes a citizen of the state, responsible for his or her own actions (1987, p. 35). This construction of the individual is Western, capitalist, and colonialist. It is as a collective that Haug et al. saw the possibility to disrupt the notion of the individual—"self," "researcher," "author," or "knower"—to begin to chip away at institutions, languages, and dualisms and imagine an alternate way of being. They do admit that we can individually take up agency in order to resist the dominant narratives and structures that shape our identities—but collectively our resistance is stronger. If our goal is to make the personal political and vice versa, we have a better chance of doing so when we work collectively.

But the work it takes to disrupt commonsense individualist narratives and ways of being is not easy, because the tools we have to do such work are tools created by the dominant ideologies themselves. That is why, Haug et al. (1987) write, "the disruptive and destabilizing effect of memory work demands conscious collective counter-strategies that we had not yet adequately developed" (p. 45). The analysis part of CMW, which relies most on the collective efforts of the group, is the place where these counter-strategies can be imagined and experimented with. Haug, et al. cannot even conceive of the analysis process of their methodology in the absence of a collective (a few researchers, e.g. Norquay, 1993, have tried). Because we as humans produce our lives collectively, we should not seek to understand that production of life, and our own subjectification, outside the collective. Paradoxically, Haug et al. also posit that individual experience only becomes possible through and within collective production of lives and memories. Finally, the work of the collective is extremely helpful in the shared labor of the work, and the group can draw on the strengths and interests of each member in order to distribute the necessary tasks of CMW and disperse authority in order to construct a plural voice (1987, p. 56).

Davies et al. (2006), however, want to make visible the struggles and conflicts that can and do get produced within a collective, particularly in the collective writing process and the construction of plural voice. Most groups, Davies et al. write, gloss over this experience as if it is "seamless," but it is important to acknowledge that all collectives are sewn together, and can quickly and easily begin to unravel (p. 14). Davies et al. (2006) cite Foucault who asserts that "writing is more than words on a page, it is oneself emerging on the page" (p. 117). Thus, when others enter our written world and

alter a line, change a word, edit things out and put new things in, we can feel obliterated. It is not just our egos as writers that can get wounded, but our very emergent selves. There are many dominant discourses at play that work to force away the veil of the "we" and expose the "I"s hiding underneath. We cannot escape those discourses—in academia, in research, and in Western, individualist societies and relationships. Sometimes one author must be listed first and rest of the "we" gets lost in the "et al." of citation work. Sometimes the "we" just feels bad. It gets prioritized below or after individual work— which is rewarded and affirmed by the institutions we participate in. This collective tension requires a kind of radical care we must have for one another and ourselves. Gannon (2001) writes about the kind of tension that arises when a feminist methodology—collective biography/memory work—is subsumed into a patriarchal discourse—academic practices that venerate and demand a single author. The author knows that she must selectively 'use' the texts constructed/created by the collective in order to complete her research. This dilemma requires thoughtful and careful consideration.

Disruption of the subject. The "deterritorializing of the self" (Deleuze and Guattari, cited by Gannon et al., 2012) also lives in the tension of collectivity and research. To deterritorialize the self, to be a nomadic, perpetually reflexive, dynamic researcher is to work in and against the dominant notion of single author, of a unitary subject. Collective memory work methodologies afford us the opportunity to disrupt the separation between a subject and an object of research and to be both/and. Since we are our own subjects, we can interrogate ourselves as much as we need to. There is a dissolution here of the "beginning" and the "end" of a research process. Because of this,

CMW can be ruthless; it requires us not to analyze what someone else did or said, but to question ourselves (collectively), and with trust and mutual commitment, "pursue the details that otherwise might be obscured by dominant discourses that become our commonsense ways of seeing the world" (Davies, p. 5, 2006). Acknowledging the affordances here is important. In CMW we do not need to accept versions of events as they are told to us in response to our questioning. The questions are ours and the responses are ours, so we can continue to work until we have explored the same memory from many vantage points, peeling away the layers of discourse, the commonsense and clichéd responses, and honoring and highlighting (rather than trying to resolve) the contradictions.

The dissolution of subject and object of research also creates a more humanizing, ethical, and vulnerable approach to research—though it is not without its challenges as well. There is nothing magic about this dissolution; in fact, the binary can be just as easily reasserted as it is disrupted. We must continually question what it means to participate in collective memory work, what it means to be a subject as we study our collective subjectification, and how power moves through us and through the collective— re-inscribing dominant notions of research even as we try to dismantle them.

Attention to language and power. Davies et al. (2006) also site critical attention to language and power as an advantage of memory-work methodologies, and I agree. The work is strongest (and most difficult) when attention to the ways language operates to construct and constitute us through discourse is highlighted in the analysis process. Without this close look at discourse, memory work becomes more akin to a kind of narrative analysis process—locating themes in and across stories and theorizing about

them. While this process might be interesting, it doesn't explicitly seek to crack open the powerful ideologies produced through the stories or the process of subjectification through language. I read several CMW studies that I believe methodologically fell short because they did not take up discourse analysis in the collective discussion of memories; some of these studies I did not include in this review because, without discourse analysis, they seemed to stray too far from the aims of the methodology. The use of critical discourse analysis in the memory work process rejects the notion that any story can capture some kind of authentic truth about an individual and her story. Instead, normalizing and disruptive discourses actively shape and ultimately constitute the "individual," including the discourse of individuality, and the story is the collection of discourses that are used and use us in the construction of the narratives of our lives. The only ways to expose normalizing discourses and the roles we play to embody and reproduce them is to make overt the constructedness of language and the power that moves through it in the CMW process.

That said, Gillies et al. (2004) also describe the constraints or potential traps of a methodology that focuses exclusively on language. Gillies et al. formed a collective based on their mutual interest in studying and exploring bodies and embodiment in social psychology (they all also had experience taking up poststructuralist perspectives, i.e. Butler and Foucault). Gillies et al. believe that social constructivist accounts of self and identity tend to overlook materiality and embodiment. By centering embodiment in their research, the collective attempted to address some of the tension created when theorists talk (or fail to talk) about the body—when language just isn't adequate. In this work of exploring the body through memory, Gillies et al. encountered some limitations when

using a methodology focused so much on language. First, Gillies et al. write, "the discourses we have to interpret, analyze, and understand our construction of memory are the same as the discourses we used to construct the memory in the first place. So, we often end up reproducing dominant discourses and narratives, even in our attempt to challenge or deconstruct them" (p. 111). In their work, language always fell a little short in their attempts to understand the body. They ask, for instance, how one might use language to describe pain. We can use language to write and talk about pain, but not to actually describe or encapsulate how pain feels in our bodies, and distinguishing the two is important. Gillies et al. conclude that describing and retelling embodied experiences through language is a place to *begin* reconnecting ourselves to our bodies and calling into question the Cartesian mind/body split. But perhaps art, music, dance, and other forms of expression can also capture memories and extend the work that we can do with language and writing. In CMW, the analysis of language and response in written text were never fully adequate for the group to explore the body.

Others also describe, as a tension in collective memory work, the risk of reproducing the very discourses and narratives we work to disrupt. Norquay (1999) worked with white female teachers on memories of rebellion and gender. But ultimately, the women were reluctant to interrogate their own stories. Perhaps part of their reluctance emerged from the adaptations that Norquay made to the methodology. She orally recorded members' memories and then the collective met to analyze the transcript of each individual interview. Ultimately, the teachers had very little responsibility in the shaping of the collective, its goals, prompts, or processes. Norquay writes that the group sessions, rather than a place of critique and challenge, mostly served to reaffirm the teachers'

beliefs about themselves and their identities. If they considered themselves "progressive" educators, then that subject position was strengthened through the group discussion of the transcript excerpts (p. 428). The only instances of challenge or disruption came when social class was made explicit. Otherwise, the focus of the discussion was on shared experiences and the women sought to affirm one another's memories, identities, and subject positions. Based on Norquay's (1999) work, it seems evident that there is a strong connection between meaningful discourse analysis and establishing a collective that attempts to deconstruct hierarchies and develop itself in mutually shared ways.

Jansson, Wendt, and Ase (2008) wonder about how we risk stabilizing our subjectivity, rather than deconstructing or disrupting it, when we analyze our experience. "Experiences," they write, cannot be said to exist in any straightforward way because they are "already discursively constituted, in and by language" (p. 228). As our experiences do not exist outside of social and political discourses, studying experience then becomes a question of studying language and discourse. Jansson et al. (2008) do not have a resolution to the tension of studying "experience" and our subjectivity. They write about how a back-and-forth from theory to language takes place throughout the discussion of memories and until participants feel theoretically satisfied or need to go home. The openness of the inductive process, they assert, is important, as the initial theme or theory posited about the memory might need significant revision by the end of the analysis process. Perhaps multiple, even conflicting themes or theories might all be present in the end. But avoiding interpretive closure is easier said than done. The key is to allow the texts to direct the interpretation and recognize when the interpretation is being "hijacked" by commonsense understandings, serving only to reaffirm what we already

know or believe to be "true" (p. 237). So, perhaps it is possible to avoid or reduce the risk of reproducing power orders or reaffirming dominant knowledge(s) or narratives in the process of collective memory work, but it is not always easy to do. "Through displacement and careful attention to methodology," Jansson et al. write, "including an open and inductive process of writing and interpretation, memory work can serve as a disruptive, deconstructionist, feminist research method" (2008, p. 238).

Research vs. Therapy. One particular tension in CMW is the question of its therapeutic aims and intentions. You will remember that this conflict of therapy's role within memory work is one way Davies et al. (2006) separate their work from Haug et al.'s (1987) work, claiming that Haug et al. position a therapeutic aim as a legitimate experience or outcome of the work. Davies et al. distance themselves from this notion, rejecting "therapeutic experiences" as appropriate. Davies et al. are not alone in their questions about the memory work process and "therapy." Kaufman, Ewing, Hyle, Montgomery, and Self (2001) are an interdisciplinary group that uses memory work to interrogate how they have been socialized to think about and relate to the natural world. They wrote memories related to the elements (fire, water, earth, air) and trees and through the subsequent analysis of these memories, they learned that the way they were socialized to interact with nature deemphasized the influence of their mothers, devalued their sensual connections with nature, and devalued the ways in which they investigated nature (p. 360). Kaufman et al. believe that the focus on social meaning sets memory work apart from therapy. But they don't shy away from using the "T" word in relation to their collective work. They assert that memory work *can* be therapeutic because, as you learn more about how you have been socialized you can begin to free yourself and your

consciousness from oppressive forms of socialization. But does the use of the word "therapy" reinforce notions of unitary individuals, a construct that CMW seeks to deconstruct?

Dalzell, Bonsmann, Erskine, Kefalogiani, Keogh, and Maniorou, (2010) did research with a group of graduate students in counseling who met outside the requirements of their program because they shared an interest in narrative/arts-based research and wanted to collaboratively explore the liminal space between counselor and counseling researcher through their lived and embodied experience. Because of the context of this study, it was necessary for Dalzell et al. to directly address the tension between memory work and therapy. They recognize that the work of telling one's story as research practice and the work of therapy are not that far apart. They write, "counseling research trainers can learn from the ways in which the 'narrative turn' has opened up new spaces across the social sciences for researchers interested in 'story as a metaphor for how human beings make sense of their lives and their world' (Speedy, 2008, p. 11 as cited in Dalzell et al, 2010); something which is also at the heart of therapeutic practice" (Dalzell et al., 2010, p. 127). Rather than attempt to distance themselves from therapy or create a separation between methodology and therapeutic experiences, Dalzell et al. confront Davies et al. directly when they write, "although Davies et al. (2006, p. 6) insist that when we take part in collective biography work, 'we are not 'doing therapy,' we are doing research', we recognized that reflexive personal learning took place during our collective research alongside professional learning" (p. 134). The term "therapy" is a loaded one, and has not proven helpful in discussing the experience of participating in collective memory work. Dalzell et al. exchange "therapy"

with "reflexive personal learning" in order to contrast it with "professional learning," and they do not create a hierarchy between the two.

Is it important to delineate therapy from the analytic work on memories in the CMW process? Is it better to rename these "therapeutic experiences" as "reflexive personal learning" in order to legitimate it in the research process? Why are Davies et al. (2006) reticent to accept therapy as a potential part of the collective biography participant's experience? Does therapy work to reinscribe the single, unitary subject—the "I"? The "therapy conflict" is important to interrogate because it helps make transparent some of the larger assumptions or concerns of researchers as they take up a methodology that is unconventional, feminist, and potentially marginalized by the larger qualitative research community.

What is Memory?

Memory, Haug (2008) writes that memory, "should be conceived of as contested" (p. 538). It is simultaneously true and not true, real and imaginary. It matters less what is remembered, and more how we use language and our imagination to remember and to use language (as it uses us) to construct us, to constitute us into existence. Memory is our identity and identification. It is a tool and we are its tool in meaning and sense making.

That said, it is vital to acknowledge the challenges to the methodology based on its reliance on memory, and the critics who have questioned what it means to study memories and how memories are or are not related to "truth." Davies and Gannon (2006) begin their work with the argument that all qualitative research relies on memories—the memories of those we interview or survey about an idea, moment, event, or experience, and our own memories, as researchers, of what we see, hear, experience, transcribe, and

record during interviews or fieldwork. We are always making sense of memories as we collect and analyze our data. Sometimes we attempt to make this sense-making more "scientific" by taking on systems of coding and quantifying or following some carefully laid out steps of a "method" of analysis. We comfort ourselves by utilizing neo-positivist strategies in a qualitative way, and then we "member check" our data (actually generating new data and memories through our member check conversations). All the while, we draw on theoretical concepts that enable us to make sense of what we see and hear. Our participants are engaged in the interpretation and construction of their world—by talking about it or being embodied in it—so too do we as qualitative inquirers interpret and construct meaning to tell the story of our research. Davies et al. (2006) write, "In every step of the process we depend on the partial, flawed, but powerful capacity we have to remember and make sense of what we remember" (p. 1-2). Yet in the end, the goal of most qualitative researchers is to be able to get a hold of some sense of "reality" and to say what it is and how it is. Despite the seeping of positivism into the qualitative paradigm that leads scholars to deny it, memories and remembering play the primary role in how researchers say they know what they know about the world.

In her 2008 piece, Haug addresses the tension around memories by citing Morus Markard (2008), who challenged the value of memory work, arguing that it evaded a central question: "How far apart are memory and truth from each other? Or, to put it differently, how far does that which is remembered distance itself from that which really happened" (Haug, 2008, p. 538)? Haug's response is to reframe the question—because there is no "that which really happened" but more and less powerful narratives about what happened, what counts as truth, and who gets to decide. Haug acknowledges that,

when it goes uninterrograted, memory is usually a tool of the dominant class. Those of us who hold that privilege remember in ways that smooth over our tensions and contradictions, reinforce the "commonsense" values and beliefs of our culture and community, and seek to resolve and fix, not disrupt or unearth. Memory always runs the risk of reflecting normalizing discourses and perspectives, and often does. But it is also always being written anew. In those rewritings, those reinterpretations, there is space for interruption. And when we interrupt the narratives alongside others—those who can help us disrupt even if we don't even have the language to do so—memory suddenly has the potential to be transformed, to transform us.

Similarly, theories of embodiment are helping us to reexamine our normalizing discourses of the body and providing a way for us to interrupt how the body has been constructed, positioned, and disciplined through Western, individualist, and capitalist regimes of power. These theories push us to see beyond the body as a single, static, and unified thing, and to bring the body to bear in fields where it has previously been denigrated, pathologized, or excluded entirely. In the next section of this chapter, I will review several perspectives that embodiment theorists have centered in their work as they have aimed to interrupt and reframe the meaning we make of and from the body in academic scholarship and research.

Embodiment

In the past, the use of theories of embodiment in educational research has been limited to performance arts or physical education-based school programs like theatre, dance, sports, and music. In these contexts, the bodies of students (sometimes literally) take center stage. In physical education, for instance, students' bodies are curricular texts

and serve as both the tools for learning and the products of assessment in the classroom. However, in the last ten years an exploration of bodies has taken on new importance in a growing number of educational fields, including literacy research and research on teacher education. There is an increasing interest in frameworks, methods, and research questions that seek to understand the body as a doer of discourse, a mediator of tools and signs, and itself material flesh and bone that lives in, manipulates, and constructs/is constructed by space in schools, classrooms, and other teaching and learning environments. Some scholars have even ventured to ask questions and collect stories about how bodies experience emotion, live in the world viscerally and corporeally, and make meaning through bodily activity in schools and classrooms. Further, connections between bodies and the identities and discourses that live on, in, and through them, including race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and (dis)ability, are being explored in various contexts of teaching and learning.

"Embodiment" is described as the methodological and ontological field through which we can address familiar topics—like literacy practices, teaching, and learning—through the body (Bresler, 2004). Liora Bresler writes that theories of embodiment can have profound implications on the study of education, including the ways we come to think about how students learn, teachers teach, and how schools are organized, and I agree. But in order to use the field of embodiment and its various theories to frame my own scholarship on literacy education, I set out first to understand why and how bodies matter.

As I explore the scholarship, research, and theory on how bodies teach, learn, and interact in school spaces and how we tell stories about those bodies, I also work toward

articulating my own theory of embodiment. In this paper, I will explore the theories that others have constructed about the body, drawing on scholars in disciplines such as gender and sexuality studies, literary studies, curriculum and instruction, sociology, philosophy, and political science. As I examine these feminist, postmodern, and poststructuralist theories of the body, I consider their place in my ongoing understanding of: 1) the material body and its relationship to space and landscape, 2) the ways that students' and teachers' bodies write and are written by powerful inscriptions, 3) the construction and disruption of the mind/body binary, and 4) the possibilities for tending to the bodies of students and teachers in educational contexts. Finally, I will respond to one particular concern about using theories of embodiment in educational research, and then end the chapter by exploring how collective memory work and theories of embodiment together open up space to for teachers to study their own bodies in generative ways.

The Material Body in Space

"…the body is the original subject that constitutes space; there would be no space without the body" (Merleau-Ponty as cited by Young, 2005, p. 41).

The body matters in its relationship to space and landscape; exploring what the body is and how it exists in space is an important aspect of a theory of embodiment. Liora Bresler (2004) prominently positions space in her definition of embodiment. She writes, "the body is the material object that *occupies space*, embodiment is the methodological field that is experienced as activity and production [italics added]" (p. 7). Iris Young (2005), likewise, draws out this complex relationship between bodies and space when she asserts, "the body brings unity to and unites itself with its surroundings…it sets things in relation to one another and to itself. The body's movement and orientation organizes the surrounding space as a continuous extension of

its own being" (p. 37). Embodiment theorists, including Bresler (2004), Davies (2000), Grosz (1994), Hughes-Decatur (2011) and Young (2005) insist that there is a complex relationship between bodies and space—that our material bodies are constituted and shaped by their surrounding space and landscape, and that the space itself is organized and unified, in fact it exists at all, because of the bodies that inhabit it.

In order to understand the material body's relationship to space, I first explore the body's materiality—the stuff that takes up, shapes, makes, and is made by space. In *Bodies that Matter*, Judith Butler (1993) proposes that, in theorizing the body, we move away from notions of construction and toward matter, "not as a site or surface, but as *a process of materialization that stabilizes over time to produce the effect of a boundary, fixity, and surface we call matter*" (p. xviii, italics in original). Butler then explores the Latin etymology of *materia*, which denotes "the stuff out of which things are made" including wood, metal, flesh, and bone, and the nourishment that sustains new life and growth like mothers' milk, rainwater, soil, and sunlight (p. 7). She writes that to know the significance of something is to "know how and why it matters, where 'to matter' means at once 'to materialize' and 'to mean'" (p. 7). This *materia* has the potential to both "originate and compose" our intelligibility (p. 7). In other words, bodies matter because they are material, but we cannot take materiality as an "irreducible;" there is nothing about the material of our bodies that is easy, fixed, stable, natural, or unmediated (p. 7). Susan Bordo (1993) encourages us to imagine "material" as the "direct grip that culture has on our bodies, through the practices and bodily habits of everyday life" (p. 16). Through routine activity, our bodies learn (what Bourdieu (2000) calls, "habitus" or "bodily knowledge") "what is inner and outer, which gestures are forbidden and which

required, how violable or inviolable are the boundaries of our bodies, how much space around the body may be claimed, and so on" (Bordo, 1993, p. 16). However, there is nothing certain about this cultural grip, or *materia,* and Butler insists that a loss of certainty about materiality is necessary to shift our political thinking. The body must be an unsettled matter. Deconstructing matter, she writes, "does not negate or do away with the usefulness of the term" (1993, p. 5).

Thus, Butler (1993) aims not to either presume or negate materiality, but to problematize the very notion of the body's materiality in order to open up possibilities and new ways for bodies to matter. She then works to complicate an understanding of the materiality of the body through her concept of signification. Butler writes that the body is always "posited or signified as prior" to the sign, and this signification produces, "as an effect of its own procedure, the very body that it also nevertheless claims to discover as that which precedes its own action" (p. 6). Essentially, Butler asserts that: Body or signification, which came first? is an unhelpful question, but it is a paradox that one must live in. The materiality of the body is bound up from signification from the start; signification both follows the body and is always there first to signify the body. Within Butler's theory of performativity, it is in the performance of regulatory norms and through a complex matrix of power relations that the materiality of the body emerges and moves.

Elizabeth Grosz (1994) also theorizes about the materiality of bodies by asserting that a body cannot be "regarded as purely a social, cultural, and signifying effect lacking its own weighty materiality" (p. 21). If we take seriously the construction of subjectivity, she writes, then we must figure out how to explain and problematize the "raw materials"

in the process of subject construction (p. 21). But Grosz also does not want to imply that the body is, in any sense, "raw" or "natural"; what Grosz aims for above all else is a way of moving beyond binaries and dualistic thinking—including the natural/constructed dichotomy that plagues our attempts at understanding the body. Bresler (2004) compliments this view by acknowledging that the body is not natural biological material, instead, it is a play of forces that shifts the emphasis away from being to becoming. Butler names these forces of materiality as "the effect of power, as power's most productive effect" (1993, p. xii). Foucault (1995), likewise, asserts that our bodily materiality is produced by and exists in and through discourse and power, that "materiality is power in its formative or constituting effects" (Butler, p. 9). Understanding the process by which the materiality of the body is produced, as well as what constrains the domain of what is materializable, matters. Equally important is exploring the relationship between this materiality of our bodies and space and landscape.

In her exploration of the ways in which the body is fundamentally linked to representations of spatiality, Grosz (1994) turns to Merleau-Ponty, who asserts that we "grasp the idea of external space only through certain relations we have to our body" (p. 90). Merleau-Ponty (cited by Grosz) continues: "our body is not in space like things; it inhabits or haunts space. It applies itself to space like a hand to an instrument" (p. 90). For Merleau-Ponty, the body is the very condition of our access to and conception of space (Grosz, 1994, p. 91). Similarly, Hilary Hughes-Decatur (2011), in her work on embodiment in education writes that, "it is through the body that the surrounding world becomes meaningful for us" (p. 73). She and Stephanie Jones (2012) call the body a "nexus of meaning-making, a reception point of everything in the social and natural

world, and the embodiment of perceptions made and remade across time and space" (p. 54).

To illustrate this conception of bodies in space consider the way a teacher often stands, sits, or situates herself at the front of the classroom, remembering that there is no "front of the room" without the teacher's body there to be a reception point and be perceived as this particular body in this specific place. The materialization of this space also depends on the gaze and orientation of the students' bodies, turned toward her and therefore toward the "front of the room." The teacher thus makes and is made by space with her body as a "nexus of meaning-making" between herself, her students, the signs and objects of the classroom, and the discourses of power that circulate through all of them (p. 73). Hughes-Decatur and Jones (2012) remind us that these embodied perceptions are "made and remade across time and space": as the teacher's body moves, the space around her can become "not the front the room" or she can re-orient the front of the room to a new location based on her movement and whether/how her students track her with their bodies and gaze (p. 73). The making of meaning and space through bodies is so strong that even when the teacher is not in the room, her body haunts the space and the "front of the room" remains as such. Additionally, bodies are so intensely made by the spaces they inhabit that it is discomforting for students to see their teachers' bodies outside the walls of the classroom or school. These perceptions, relations, or hauntings between our bodies and space become, as Merleau-Ponty writes, the music played by hand-on-instrument—the stuff that brings vibrancy to space and gives it meaning in our lives.

While space and time exist as bodily perceptions, our awareness of being embodied in relation to the spaces our bodies inhabit and create is something we have little practice observing or articulating. Both the body and space are usually understood as "natural" and invisible and as such are taken for granted, like the "front of the room." Bronwyn Davies (2000) writes, "our bodies are not made observable, generally, until they cease functioning in ways that various authoritative discourses say that they should, or until we find ourselves in an entirely different discursive or physical landscape" (p. 15). Davies points out that, actually, the first landscape we experience *is* the body because our body comes into existence within the landscape of another body, our mother's womb. Though our bodies are constructed as separate from the space or the landscape around us, can we really know where our bodies end and space/landscape begins? Davies posits that through embodied writing we are able to "re-constitute, and re-signify our bodies in landscape, bodies as landscape, and landscapes as extensions of bodies, all being worked and reworked, scribed and re-inscribed" (p. 249). Further, the "physical, discursive, emotional, political, and social landscapes with/in which we are subjected and with/in which we become speaking subjects are both social and coercive, and fluid and shifting" (Davies, 2000, p. 249). Davies' goal in her work was to discover what the materiality of the body might be, and how we can write about it. In the process she found that through a new awareness of space and landscape and a troubling of the separation of body and landscape, we might write from the body and "go beyond the limits of those discourses that we thought held us captive" (p. 255). Of course, the power of those discourses as inscriptions of/on/through our bodies is great.

Bodies, Power, and Inscription

"The body must be regarded as a site of social, political, cultural, and geographical inscriptions, production, or constitution" (Grosz, 1994, p. 23).

The body matters because structures and forces of power surveille, shape, control, and police it; these forces also convince us to surveille, shape, control, and police our own bodies. Jones and Hughes-Decatur (2012) write, "bodies are manipulated and shaped by the ideological contours of whatever hegemonic power is in place" (p. 51). This seems especially true for female bodies as they are the recipients of patriarchal, sexist, and hetero-normative hegemonic manipulation and inscription, but in fact this ideological shaping works on every*body* and leaves every*body* wounded. Understanding the ways in which bodies are inscribed with gender and how hegemonic power works on gendered bodies can help us theorize about the cultural wounded-ness of *all* bodies, including the ways in which our bodies have been made docile: both manipulated by powerful forces that monitor and control us, and complicit in acts of self-policing and regulation (Foucault, 1995).

In *Gender Trouble*, Judith Butler (1993) makes it clear that bodies are not "mute facticity" or facts of nature, but are, like gender, produced by discourses that etch, mark, write, and inscribe them into existence (p. 176). There is no natural body that pre-exists its cultural inscriptions. So, just as gender is not a thing but a performance, the body is not something one *has*, but something one *does*. Or, as Heidegger writes, "We do not 'have' a body; rather we 'are' bodily" (1997, pp. 98–99; in Butler, 1993). Drawing on Butler's (1994) argument, I characterize bodies as palimpsests sans an original surface, written on and inscribed upon over again and again (and again and again). Even when we attempt to erase or rewrite ourselves, traces of those inscriptions (historical, cultural,

social, political, and personal) will always remain as we "do" ourselves bodily in the world. In other words, our bodies' inscriptions make them so, as do the acts of bodily reading, rereading, and re-inscribing that happen through our contact with others, across time, and in space. Butler warns us not to separate inscriptions as one thing and the body those inscriptions produce as another. She writes, "there is no 'real' material body on one hand and its various cultural and historical representations on the other. These representations and cultural inscriptions quite literally constitute bodies and help produce them as such" (Butler, 1994, p. x).

Butler and Foucault: An interlude. Here I will note that I find Michel Foucault's work on bodies in *Discipline and Punish* (1995) and *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1* (1978) to be helpful to the ways I think about the material body as a site of inscription by regimes of power and discourse. Particularly powerful is Foucault's work on the ways the power of the state (including prisons, the military, and schools) uses the technology of discipline to "produce subjected and practiced bodies, 'docile bodies'" (1995, p. 138). "A body is docile," Foucault asserts, "that may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved" (p. 136). Today, the docile schooled body is disciplined in much the same way Foucault characterizes the treatment of the body in the classical age. He writes, "it is easy enough to find signs of the attention then [in the 17th and 18th centuries] paid to the body--to the body that is manipulated, shaped, trained, which obeys, responds, becomes skillful, and increases its forces" (p. 136). This disciplining works not through overt, tyrannical power as between a slave master and slave, or tyrant and tortured, but through the power of coercion; docile bodies not only do what someone wishes, but they also operate as *they* wish, believing that the two are one and the same (p.

138). The docile body is a self-regulating subject, compliant and actively participating in its own management and control.

That said, I also heed Judith Butler's (1998) warning that Foucault's notion of bodily inscriptions and constructedness is paradoxical. She points us to Foucault's description of the body as a site of in-scription and suggests that this supposition "invariably suggests that there is a body that is in some sense there, pregiven, existentially available to become the site of its own ostensible construction" (p. 601). If this is the case, she asks, what constitutes "a body" to begin with? Butler writes that, in his theorizing about the mechanism of cultural construction as "history," and then "history" as bodily inscription, Foucault's use of metaphors--the body as a (somewhat) stable surface to be imprinted on by history, forces of power, and culture--actually maintains the existence of a body prior to its inscription, a materiality that precedes signification and form. Butler sees this paradox as contradicting the central point of Foucault's argument about the constructed status of bodies.

I hold this tension—between Butler and Foucault's theoretical understandings of body construction and inscription—as I use both theorists to help me explore how bodies matter in schools and classrooms. The Foucaultian paradox--a problem perhaps of the limits of language more than anything else, is important to understand because the dominant narrative about an "essential" or "natural" body, one that is individual and can operate as a blank slate to be written on, is so normalized that it has become commonsense. Butler's theory of bodily inscription helps me respond in more nuanced ways to this dangerous conception of bodies, and Foucault's work on the way power moves through and disciplines bodies helps me theorize the ways in which schools, as

mechanisms of the state, operate on and through our constantly re-inscribed and reconstructed selves. Butler's critique of Foucault is a reminder that language works on us more than we work on it, and it often stifles our ability to see beyond our own inscriptions.

Return to bodies, power, and inscription

Inscription also matters because our bodies are always for something "more than, and other than, ourselves" (Butler, 1994, p. 25). When we attempt to separate the body that is mine (the body I am) and the body that is for others (who I am inscribed to be), there exists a tension that has profound implications and is largely about the public-ness of our bodies as they perform and are observed by others in culturally visible spaces. Iris Young (2005) calls this tension "body-in-situation." She writes, "the lived body is a unified idea of a physical body acting and experiencing in a specific sociocultural context" (p. 16). Indeed, our bodies are molded by and inscribed through multiple regimes—social, historical, cultural, political, and personal. Davies (2000) uses the work of Grosz (1994) to explore the ways in which the inscription of bodies is a permanent and ongoing feature of human embodiment. "The overt, violent practices of controlling and shaping bodies," Davies writes, "are only one aspect of how bodies are inscribed. Equally relevant is the covert shaping that takes place through the establishment of 'norms and values' and patterns of desire" (2000, p. 15). These forms of inscription include the ways in which our bodies are marked and categorized through race, class, gender, sexuality, age, and ability, discourses of beauty, health, exercise, appropriateness, and cultural norms, and the ways in which we stylize and perform identities with/on our bodies.

Further, inscription and re-inscription happens in a public domain and in contact with others. Butler (2004) writes, "to be a body is to be given over to others" (p. 20). It is this expression of our bodies, our "corporeal vulnerability," that characterizes the realm of "public-ness" and is vitally important to the ways in which we become in the world (p. 20). But perhaps corporeal vulnerability is also a state and place for agency and action. While, as Davies (2000) writes, "we are inscribed as that which the discourses take us to be," the possibility for agency also resides in the re-signification and re-inscription of discourses (Butler, 1993). Davies (2000) reminds us that in this space of corporeal vulnerability we, too, have agency to take up those inscriptions and "re-appropriate their meanings and patterns." We can "re-constitute our bodies" in relation to our surroundings. We can "re-signify what we find we have become" (p. 61). There is lived complexity and contradiction in our bodies as we take up this agency, which requires us to examine our own body's subjection and our implicated-ness in that subjection, to open ourselves up to public vulnerability, and harder yet, vulnerability with and of ourselves. This process begins with the simplest resistant act of making bodies visible where they are usually rendered invisible, as in schools and classrooms. Acts of bodily resistance require us to rethink the most basic assumptions we have about what our body is, and what it is not, including the powerful narratives we retell about the separation of the mind and body.

The Mind/Body Binary

"Only when the relation between mind and body is adequately re-theorized can we understand the contributions of the body to the production of knowledge systems, regimes of representation, cultural production, and socio-economic exchange" (Grosz, 1994, p. 19)

Perhaps the narrative that matters most in the ways we imagine and theorize the body is the mind/body binary. Theories of embodiment are, in one sense, a response to this dangerous dualism. In their research, Margaret Latta and Gayle Buck (2013) draw on Heidegger who characterizes human embodiment as the "underlying premise eradicating the mind/body division that permeates Western thinking" (p. 316). These scholars disrupt the dualism of mind/body that usually positions mind *over* body, instead placing the body at the center of all sense making. They assert that a separation of mind and body creates a disconnection and our preoccupation with this disconnect "gives rise to disembodied curricula, impoverishing learners, teachers, and teaching contexts" (Latta & Buck, p. 316). It is vital to understand the ways in which this dualism exists, perpetuates, and functions and to consider in what ways we might attempt to challenge or re-write this powerful narrative.

The mind/body dichotomy has profoundly shaped our (Western, individualist) thinking about the body. In *Volatile Bodies*, Elizabeth Grosz (1994) explains the effect of dualistic thinking: it hierarchizes and ranks two terms so that one becomes privileged and the other, marginalized. The subordinate term is the "negation, denial, or absence of the primary term, or its 'fall from grace'" (p. 3). The primary term, then, is able to define itself in any way it wants, "establishing its own borders and boundaries" and creating an identity for itself (p. 4). In this case, body is what is not mind; it is what the "mind must negate and expel in order to maintain its integrity" (p. 4). Body becomes the unruly, gross, dangerous thing that must be managed, controlled, or hidden. The mind/body binary, Grosz writes, is also closely related to other dualistic terms, like reason and passion, outside and inside, self and other, reality and fiction, psychology and

physiology, form and matter, and so on. The body gets connected and coded to other terms that are then also positioned as the subordinate, the weaker, or the devalued of the duo. The strongest binary connection to mind/body is that of male/female. It is this coding of femininity with emotion and the body, in opposition to masculinity, reason, and the mind, that perpetuates the marginalization of women, bodies, and feelings (Grosz, 1994).

In *Unbearable Weight*, Susan Bordo (1993) further describes the relationship between gender discourse and the mind/body dualism. When this scheme codes male with mind and female with body, she writes, the woman/body gets "weighed down" by everything related to it, including its flesh and waste, while man/mind is elevated and separated from the limitations of the body (p. 5). Bordo insists that, "the costs of such projections to women are obvious" because "the body is the negative term, and if woman is the body, then women are that negativity, whatever it may be: distraction from knowledge, seduction away from God, capitulation to sexual desire, violence or aggression, failure of will, even death" (p. 5). Further, as the body is in service to the mind, according to the dualist relationship, so is female positioned in service of male. This connection between mind/body and male/female genders our conceptions of knowledge, teaching, and learning, and erases embodied histories and cultures as students and teachers deny their bodies/femaleness and aspire to minds/maleness. But what can we do to challenge and resist this dualism, to bring margin to center, to relocate the body, in our schools, classrooms, and cultures? Do we aim to "transcend" binary notions of mind/body, or do we need to "bloom" the historically located and culturally inscribed imaginations of the body (Bordo, 1993, p. 41)?

Bordo (1993) acknowledges that "going beyond" dualisms and deconstructing hierarchies, while often called for, is not easily accomplished and might, in fact, be a "fantasy" of postmodern and poststructuralist thought (p. 15). And so, she says, we learn a politics-of-the-body critique, analyzing and deconstructing the texts of Western culture more complexly and completely, and attuning to the presence of dualities connecting bodies to gender, race, social class, age, and ability. If deconstructing the binary is a fantasy, perhaps the next best effort is to invert it, placing body at the center and pushing the mind to the margins. Centering and understanding the body as a site of political struggle is often traced back to Foucault's (1978, 1995) work on bodies and power, which has profoundly shaped new scholarship on the body. But equally as important is the work of feminists who have theorized the ways in which the body is conceived of as a "site of production of subjectivity" or "a situation" (Bordo, p. 17).

Despite the feminist poststructuralist moves to constantly critique, complicate, and flip the mind/body dualism, the binary discourse perpetuates. The argument to remember and re-center "knowledge from and about the body," what Merleau-Ponty calls, "knowledge in the hand and knowledge in the feet" (and Grumet adds, "knowledge in the womb") essentially remains a feminist argument (Grumet, 1988, p. 3). The narratives that our Western knowledge system has bodies (i.e. "bodies of knowledge") while bodies themselves are disallowed to have or produce knowledge continues to prevail and be re-inscribed in the way we conceive of teaching and learning. This is just one way that the mind/body binary narrative plays out in educational contexts.

In fact, it's not that the presence of human bodies has been completely ignored in schools, but that the way in which the body is taken up in educational research generally

serves to reinforce the binary rather than subvert or reconstruct it. The development of a "healthy mind and a healthy body" has been encouraged by educators, and a relationship between the "physical and the mental" is important in the field of early childhood and physical education (McWilliam & Taylor, 1996, p. 16). However, Erica McWilliam and Peter Taylor (1996) write that the body's importance has been limited to the "necessity of its careful management in order to enhance or avoid distracting from 'mental effort" (p. 16). For example, children are encouraged to burn off excess energy before class or to rein in their adolescent sexual desires in order to learn. Much of this discourse of minds/bodies in schools comes from an understanding of the body as a fixed, biological, and natural entity—a system of muscle, bones, nerves and organs—that transcends history and culture. Recent emphasis on the study of embodiment or corporeality brings life back into this static, scientific representation of body so that our bodies become subjects constituted through social and historical discourses (p. 17). Questions are now being asked about the body, its "naturalness," and its elusiveness as an object of analysis. In the field of embodiment, not only is the duality of mind/body being questioned and disrupted, but the body is also being "interrogated as unfinished or incomplete as a cultural production, always in the process of becoming, lacking finality but yet amenable to completion" (McWilliam & Taylor, p. 17).

Bronwyn Davies (2000) names an effect of the long-standing dualism between mind and body: that it is "our minds that we are practiced at knowing, rather than our bodies. In those discourses, in which the body is constituted as natural (such as medical discourses), we leave the knowing and the reading of bodies to experts who know how to read and interpret the body's signs" (p. 19). But there is a problem with leaving bodily

knowledge to "experts" because no one knows our bodies or can know through our own bodies as we can. Taking the positions that bodily knowledge is legitimate and visceral experiences matter challenges the role of researcher as knower--those studying embodiment and bodies cannot also claim a field of expertise the way, for instance, psychologists might. Instead, they must shed notions of knowing, defer to the experiences of those with/in their own bodies, and tend to their own living researcher bodies as well. To do this, we need divergent ways, counter stories, different methods, and new language take action against the mind/body binary by disrupting, inverting, resisting, and redefining it, and thus who and how we are in the

world.

Elizabeth Grosz (1994) has much to say about how the rethinking of dualism can occur. She asserts that we must extricate the body from any one discourse, particularly those of biology and the life sciences that perpetuate the binary and privilege the mind, rationality, truth, and knowledge as fixed and knowable. We must also, however, contest the terms of biology itself, so that biology is able to see the body in ways other than what it has developed. Next, we must disrupt the mind/body dualism and all other binary relationships that are connected to it, including male/female, reason/emotion, truth/fiction, and so on. We can do this by rethinking the opposition of the two terms, instead framing the two terms as intricately connected, even the same (outside *is* inside, theory *is* practice, etc.). Finally, we must refuse to consider the body as simply a raw material thing, but nor should we regard it as purely a social, cultural, and signifying effect. Grosz writes that "we need an account [of the body] which refuses reductionism, resists dualism, and remains suspicious of the holism and the unity implied by monism--a

notion of corporeality, that is, which avoids not only dualism but also the very problematic of dualism that makes alternatives to it and criticisms of it impossible" (Grosz, 1994, p. 22). Instead, we need to develop new ways of understanding corporeality, for instance, viewing the body as both/and or sometimes neither one or the other.

Schools, classrooms, curricula, and pedagogies have been constructed on the premise that the mind and body are two distinct entities, that bodies are separate from the spaces and landscapes they occupy, and that the materiality of the body exists "naturally" and can therefore be taken for granted. Imagine, instead, if teachers and students conceived of bodies as shaped by and shaping the space around them, as simultaneously material and immaterial, as inscribed and constructed through discourse, as not separate or exclusive of the mind, and as agentic, vulnerable, meaning-making, and enough.

Embodiment theorists in educational contexts both acknowledge and reject the dualism that places mind and body in opposition to one another, and take up both/and, our subjective corporeality, as the thing to be studied (Grosz, 1994). In so doing, they often have to first critique the wounding pedagogies that cause bodies to experience pain, separation, and diminishment. But they also look toward the hopefulness and possibility of liberated bodies in school spaces. As Liora Bresler (2004) writes, "there is vital need to examine what somatic modes of attention, those 'culturally elaborated ways of attending to and with one's body in surroundings that include the embodied presence of others' mean for schooling and curriculum" (p. 7). In the next section, I turn toward the recent scholarship constructed by bodies, about bodies, and through literacy research. In this work, these feminist post-structuralist theories of embodiment create a path on which

to travel to reclaim bodily knowledges, literacies, and ways of being in schools and classrooms.

Bodies in Schools

"Round robin reading is embedded in the body" (Jones, 2013, p. 528).

Hilary Hughes-Decatur (2011) writes, "We are all sensing-bodies living in the world; teaching, learning, living, and interacting with other sensing-bodies. We don't make contact with the world just by thinking about it, we experience the world with our sensing bodies, acting on it, and having feelings about it" (p. 73). But what happens to our sensing-bodies when they enter into schools and classrooms, to learning environments and educational contexts? The work of feminist poststructuralists and the ways they theorize the female body resonates as important to how I approach the study of education, pedagogy, and curriculum. I argue that, since all bodies are alive in classroom spaces, the ways in which bodies are gendered, raced, classed, and sexualized, among other markers and inscriptions, matter and have profound implications for teaching and learning. Here, I will examine how body theorists describe the current state of bodies in schools and classrooms to understand what happens to the body, especially students' bodies, in those spaces. I begin with considering the implications for and relationships between a literacy called reading and the body.

"At first glance," Madeline Grumet (1988) observes in *Bitter Milk*, "reading appears to reside within the domination of the look" (p. 129). "The look" is in our mind's eye, separated and split from the integration of all our sensations, perceptions, feelings, and experiences—from "our body, the other, the world" (p. 129). Grumet refutes this dualist framing of reading by insisting that our reading of text is actually an embodied

experience, a "bodyreading," because when we read we bring what we know to where we live (in our bodies), and reading is always contingent upon, and tangled up in "the world from which texts and readers come" (p. 130). "Reading," Grumet continues, "is an act that is oriented toward what the subject can do in the world. Bodyreading is strung between the poles of our actual situation, crowded as it is with our own intentions, assumptions, and positions, and the possibilities that texts point to" (p. 130). Because language is a sign of our alienation and an attempt to separate us, via symbols, from our sensing, perceiving, feeling bodies, bodyreading is a "practical necessity" to explore the world without becoming split from our bodies (p. 132).

A child's first experiences with reading are often within close contact with her parent, the two curled up together, touching and sensing, hearing and feeling the vibrations of speech and sound together. In schools, reading often begins with the teacher reading aloud—with her whole body, with sensations and movements and voice and touch—to students reading aloud, and finally students reading alone, silently, further forcing the act of reading to the sphere of the mind and away from the sensual experience of hearing, touching, and perceiving language (Grumet, 1988, p. 140). Schools, too, displace bodies with texts (p. 144). Teachers stop asking their students, "Do you understand me?" and begin to ask, "Do you understand the text?" We touch the text instead of each other. We pass the text between us. We look at the text instead of into one another's eyes. We make marks on the text instead of marking each other. We get "tangled up in" the texts instead of with/between our bodies. The body becomes private and the text public, and meaning is located in one place or the other. The meaning inside

our bodies is silenced in exchange for the meaning outside, in the text. Finding that meaning requires us to deny our body's way of understanding the text (Grumet, 1988).

The desire to control reading in classrooms—to level and label comprehension skills, to mark and correct fluency, to predetermine and evaluate meaning in texts—mirrors the school's desire to control the body. Just as reading moves from the arms of the parent in the home, to the voice and body of the teacher, the voice of the student, and finally in the silence and stillness of the student's body, so does school require the "gradual and orderly surrender of one's body" (Grumet, 1988, p. 111). The stillness of the students' bodies as they read silently, allows for total surveillance by a teacher who is untouchable. When touch and sound do appear in the classroom, they come "banging on the door, demanding to be let in, pounding with anger, flailing with violence" (p. 109). The state of bodies in classrooms, then, is represented by two extremes: they are either silenced and ignored or viewed as wild, chaotic, and in need of control and management. Beyond reading pedagogies, nearly all interactions that bodies have in classroom spaces play out in ways that reinforce these extremes.

I opened this dissertation with one description of the current state of bodies in schools, what Hughes-Decatur (2011) calls "body-not-enough-ness." "We read each other's bodies" Hughes-Decatur writes, "in order to try to understand each other when we attempt to make meaning in the world, and we read bodies as normal or deficient, as 'enough or not enough'" (p. 73). In schools today, students' bodies have been reduced to test scores, data, categories, and demographics, and all of these ways of labeling and imagining bodies puts them in a state of perpetual "body-not-enough-ness." In response to this "body-not-enoughness" Stephanie Jones (2013) asks us to tend to the ways this

narrative of brokenness, and other narratives about bodies, shapes our encounters with bodies in classrooms. What meaning do we make of a lanky, brown-skinned boy with an afro, a Latina girl in skinny jeans and dark eye make-up, a white pre-service teacher from the suburbs, a parent with calloused hands and leathery skin? "How is it," Jones asks, "that we encounter bodies and believe we already know something about them?" (p. 526). And why are the things we think we know so tied to narratives of deficits and deficiencies?

These brokenness narratives extend beyond students' bodies. Hughes-Decatur (2011) connects her notion of "body-not-enough-ness" to the state of the public school system. She builds an argument that both bodies and the education system are trapped in a similar discourse of brokenness and fixedness—each is positioned as perpetually broken or being "in crisis." In these discourses, both schools and bodies need to be fixed. And in order to fix them we must vigilantly surveille and manage both bodies and schools— "constantly poking and prodding them, looking for quick, cosmetic changes, ripped apart and put back together again, pushed to work harder to reach some ideal, something, some—we don't even know what" (Hughes-Decatur, 2011, p. 74).

With and through this discourse of perpetual brokenness we have also built literacies, what Bourdieu (2000) calls, "previously constituted dispositions"—ways of talking, walking, sitting, standing, playing, reading, writing, gesturing, eating, loving, feeling, hiding, and performing—that are so embedded in our bodies that we enact them automatically. Jones (2013) provides the example of "round robin reading," a literacy of brokenness in which the teacher tightly controls how students read publicly by calling on them at random. This literacy lives in docile bodies, constructing the teacher as authority

and surveiller of students, text, and "good" reading, and students' bodies respond: huddled anxiously, waiting to be called on, fearing shame or hyper-performing "good reader," making or avoiding eye contact, trying to be visible or invisible in that moment. This is a reading lesson, but the focus is not on the meaning of the text as much as the materialization of bodies as (good)enough or not (good)enough readers. Through participation in these embodied literacies we construct the space and landscape around us to make a certain kind of classroom, we enact the brokenness that is inscribed on us, and we control and allow our docile bodies to be disciplined and managed (Hughes-Decatur, 2011).

Liora Bresler (2004) writes that bodies are "the hidden student in American classrooms" because they are either denigrated or ignored. Teachers, as well, are subjected to the brokenness of bodies discourse as they regulate and manage the bodies in their classroom space. For teachers, the mind/body binary discourse permeates their identities; the split becomes part of their brokenness as they are pegged as "brains on sticks," bodiless, and only attentive to the minds of their students. Further, to be "good," teachers' bodies must be asexual and undesirable (Hughes-Decatur, 2011). Thus, the teacher is seen as a disembodied mind and her students' bodies become objects, statistics, and pieces of furniture to move around the room. In this state of bodily affairs, Hughes-Decatur (2011) asks, "Can we unlearn the literacies in our bodies that teach us that bodies are 'not-enough' and relearn new literacies, new ways of reading the word and the world while we not only acknowledging our bodies but make them central to learning as body-sense-making" (p. 75)?

Stephanie Jones (2013) helps us think about a possible answer to this question. She asks literacy educators and scholars to tend to the body in multiple ways, including 1) "the ways we engage literacies in order to make sense of bodies, and 2) the ways in which literacies are situated in, performed through, and experienced as bodies" (p. 525). First, she says, we ought to think more about the literacies we use to make sense of bodies—the discourses of beauty, health, and exercise, the ways in which we talk about our own bodies, our students' bodies, and the body of "the other," discourses of race and bodies, and gender and sexuality and bodies, and many others. How do these *literacies of the body* get taught learned in classrooms? How can we critique the discourses through which our bodies are constituted and notice the limitations of our language to speak about our bodies? Next, Jones (2013) invites us to see the ways in which we enact and experience *literacies in the body*, which are far more elusive. While these literacies might be highlighted (or at least acknowledged) in some school spaces like a sports field, a dance studio, or a theater stage, they are less noticed, but equally present in a mathematics classroom, computer lab, in the bodies of students who sit in desks in rows and in the body of the teacher who stands in the "front of the room." Literacies in the body are acquired through observation and repetition and manifest themselves often involuntarily, as in the previous example of "round robin reading." Jones (2013) asks, "How do these literacies in our bodies make pedagogical moments intelligible? And how can we re-imagine and re-construct literacies in the body that are violent and body-wounding?" (p. 526).

Fortunately, embodied approaches to studying literacies are a growing field. Complementing and drawing on Jones' work on literacies in and of the body, in the

introduction to *Literacies, Learning, and the Body: Putting Theory and Research into Pedagogical Practice*, Elizabeth Johnson and Stavroula Kontovourki (2016) write that literacies can be "(re)defined when literacies and bodies are seen as inextricably linked and intertwined" (p. 4). As literacies are always in flux, so are bodies. And both the body and literacies are always already everywhere—impossible to pin down, fix, stabilize, or know. Johnson and Kontovourki (2016) propose four frameworks through which we might study the relationship between literacies and the body: "literacy practices discipline the body; literacy practices shape and recognize embodied meaning making across time and space in discourse communities; social texts make bodies, so bodies may be re-made as social texts; and bodies are mobile, affective, and indeterminate, and therefore, so are literacies" (p. 5). These four possibilities put theories of embodiment—including material, discursive, emotive, and spatial understandings of the body—into research practice in schools and classrooms.

Within Enriquez et al.'s (2016) text, Christine Mallozzi (2016) writes about the disciplining of teachers' bodies as they teach the discipline of English where instruction often includes teaching young people about what it means to be human. In this way, the English teacher's body also becomes a text about what it means to be human, what Mallozzi calls a "*body-text"* which intertwines the human body with a traditional text (p. 59). The images, sounds, gestures, movements, and language produced by and through the teacher body thus becomes a model for being human, and students observe, imitate, study, and make meaning through their teacher's body-text. Of course, what happens to teachers, as Mallozzi found in her study of teachers body-text stories, is disciplining, surveilling, and controlling of their gender and sexuality in order to make their body-texts

read as "proper" women and teachers. Thus, the woman teacher's body is always a site of political struggle, and the "false dichotomies of personal/political, professional/personal, public/private, and mind/body become matters of pedagogy" (p. 68). The disciplining of women's teacher bodies in schools, for the women in the study, was a source of discomfort and disorientation. Mallozzi argues that, though our tendency is to desire comfort, it is through discomfort that we can find multiplicity—we may not be able to escape disciplining, but perhaps we can discipline differently and live in productive discomfort with our bodies.

Margaret Latta and Gayle Buck (2013) also find tremendous hope in the turn to embodied knowledge in educational research that promises to address the current problematic state of the body: as separate from space and landscape, inscribed and managed through regimes of power, and split dualistically. They see a theory of embodiment as a point from which we can begin to recognize what is at stake for teaching and learning when we start with our bodies and our understanding of the bodies of others/"the other" (p. 316). While Latta and Buck find embodiment compelling, they also "wonder why there is so much distrust of the body in relation to teaching and learning and only the rare deliberate interstice between embodied knowledge with teacher education programs" (p. 316). They characterize embodied teaching and learning as "about building relationships between self, others, and subject matter; living in-between these entities" (Latta & Buck, 2013, p. 317). Recently, researchers have also begun to make connections between critical literacy pedagogies and the body in their work. Elisabeth Johnson and Lalitha Vasudevan (2012) argue that students use their bodies to respond to and convey their critical engagement with texts—performances of embodied

critical literacy—that often go unrecognized or marginalized in classrooms because they are viewed as "inappropriate" behaviors (including the expression of certain emotions like anger, sadness, frustration, or alienation) that need to be managed and punished (p. 35). If we reframe the way we view students' bodies as performers of critically embodied responses to texts instead of in a state of perpetual "body-not-enough-ness," we can also shift the way we understand how space is constructed, the kinds of knowledge and sense-making that are legitimized in school, the power of inscription and re-inscription on bodies in classrooms, and the ways bodies can be recognized as curricular, pedagogical, and instructional.

Connected to critical embodied engagement with texts, the relationship between bodies and emotions is also an important aspect of studying literacy, learning, and the body in schools. When emotion is conceptualized as action—a social, political, and relational process that is distributed and circulates, rather than an individual entity to be owned, given, and received, the relationship between bodies and emotions and the ways that bodies do emotions becomes undeniable (Ahmed, 2004). In schools and classrooms, emotions, and the bodies that are shaped by them can be viewed as dangerous (especially when socially marked bodies including people of color, queer folks, people with (dis)abilities, and working class people express emotions), but the regulation of emotion is impossible because "emotions are not anchored" (Lewis & Crampton, 2016, p. 106). Nevertheless, Lewis and Crampton (2016) write, schools have become institutions that attempt to produce "particular kinds of citizens with particular emotional dispositions," and thus they monitor and enforce acceptable ways of performing emotions (p. 106). This enforcement happens to teachers as well as students, and perhaps more intensely to

women teachers who are already marked as "emotional" via the gender binary. Lewis and Crampton argue that, because bodies mediate emotions, understanding "emotion in motion, as central to immersive learning experiences" can be a source of hope for developing more humane and generative spaces for learning in schools (p. 119). Teachers recognizing themselves as social actors who experience institutional pressure to attempt to regulate the emotions circulating in their classroom as well as through their own bodies is important to disrupting the ways emotions, and therefore bodies, get trapped as individualistic and fixed.

Because bodies are always already in the classroom, once we've done the work to develop a theory of embodiment in which the body matters, we can rely on that theory, our lived experiences, and our observations of bodies in schools and spaces to answer questions that tend to the body. Diane Freedman and Martha Holmes (2003) suggest questions like:

"What is it like to be a marked/invisible body in the classroom?

How does the body's experience in the classroom change over time?

How do we engage with those bodily changes?

How do we give meaning to bodies both in the real time of the classroom and in the writing we attach to it?" (p. 14)

These questions certainly apply to the bodies of students who are always finding ways to resist, challenge, and disrupt narratives and constructions of their bodies in schools; we could better see and hear their counter stories if only we would watch closely and listen carefully to them. They also help us tend to the position of teachers' bodies in classrooms, and consider how theories of embodiment can help us understand how

teachers' bodies live in and resist their own narrative selves, including the historical and cultural weight of their profession that teachers carry in and on their bodies.

The Trouble with Embodiment

In "Troubles with Embodiment," Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre's (2015) afterword to *Methodologies of Embodiment,* she questions the most basic underlying assumptions of a study of embodiment, and ultimately says that she "doesn't get it" (p. 138). Embodiment, she believes, is "thinkable only in relation to what is not embodied: The body is embodied, the mind is not" (p. 138). Therefore, using a framework of embodiment only serves to reinforce the mind/body binary—by asserting that we need to "bring back the body" to research, we are declaring that it was missing in the first place, which confirms that the body can, in fact, be separate from the mind. For St. Pierre, adding the word "embodiment" to knowledge or learning suggests that there is a way of learning or knowing that is without the body. But that's a problem because the body never went missing—it has always been there. St. Pierre isn't the only one to critique theories of embodiment, but her argument certainly resonates, especially because I am inspired by her work within the post-qualitative turn in research and trust her theoretical instincts.

I understand St. Pierre's troubling of and resistance to embodiment; she is exasperated that we "feel a continuing need to point out that *we are bodies*" because by doing so, we re-empower the very dualistic, binary construction of the mind and body that we seek to disrupt (p. 138). Like many things, the language we use to articulate a theory can also serve to reinforce dichotomous thinking, particularly when we seek to disrupt or deconstruct some powerful discourse or normalizing narrative. My response to

St. Pierre's critique is two-fold. First, I approach the work of embodiment as both/and, understanding that I will never be able to completely escape the reproduction of a discourse as strong as Cartesian mind/body duality but that I can work to resist and challenge it by acknowledging, honoring, and centering the body in my work. Secondly, I do see that operating within particular theories of embodiment there is an explicit deconstruction of the mind/body binary—in other words, when we say "body" we mean mind and body as one, not separate entities, and we reject the narratives that attempt to make them distinct. On one hand, a term like "being" or, as St. Pierre suggests, Deleuze and Guattari's (1980, 1987) "assemblage," "rhizome," or "body-without-organs" or Bennett's (2010) "vibrant matter," or "thing power" might do a better job describing the material and discursiveness of us that is both/and and cannot be partitioned. On the other hand, it's difficult to feel able to confront and disrupt, for instance, the narrative of the dangerous Black male body and the ways that narrative justifies the killing of unarmed 12-year-old boys if we limit ourselves to saying, "Black Assemblages Matter," because attending to Black bodies and lives reinforces the mind/body binary.

In The Mind/Body Binary section of this chapter I traced the powerful Western discourse that has constructed and perpetuated this dichotomy, and other dualities, and then examined ways in which post-modern and post-structuralist theorists have responded to it—some by inverting it, others by attempting to deconstruct it. Refusing to study embodiment is another response to this ontological dilemma, one that might serve post-qualitative researchers like St. Pierre quite well. My approach refuses to refuse embodiment because I see a possibility for disrupting the mind/body binary within a

framework of embodiment and because attending to and disrupting those normalizing narratives of the body are pertinent to my collective memory work with teachers.

Conclusion: Collective Memory Work and Embodiment

Having explored the history, use, affordances and limitations of collective memory work and several feminist post-structuralist theories of embodiment, including a recent critique of embodiment as a conceptual approach, I now return to the question: Taken up together, what do theories of embodiment and the methodology of collective memory work offer to researchers, teacher educators, and teachers, and our understanding of teaching and learning?

In their introduction to *Methodologies of Embodiment: Inscribing Bodies in Qualitative Research*, Mia Perry and Carmen Medina (2015) ask how "we might grant the body its (well-theorized) status in the practice and representation of research" (p. 5). They go on to ask: "How can we make the body substantive in our research? How do we talk or write about the body?" (p. 5). Collective memory work's response to these questions is its placement of embodied memories at the center of the methodology, asking its co-researchers (the collective) to explore both new and old ways to talk and write about the body together. While Gillies et al. (2004) question the extent to which memory work can adequately capture the experiences of the body through language or how discourse analysis can help us understand the body, many other researchers praise the methodology for the way it, unlike many other types of qualitative research, does privilege and center the experiences of the body. Haug et al. (1987), in fact, were challenged and questioned for doing just that: centering the body in their research. From their critics' perspectives, the body wasn't "enough" of a place to start; by privileging the

body surely they were leaving some other important dimension out of account (p. 27). Since the body was seen as feminine and base it could therefore not be trusted "scientifically," nor could collective memory work, by extension. In response, Haug et al. write, "it is precisely because we gain in competence through our bodily practices that we cling to them as we do" (1987, p. 27).

Likewise, Davies & Gannon (2006) reassert and privilege the body by highlighting the way their work with collective biography is embodied. The writing process in their method, they state, begins with an attention to language that is attuned to the body—including its senses, movement, emotion, and materiality (muscle, flesh, and blood). They acknowledge that in the memory drafts, the body might be silent, missing, or invisible, but through analysis and reconstruction, those embodied memories can be imagined and translated through language. This focus on the body works to disrupt the mind/body dichotomy and bring experience and theory closer together in inquiry. Davies & Gannon (2006) continue, "it could be claimed that any good writing is embodied—it is evocative, detailed, and multidimensional—but in collective biography we engage in embodied writing not just to produce good writing, but to tap into and legitimate the body's knowledge" (p. 13).

There are many different ways to tell stories about the body's knowledge, and theories of embodiment are essentially stories we tell about how and why bodies matter: Bodies lack a "truth" or a "nature." Bodies are best characterized as a process, a situation, a field of relations and power, or the materialization of discourses and inscriptions. The materiality of the body lives in a paradox that is contested, not resolved. Bodies construct space and space constructs our bodies. "Body-in-situation." "Body-not-enough-ness."

Brokenness of bodies. Mind/body inverted to body/mind or completely disrupted to both/and/neither. Literacies *of* the body and literacies *in* the body. Docile bodies, complicit in their own surveillance and management. Bodies as visible and invisible, marked and unmarked, remarkable and mundane, precarious and contradictory. Bodies as curricular and pedagogical. My vs. The Teacher's Body.

Through the writing, speaking, and analyzing of our memories there is much to be learned about the limits and possibilities of discourse in the expression of our bodies, what they do, feel, and experience. There is more uncertainty than certainty about our bodies. This multiplicity of uncertain stories about our bodies makes them powerful fictions; those who see the generative and transformative potential of bodies have told very engaging theoretical stories about them. But we run into trouble when our theorizing—our telling and writing—about the body ends up being not about our body but about language. Judith Butler (2004) asks, "How do we write about the body in ways that really are about the body? There is always a dimension of bodily life that cannot be fully represented, even as it works as the condition and activating condition of language" (p. 199). Claudia Rankine (2014) agrees; she writes that words are "release," they both "encode" and "cover" our bodies, and yet in silence, our bodies remain (p. 69). Scott Andrew Smith (2003) adds, "Perhaps then, we all—teachers and students—exist in this silence about the body. The question becomes whether this silence really doesn't speak after all" (in Freedman & Holmes, p. 30). Thus, there will always be limitations to collective memory work's capacity to make the body substantive in our research, because CMW does rely on written and spoken language—fairly traditional and privileged literacy practices—for much of its meaning-making. Utilizing video recordings of CMW

sessions and incorporating performance and movement into the analysis process can assist the collective in an examination of our bodies even beyond the language we use to construct memories about them.

The literature provides me with hope that theories of embodiment and collective memory work, taken up together, can offer researchers, teachers, and teacher educators possibilities for understanding how and why the body matters in teaching and learning contexts. Of course, it is important for us to be cognizant of the ways that language and discourse work on us and can reproduce normalizing discourses more than disrupt them. In addition to the literature, I also turn to the work our collective did together in this study to demonstrate how embodiment and CMW might operate synergistically. In our initial brainstorming session to construct a prompt for our memory work, it quickly became apparent that the thing we call "the body" was a contested concept. Discussing what "counts" as the body (parts, representations, inside/outside, emotions, others' perceptions, living or dead) and who decides became an important part of our brainstorming conversation—and in having this discussion we were able to name and question traditional narratives of the body, including the mind/body binary. Without the language of embodiment theory and the methodology of collective memory work, I do not know if my participants and I would have had the same kind of access to this ontological work. This process of exploring the body anew and attuning ourselves to the ways we both reproduce and disrupt normalizing body discourses became available in and through collective memory work practices.

Haug et al. (1987) end *Female Sexualization* not with conclusions, but new beginnings, their aims—a mission statement that transcends "legitimate" purposes and

possibilities of research. One of these aims reads: "We aim to practice a politics of the body, which enable us to live a life of resistance, to perceive in different ways, to forge new connections, and not subjugate ourselves" (Haug et al., 1987, p. 283). To practice collective memory work is to practice the politics of the body; collective memory work and embodiment, therefore, cannot be separated—we use CMW to collect, tell, analyze, and reimagine stories about our bodies, and these stories build our embodied selves and bring us into being.

Our Collective Memory Work Process

The next three chapters present accounts of our collective memory work (CMW). While each chapter offers a different approach to the memories, our group analysis, and my theorizing, the empirical materials were all initially produced through a similar group process. After gathering as a collective, we discussed the aims of CMW and created a set of group commitments. Then we assembled around a whiteboard to brainstorm about the body and construct a writing prompt. We talked about our memories and experiences related to the prompt, and over the next two weeks we each chose one memory to write. We wrote our memories in the third person, with attention paid to as much detail as possible, returning to the sights, sounds, smells, sensations, and emotions of the moment.

In our sessions that followed, we analyzed the memories, two memories per session. The process utilizes critical discourse analysis tools to explore the power of language in the texts, examining linguistic features, repetition, peculiarities, vacuums, narrative features (characters, agency, structure, tone, and mood) and commonsense narratives. We began each session by listing possible initial statements of meaning (This is a story about…) and recognizing/naming the normalizing narratives present in the story and in our lives. Close and critical linguistic and thematic analysis followed, which often led to additional story telling. Through this process we stayed attuned to multiple interpretations, perspectives, and meanings, working to complicate and deepen our understanding of the stories. At the end of each session we returned to our initial statements of meaning, identifying those that still felt important and adding new ones based on our group discussion. These sessions built on and connected to one another, and analysis was often made across many memories as well as within individual ones.

Chapter Three: This Is a Story About a Blue Line

Figure 1: A photograph of the school hallway: the setting in Justine's memory, including the blue line that runs down its center.

A Memory[1]

She dreaded passing time. A stranger to the battles of hallways past, Justine struggled to understand the pertinence of hallway teacher presence in the same way her veteran coworkers could. She stood, each day, with her clipboard signage on the straight blue line running a full clockwise scale around the school.

On this particular Tuesday, Justine stood in position on the blue line with little thought given to the cacophonous upheaval surrounding her position. She repeatedly pointed her finger towards the sign reading, "Be On-Time for Learning" and was repeatedly ignored by students of all genders, sizes, and colors. She stood still along the line with her feet planted with equally distributed weight in true ENVoY fashion. She did not approach students to redirect, engage, or partake. Rather, she pointed to her sign. Her

---

[1] All memories written by our collective were based on the prompt: Write about a time when you

sign to be quiet, to get to class on time, or, to walk. On this particular day, "WALK" was her sign of choice. In true student fashion, the sign was blatantly ignored.

As one student whizzed past her just brushing the end of her clipboard, Justine whirled around to remind the student – using her finger and clipboard, of course – to please walk through the hallways. As she turned, Justine felt her stomach lurch forward into her throat and her knees buckle beneath her. Justine was hit from behind by the clipboard brusher's pursuer and the two of them went tumbling to the floor. The male student landed on top of Justin's ankles and knees. Justine's dress was drawn up and the wind knocked out of her throat. The student's shock and annoyance manifested into a low guttural growl. Though unsure, Justine is almost certain the noise had little to do with her, and more to do with having failed to catch his target. As the student got up, brushed away the dust and ran off, Justine brushed away a quick tear and returned to her spot on the blue line; frozen.

Introduction

As the memory above opens, a new teacher (Justine) feels a sense of dread while monitoring the hallway in between classes in her urban middle school. She is attempting to follow her school's adopted corporate behavior protocol (ENVoY) in which teachers use nonverbal communication (gestures, body movement, and signs) to "manage" their interactions with students. In this scene, Justine is standing statue-like on a tiled blue line in the middle of the hallway and pointing at a sign she carries on her clipboard to remind students to walk in the halls. The students ignore both the teacher and her sign. When one student runs past her she whirls her body around to prompt him to walk and is suddenly hit from behind by a second student who was chasing the first. The impact knocks the

two of them down and Justine finds herself lying on the floor in the middle of the hallway with a male student on top of her, her dress drawn up, and the wind knocked out of her. As the story quickly concludes, the young man gets up, brushes off, and runs from the scene, while Justine—hurt and shaken—brushes away a tear and returns to the blue line to continue her duty monitoring the hallway.

Our collective gathered around Justine's story during our second session of memory analysis. With the work of analyzing two memories behind us, we entered into our discussion of Justine's memory with a certain ease and familiarity. At the same time, as a collective we were still getting to know one another, understanding our particular group dynamics, and testing out ways our readings of these stories could be both critical and kind, courageous and generous. Due in part, I think, to our hesitance to make our analysis *too* pointed, or perhaps from our fears of exposing someone's vulnerability, for most of the session our reading of Justine's memory remained centered either on the teacher's experiences being silenced, ignored, disembodied, and (in the end) physically and emotionally hurt, or it speculated about the student's action and response to his collision with the teacher. Eventually, it was Justine herself who pointed us towards the larger systems and discourses of power that construct racialized interactions between teachers and students in schools and live in and through her representation of bodies in this memory.

In order to present and theorize our collective memory work with Justine's story, I will first contextualize and historicize the construction of white women teachers' bodies, and then examine those histories in relation to the ways Justine used language to construct her own body in the memory. Then I will explore three of our collective

readings of the memory (that is, ways we approached and interpreted the story) that were generated from our discussion and analysis. Through each of these readings we sought to understand how the practice of teaching involves both ignoring and acknowledging race. These readings are subtitled: 1) the construction of *teacher as statue*, 2) *race as a vacuum* in the story (and the classroom), and 3) the *dangers of intimacy* between white female teachers and their students of color. In order to capture and reproduce these readings, I use excerpts from Justine's memory and the transcript of our session, and additional theory that helps support, extend, and illuminate the theorizing we did collectively. Finally, I conclude the chapter with a discussion of some implications for the possibilities of collective memory work and new understandings for white women teachers as they work with students of color in their classrooms.

White Woman Teachers' Bodies

In order to frame our collective's analysis of the memory, I first draw on the historical, social, and political histories of white women and teachers in the U.S., exploring how, through narratives of gender, sexuality, and race, white women have been positioned as sources of cheap labor, colonial nation builders, and reproducers of white supremacist ideologies while also upheld as the nurturing mothers of the school and nation-state (Grumet, 1988; Meiners, 2007). A critical engagement with these racial imaginaries and gendered narratives helps me to understand how white woman teacher bodies—including Justine's—are positioned in a precariously contradictory way: as both controlled bodies (by the patriarchal and institution practices of the school) and controllers/managers of students' bodies in school (in Justine's case, the school hallway). These histories are ever-present in the ways Justine, and many of the women teachers in

our collective, narrated their experiences and constructed their identities through their written memories.

Gendered, Sexualized, and Racialized Histories

In *Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching* Madeline Grumet (1988) explores the social, economic, and political histories of women and teaching, beginning in the era of industrialization, a time when teaching was one of the few occupations available to women. She writes, "the ideal teacher was one who could control the children and be controlled by her superiors" (p. 43). This contradiction of control became naturalized within the profession of teaching as the role of teacher was feminized and sexualized, such that "control and be controlled" became aligned with teaching, femininity, and sexual reproduction. Grumet further argues that the "cult of motherhood and the image of the ideal woman extended into the training of the ideal teacher" (p. 43). In this way, the "feminization of teaching became a form of denial as the female teachers in the common schools demanded order in the name of sweetness, compelled moral rectitude in the name of recitation, citizenship in the name of silence, and asexuality in the name of manners" (p. 44).

Historically, the hierarchy of schools was, and in many ways still is, patriarchal and hetero-normative: men take on roles of leading and organizing schools and designing and producing methods of pedagogy, learning, and curricula, while women, often silenced and excluded from this work, do the labor of teaching—the reproduction of the hetero-patriarchy (Grumet, 1988). This hierarchy requires a system of subordination whereby students are subordinate to their teachers who are, in turn, submissive to and malleable by their administrators. In the middle position of this hierarchy, women

teachers are complicit in the reproduction and legitimization of the colonial discourses of the hetero-patriarchy through methods, pedagogy, curricula and the management of students' bodies. Simultaneously, their male superiors subject women's bodies to those controlling discourses. In Justine's memory, the description of her teacher body in the school hallway reflects these competing hetero- and gender-normative discourses: women teachers as subordinate, controlled, and compliant, while controlling, managing, and monitoring their students.

Further, a complicated history of race and women teachers' bodies in the U.S. has harnessed white femininity (constructed as innocent, kind, gentle, pure, nurturing, and good) and teaching to the project of colonial nation building. Erica Meiners (2007) in *Right to Be Hostile: Schools, Prisons, and the Making of Public Enemies* describes the particular role that whiteness has played in the ways that women teachers have been used to mediate civility in schools: "Empire building had always required control of institutional education, and white women, historically, have functioned to mask the Racial Contract in education" (p. 46). The Racial Contract[2] Meiners references here, drawn from the work of Charles Mills, is maintained through a particular kind of silence, the cloaking of the state's white supremacist ideologies beneath a veil of "commonsense" or taken for granted assumptions about structures of power (p. 44).

To explicate the role women teachers play in this colonial project, Meiners draws on Helen Harper's description of the teacher as a "Lady Bountiful," implicitly charged

---

[2] Mills describes the Racial Contract as a political system, central to social practices, institutions, and disciplinary ways of knowing that are Western and white, but fail to account for the structured role white supremacy plays in shaping what counts as knowledge and who counts as fully human, a citizen, and an agent of knowledge production. Mills argues that this Racial Contract is so pervasive that it is most often invisible or taken for granted as "commonsense." The overrepresentation of white women in teaching, he argues, is a manifestation of this contract, an expressed logic of the system of white supremacy (Meiners, 2007, p. 44).

with "colonizing her 'native' students and molding them into good citizens of the republic" (p. 46). White women teachers participate in empire building by educating and "civilizing" Black and Brown students via the control of both their own teacher bodies and their students' bodies. Further, women teachers have been taken hostage by the rational, gendered concept of "teacher professionalism." Jo-Anne Dillabough (1999) writes that:

> "the professional [teacher] is ultimately one who is free to the extent that rational and independent choices about educational practice can be made. However, women teachers are at the same time constrained by the very 'illusion of freedom' as they are continually reconstituted as 'mothers' and 'guardians' of the nation. These constraints are clearly linked to identity narratives, which concern women's reproductive capacity rather than their ability, as it were, to be 'rational'." (p. 381)

Therefore, the social construction of women teachers naturalizes women as inferior to men and suggests that "women teachers' professional identities can only be found within the so-called virtues of the private sphere" (home, domestic space, and motherhood) which is, paradoxically, considered "unprofessional" by the patriarchy (p. 381). This contradictory relationship between women and professionalism, that demands women teachers be "professional" while excluding and subordinating them from this very professionalism, presents yet another way women teachers' bodies become positioned precariously in schools and classrooms.

In Justine's memory, it is through the teacher's literal silence and her body's stance, gesture, and movement in the enactment of her institution's protocol for behavior management (ENVoY) that she upholds/masks the Racial Contract and attempts to enact

a "professional" teacher identity. Hetero-patriarchal power is obscured by contradictory notions of professionalism, while white supremacy is veiled under commonsense notions of authority in school: who is subordinate to whom, who gets to make the rules, which students must follow them, and how these rules reproduce the authority of whiteness, masculinity, and the relegation of Black bodies. These gendered and racial histories live in Justine's teacher body and are both revealed and disrupted in the construction of her memory.

Justine's Teacher Body

In her memory, Justine describes her body as something that she must/can have extreme and precise control over; the language she uses is militaristic, objectifies the body, and reproduces the gendered hierarchy of the hetero-patriarchy. While students are depicted as able to move, in fact, creating a "cacophonous upheaval" with their bodies in the hallway, the teacher in the memory tightly controls how she stands, where she stands, how she holds her body, what she looks at, and what she points to. Her movements are exact and repetitive—using her finger to continually point at a sign affixed to her clipboard as she stands on the blue line. Justine's use of the militaristic language of bodies in schools refers to "battles of hallways past," names her colleagues "veterans"— which contains the doubled meaning of being experienced and having served in a military—and describes her body standing "still," "in position," with "feet planted with equally distributed weight" like a soldier at attention. This presence of militaristic language in a memory of teaching highlights the patriarchal and colonial power of schooling and Justine's perceived roles in that system of power. In this scenario, Justine plays contradictory roles: a soldier, following orders for how to move and position her

body via the ENVoY management system, and a commander, giving orders to her students about how to move their bodies as well.

In addition to the use of militaristic jargon, the language Justine uses to describe her body objectifies it—she portrays both body parts and external objects as pieces of equipment she uses to perform hallway duty. Justine writes in the memory that she stands on the blue line with her feet planted, holds her sign, and "uses" her finger and clipboard to communicate to students that they are to walk in the hallway. In this way, both her body parts (her feet and finger) and the external items she carries (clipboard and signs) are similarly presented as tools she uses to enact her role as teacher: providing a "hallway presence," and conducting the surveillance and management of students' bodies as they move in the school hallway. In fact, compared to her body parts and tools, which get objectified and passively used in the memory, the blue line—another piece of equipment—is associated with the most active and human-like verb in the story; the blue line is "running a full clockwise scale around the school" while Justine's body remains still and silent. The blue line takes up agency in the story as an active and dynamic character—there is no part of the school that is without the blue line, and it regulates the compliance of the other characters—managing students' bodies moving along either side of it and teachers' bodies standing on it, at attention.

The character of the blue line in Justine's memory not only serves as a place for her body to stand, but also represents a larger cultural narrative about social control and the purpose of the police force. In U.S. culture, the Thin Blue Line is a symbol used to commemorate fallen officers. The emblem actually consists of three lines—two vertical black lines with a blue line in the middle. The black lines on the top and bottom

symbolize the public and criminals, respectively, and the blue line "officer" separates them. According to the narrative, this blue line protects citizens and preserves a sense of order in society. The construction of this emblem also builds a story about authority, control, and roles and relationships in society. While the blue line along the hallway in Justine's school was perhaps intended to be decorative, the way Justine constructs her memory, making the blue line a character and giving it agency and action, calls our attention to the narrative of the authoritarian officer whose necessary presence establishes a binary between those in society who are deemed "good" and "bad." Justine, positioned on this line, takes on the authority of the teacher who must enforce the rules that manage students' bodies. Likewise, her presence and the discipline protocol she enacts establishes that there are "good" and "bad" students—those whose bodies comply and those whose bodies don't. This narrative is especially pertinent today as attention has been drawn to the disproportionate number of Black men and women who have been abused and killed at the hands of police officers. It is not only officers of the law stationed in schools who reproduce discrimination, oppression, and violence against Black bodies—the Thin Blue Line is a permanent fixture of the hallway, and teachers' take on the role of pseudo-officers when they stand on the line and project their authority.

Three Readings: Ignoring and Acknowledging Race

It is with this construction of Justine's professional teacher body—as militaristic, an object, and an officer—that our collective composed multiple readings of the memory during the analysis process. We began these readings with the aim of better understanding how women teachers' bodies are socially, historically, and politically constituted, perceived, and imagined. As our interpretations developed and our critical

analysis deepened, our aim shifted to understanding specifically how Justine's white woman teacher body was constituted in relationship to the bodies of her students of color. The following sections explore our three readings of Justine's memory that build on one another and on a central concept we frequently returned to in our analysis of this narrative. In capturing our initial statements of meaning about the memory, one we highlighted was: *This is a story about ignoring and being ignored*. All of us in the group felt connected to the notion of ignoring—whether it was the ways we felt ignored by our students in pedagogical moments, or the times we found ourselves ignoring our students, either on purpose or accidentally. We connected this notion of ignoring to controlling bodies, making bodies invisible, feelings of discomfort, fear, and uncertainty, lack of a connection or relationship between student and teacher, and the pressure to uphold teacher authority. It wasn't until the end of the analysis process, when we revisited our initial statements of meaning, that we revised the statement to read: *This is a story about ignoring and acknowledging race*. The readings represented here demonstrate the progression of our analysis and its shifting focus as we moved from a consideration of the particular experiences and interactions of one teacher and one student to theorizing about larger discourses and systems of power between white women teachers and their students of color.

Teacher as Statue

She stood along the line with her feet planted with equally distributed weight in true ENVoY fashion. She did not approach students to redirect, engage, or partake. Rather, she pointed to her sign.

As we began to discuss this notion of ignoring and being ignored in the memory, we described and analyzed Justine as statue-like in the story. We worked to understand how and why this memory constructed teacher as statue and how being a teacher-statue was related to the concept of ignoring and being ignored. The following is an excerpt from our analysis discussion when Kelsey first names Justine as a statue in the story:

Kelsey: I felt a lot of allusions, maybe, to a statue here. Justine stands still. Her feet are planted. Um, she's being ignored. She's just holding her clipboard or her sign. And then the sign gets also ignored. They are just both part of the landscape of this school hallway.

Kathryn: There's a lot of equipment. Like, clipboards, signs, the blue line, even her body.

Tali: In the last sentence I thought the parallel structure was interesting because it says, "As the student got up, brushed away the dust and ran off, Justine brushed away a quick tear." It's like it's focusing on the student's physical brushing away of the dust. And then Justine brushes off a tear, which is a physical thing but it also kind of represents her emotional state, while the focus is on his physical state and disgruntlement.

Kathryn: In the end, he runs off but she is still frozen.

Kelsey: I feel like the brushing of the tear is a crack happening in the landscape.

This construction of teacher-statue helped our collective explore why Justine felt so ignored by students in this moment. While we had some discussion of the role that the students played in ignoring the teacher in the hallway (to disconnect from teachers, to retain control, to resist authority), our group also worked to build a connection between

the expectations of the ENVoY system of behavior management and the way Justine used language in her memory to construct and objectify her body parts and describe them as pieces of equipment/tools. In order to follow the management protocol, Justine is not allowed to use her voice—she is literally silenced as she stands in the hallway. However, the way Kelsey discusses the metaphor of teacher as statue reflects both Justine's literal stillness and silence and a feeling that the women teachers in our collective have of their bodies disappearing, of being invisible in schools. A statue is a representation of a body without a human inside. As Justine becomes a statue on the blue line, her human connection to students disappears. The students get so used to seeing a statue that they begin to take it for granted as part of the landscape. When Tali notices that the "statue" is human and has emotions (she brushes a quick tear) at the very end of the story, Justine is made into more than just a physical object in this moment. Kelsey incorporates that linguistic peculiarity into her metaphor of teacher-statue, calling it a "crack in the landscape." But by the time the crack appears, the student in the story is gone.

What happens to the relationship between teachers and students when teachers' bodies become statues? Can a statue teacher build and develop connections with students? Can she be human? Or does the teacher-statue get trapped in a pattern of ignoring and being ignored, just part of the landscape? Indeed, the description of Justine as a statue is pertinent. She perceives the students in the hallway as ignoring her—they don't seem to know or recognize her by name or respond in any way to her presence or her sign. Similarly, Justine does not know the students' names, nor is she encouraged to talk to students in order to learn them. Their lack of verbal communication impedes the construction of a relationship that could make teacher and students more than strangers in

the landscape of the hallway. In *Teaching to Transgress*, bell hooks (1994) outlines several problems that arise when a teacher's body is erased or ignored. This state of bodily erasure in the classroom creates an environment where students do not consider that what they are learning is coming from actual bodies, thus allowing them to believe that knowledge can be objective and neutral. hooks also writes that ignoring our bodies allows for systems of power to be reproduced—systems in which subjectivity is denied to some and afforded to others (p. 139). But when we acknowledge our bodies, we honor our humanness—including our flaws, mistakes, and imperfections. Power can be more fluid, and systems of oppression can be challenged and disrupted. In other words, actual relationships can be developed and built.

As a teacher-statue, Justine's body is expunged of its humanness until the moment when it is knocked to the ground. The narrative turns here when the stillness of Justine's statue body is interrupted and broken by whizzing and whirling of her body and students' bodies around her. There is something ephemerally playful about this movement in contrast to Justine's stillness and silence in the first two paragraphs of the memory. This magic movement, however, is disrupted when a student's body crashes into Justine's and they both go tumbling to the ground. The action here is collective, not individual, and results in a young man's body lying on top of a female teacher's, with her dress drawn up and the wind knocked out of her. She still cannot speak, only now it's not the discipline protocol that silences her but the physical effects of her body being knocked to the ground. Despite the fact that the teacher's role in standing on the blue line and following the procedures of hallway monitoring has been completely compromised, Justine remains silent. Now would be the time to talk, to ask the student if he is okay, to tell the student to

get off of her, to chastise him for being unsafe in the hall, to exclaim over her own pain, discomfort, or vulnerability, to say anything.

Instead, both bodies remain silent and the blue line retains its power and agency in the narrative: both Justine and the student are being policed. There are "good" and "bad" bodies in school, and the innocent must be protected. At the end of the story, even though there has been an intimate physical interaction between Justine and the student, there is no greater sense of relationship or connection between them than there was in the beginning of the story. Even in collapsing in a pile on the floor together, the two— teacher and student—ignore one another. Silence and detachment between Justine and the student preserve the "good"/"bad" binary and disallow complexity or connection; ultimately, the landscape of the school hallway remains unchanged. In our next reading we directly addressed the construction of the student in Justine's memory and we paid particular attention to what goes unsaid about this young man.

Race as a Vacuum

She repeatedly pointed her finger towards the sign reading, "Be On-Time for Learning" and was repeatedly ignored by students of all genders, sizes, and colors.

Our second reading of Justine's memory highlights and then theorizes race as a vacuum in the story. In Haug's (1999) method, a vacuum is described as: "elements not mentioned in the written memory but necessary to the plausibility and agreement of the story" (p. 18). While it is difficult to show an example of a vacuum, because a vacuum is something that literally does not appear, the line from the memory above spurred our conversation about race as a vacuum. As we learned about and practiced collective memory work together, all members of the group got better and bolder about pointing to

vacuums, but in this case, it was Justine herself who noticed what went unsaid in her memory.

> **Justine**: So 91% of my students are African American, and this boy was Black, an African American boy, too. And I don't know if this is in there [the story] but a vacuum here is that I talk very briefly here about students of all sizes and colors and genders but I don't ever come back and say that this was a Black male and I think that adds to this notion of ignoring race in this story, too, and the way that plays out in it. I think I spend so much of my day trying to acknowledge and ignore race at the same time. [pause] And how, I think that silence here is an attempt to bridge some racial line in these hallways. Like, if we're not speaking maybe we're going to eliminate some racial, or cultural boundaries, and some norms, and just take silence as a universal and see what we can get from there.

> **Kathryn**: And also what you said earlier about silence, and how you don't get into that power struggle.

> **Kelsey**: You mean by leaving out race?

There are many potential vacuums in Justine's story, but an important one is the identification of race—both her own and the male student's. Justine herself noted that, while she remarks early in the story how students of all genders, sizes, and colors roam the halls, this particular student's gender is named in the memory (male) but not his size or color. In this excerpt, Justine fills that vacuum by stating that he was a young Black man, and the absence of his racial identifier is significant in relationship to the themes in the story around teachers and students ignoring one another, and ultimately white

teachers ignoring race. In our group analysis, Justine spoke about how, by leaving race

markers (like Black or white, or a cultural category such as African American) out of the

memory, she is essentially ignoring it—and that, as a white teacher of mostly Black

students, she feels like she spends much of her day vacillating between ignoring and

acknowledging race in her classroom. She also ties the ENVoY management system to

the notion of ignoring race. Justine interprets the mandated silence in the ENVoY system

as a way that the school is attempting to eliminate racialized conflicts or interactions—

struggles for power between white teachers and students of color. Through this logic, if

white teachers cannot talk to their students of color, they will not say something that

ignites a power struggle between themselves and their students. However, Kelsey's

inquiry, "You mean by leaving out race?" helped us ask questions about whether a racial-

less form of discipline management can ever exist—or if ENVoY perpetuates the myth of

colorblindness by suggesting that non-verbal interaction can be a race-neutral approach to

classroom management.

Ignoring and acknowledging race is thus related to a struggle between two

conflicting and contradictory race narratives in schools: the color-blind narrative

(Frankenberg, 1993), a white narrative of "equality" that attempts to erase the value or

importance of race in schools in exchange for a story about how all people are "the same

on the inside," and a critical race theory perspective (Tate, 1997) which asserts not only

that race matters deeply in the ways we construct it, but that by ignoring race white

people perpetuate white supremacy and the oppression of people of color through

institutions and systems of power. This struggle between racial narratives is alive for

Justine, a white teacher of primarily Black students. On one hand, she is well versed in

the dangers of the color-blind narrative of race and seeks to work against it, to honor and acknowledge systemic racism and the lived experiences of her Black students in school. On the other hand, she is constantly confronted by the color-blind narrative because she a) is white and b) she teaches in a U.S. public school – an institution that reproduces the color-blind narrative and other systems of white privilege and supremacy as it seeks to uphold/mask Mills' Racial Contract. Kathryn and Kelsey are also working to understand race in these complicated and contradictory ways, all because of something that was left out of the memory in the first place.

In the position of teacher, Justine must negotiate her participation in ENVoY—an administrative directive—both its non-verbal "race-neutral" approach to teacher-student interactions and her critically conscious beliefs about race. She negotiates these competing racial discourses as a white woman in the U.S., where whiteness is normalized and does not have to name itself. Ruth Frankenberg calls this positioning of whiteness "power evasiveness" (1993, p. 14) and Katerina Deliovsky calls it "white evasiveness" (2010, p. 37)—that which structures a white racial identity. Through this evasion, white people can choose not to engage in the complex power relations embedded in race relations, silencing themselves about race while continuing to hold racial power and privilege. Deliovsky asserts, "whiteness depends simultaneously on embracing and denying whiteness"—what Justine herself called ignoring and acknowledging race (p. 37). While much of our conversation about the role of race in the memory revolved around Justine's exclusion of the male student's race, eventually we also explicitly acknowledged that Justine's whiteness was being ignored in the memory, too, and that naming the racial identities of both the male student and Justine helped us see how the

memory can be read as Justine grappling with her participation in a particular historical narrative about race.

Dangers of Intimacy

...and the two of them went tumbling to the floor. The male student landed on top of Justine's ankles and knees. Justine's dress was drawn up and the wind knocked out of her throat.

Once the race vacuum was filled—that the student in the story is Black and Justine is white—we began a third reading related to the complex and contradictory work that teachers do to ignore and acknowledge race. In this third reading, we invoked the socio-historical narrative that imagines dangerous intimacy between white women's bodies and Black men's bodies, and Justine's memory was analyzed for the ways it reproduces and attempts to disrupt this powerful narrative via the ways she ignored race and left out racial identity markers. The following is an excerpt from this part of our conversation:

Kristin: Do you think you [Justine] were also trying to save the innocence of the

boy a little bit in your memory? Because there's this story about dangers to

young while girls from Black males who are assaulting them. And you get to   save

this this boy from being   villainized through that archetype of Black men.

Justine: Well, and here "*the two of us*" went tumbling.

Kelsey: Yes, that's the two of you together.

Justine: And "*he lands*," my dress "*was drawn up*"…I don't think I'm implicit in

the action.

Kristin: And you left out how hurt you really were.

Justine: Well, the bruise only showed up the next day. But it did hurt in the

moment.

Kristin: I know when I talk to people about my school I try to leave out the

demographics. But people always ask and I don't want to tell you because…it's

just going to perpetuate the terrible things you already think about Black kids.

Justine: He's annoyed that he landed on me. He didn't mean to. And I want to

make that clear. And I didn't know that I wanted to make that clear. But I see

that now.

Here, Kristin evokes the racial imaginary that Black men are a threat to white

women when she asks Justine if she was "trying[3] to save the innocence of the boy"

through her use of language in the memory. This dominant racial narrative can be traced

through U.S. colonial history; it is a story constructed to reinforce white racial purity and

supremacy. In *White Femininity: Race, Gender, and Power*, Deliovsky (2010) traces this

racial narrative back through the history of European colonialism and slavery as a way

---

[3] The focus in this section of the chapter is to examine the racial narratives and imaginaries constructed by white people in order to preserve and protect white dominance over people of color and the presence or disruption of those narratives in Justine's memory. However, it is also important here to look at Kristin's use of the word "trying" to understand that there were competing conceptions of language and power that were present in our CMW process. The aim of CMW is to deconstruct and critically analyze not the individual producing the memory, but the ideologies embedded in the text itself. One of the central theoretical tenets of CMW is that language uses us more than we use it—that is, we will reproduce normalizing discourses as we speak and write. Therefore, it is not in the interest of CMW to discuss the intentions of the memory's author (what she "tries" to do or "means" to write), but to examine the text for what meanings it produces, including both normalizing narratives and counter-stories. This theoretical tenet disrupts the way we have been taught to think about our relationship to language; the commonsense narrative about humans and language is that the former has control over the latter. Here, when Kristin asked Justine if she was "trying" to save the innocence of the boy in the ways she constructed the text, she questions the author rather than the text, drawing on the belief that we have control over and utilize intention in our use of language. What this moment illustrates is the power that our commonsense beliefs hold over us—even when we approach our analysis of text with a critical understanding of discourse and power, we still sometimes fall back on a belief in "intentionality" and author control over language to try to understand the stories we write and tell.

whites created "rigid boundaries of colour in an attempt to ensure European women gave birth to only 'white' children" and thus maintain the purity of the white race (p. 34). Policing the boundaries of intimacy between white women and men of color became a necessary feature of the construction of white women as victims and Black men as sexual predators. Further, this narrative justifies a need for white men to protect the virtue of white women (thus further constructing women as weak, dependent, and vulnerable) and to "suppress and control Black and Indigenous populations—ultimately, to secure white [male] control" (p. 34).

While our collective did not cite Deliovsky's historical and theoretical work in our analysis of Justine's memory, we were familiar with this racialized narrative of violent Black men, those "terrible things you already think about Black kids" that Kristin describes. As our discussion moved toward a more critical reading of race in the memory, we also became more attuned to the danger of racial narratives and imaginaries—both for white women teachers who are positioned as the vulnerable victims in this story and for Black men who are constructed as perpetrators of sexual violence. Not only did we see danger in how these stories about race position Black bodies and justify the violence done to them, but we worried about how, even by discussing these racial imaginaries, we were complicit in their reproduction and thus fortified them. Indeed, we see manifestations of this narrative in many aspects of our racialized lives today—from the violent and sexualized representations of Black men in the media to the words of white supremacist and murderer Dylann Roof, who used this false narrative, "you rape our [white] women" as justification for killing nine Black men and women in a church in Charleston, South Carolina in 2015. The teachers' familiarity with this narrative was not a surprise to me,

nor was their ability to deconstruct the ways in which Justine's memory was both reproducing and seeking to disrupt it.

In our collective analysis, we noticed how Justine's story evokes this dangerous narrative and simultaneously works to protect a Black male student from being inserted into the narrative and constructed as a sexually violent Black man. We saw how Justine protects the boy through the vacuum of race and the specific language she uses to describe the collision between the white female teacher and Black male student in the hallway. First, we revisited the lack of a racial identifier for the male student in the story. We read the fact that the student's race is erased as an attempt to avoid reconstructing a story about a dangerous Black man attacking a white female teacher. Leaving out his race might keep the reader from applying those biases and stereotypes to this interaction, or as Kristin says, "to save this this boy from being villainized through that archetype of Black men." But the thing about vacuums is that we (readers) *do* fill them in, and a dominant racial narrative like this one can lead one to fill in the male student's race, to make him Black even though that's never stated.

Next, we attuned our analysis to who or what in the memory is given agency during the moment of collision. The way Justine constructs language in the memory clearly establishes that she is not the target of the student, and that his actions are unintentional and accidental. She does this by making the action of the collision collective instead of individual, "the two of them went tumbling," implying no fault of one individual—teacher or student—for the accident. In addition, she uses passive verb construction, "her dress was drawn up" to indicate that the male student is not actively out to hurt her. He is not described as doing the action of drawing up her dress nor is he

positioned as directly responsible for Justine's intimate exposure. Further, Justine describes the male student as "annoyed" and "shocked," terms that avoid directing culpability at him, perhaps even suggesting that he, too, is a victim. While the description of the student includes his "low guttural growl," which we decided sounds like an animal noise (and we were concerned about this characterization of the student as an animal because of its racial undertones), Justine does take care in the story to suggest (to hope at least), that the boy's noise has nothing to do with her, that his intentions were not malicious or evil. Instead, she writes, he made the noise because he had "failed to catch his target" (the other student). The noise he makes has little to with her, and she is or was never his "target."

Justine is more explicit about some things in her memory—that the male student is lying on top of her and that her dress is drawn up—and these details pull us toward interpreting this moment as a dangerous story of sex and intimacy in a school. At the same time, Justine minimizes the physical and emotional pain that she experienced because of the collision. While she does describe herself brushing away a tear, it is a single tear that is characterized as "quick." This language reduces the physical pain and discomfort that Justine felt from being knocked to the ground, and doesn't begin to describe the emotional vulnerability she felt in that moment. Further, it fails to address any conclusions that might be drawn by those who witnessed the event, seeing her with her dress drawn up, underwear exposed, a young Black man lying on top of her. There is a real danger here for both of them. Dismissing her own pain and describing the student's action with language that highlights his lack of malicious intent can be read as an attempt to construct a story without a villain or a victim. Otherwise, the Black male student could

be easily villainized, placed into the historical narratives that young Black men are dangerous and a threat to white women, therefore also to white power and control.

It is with good intention, perhaps, that Justine works to avoid constructing this narrative, but in doing so she also attempts to mask a story about race. In fact, the focus of the ENVoY discipline protocol in the story and the narrative of teachers and students as strangers who ignore one another *is* a story about race in this school. In the end, Justine stands frozen on the blue line—both physically and emotionally—and she is also, perhaps, frozen in terms of what action to take to connect, build relationships, or interact with her Black students. The boy has gotten up, brushed off the dust, and run away, leaving Justine to care for her wounds alone and deal with the tear, the crack that has emerged in her statue-like performance. It's a crack in her authority, a crack in the role of being the teacher in control, and a crack in this silence = invisibility of race, a crack in the racial narrative that draws rigid boundaries between herself and her students. Just as she returns to the blue line to continue monitoring the hallway in silence, she also constructs a memory that ignores the racialized interaction that has just occurred.

Toward the end of the analysis excerpt, we hear Kristin drawing on her own experience of avoiding race by "leave[ing] out the demographics" when she talks to people about where she teaches. This presents yet another example of how competing narratives live in the practice of acknowledging/ignoring race. Kristin is anxious that if she tells friends, family, or acquaintances that she teaches primarily Black students, powerful narratives of race, including deficit-oriented stories about what Black kids or families lack or constructions of Black violence, will be reproduced and reaffirmed. Like Justine, Kristin acknowledges that these narratives are "terrible" but masking race seems

to be her only strategy for dealing with them. In other words, Kristin sees the narratives as more powerful than she is to combat them, and thus disrupting the narrative is a more difficult task than simply attempting to ignore it.

Conclusion

Our collective analysis of Justine's memory as described in this chapter provides an example of the rich potential of memory work, particularly in the way our initial meaning making from the memory was transformed by the end of our session. In order to reach this new interpretation our group needed to fill in the vacuum of race and draw on larger racial imaginaries to explore how and why white and Black bodies were constructed in the story. This kind of work requires a willingness to be vulnerable and a collective sense of trust on the part of the group. In writing up this chapter, I used excerpts from the recording of our analysis to explore the increasingly complex readings of the memory we did as a group—and where relevant, I drew on additional social, historical, and political theories of gender, race, and teaching that complement our analysis. Other aspects of the potential of CMW, as evident through our session on Justine's story, are described below, including the role of the author as participant in the process, the approach to stories as always multiple and contradictory, and the role that vacuums play in uncovering powerful discourses in our memories.

First, this experience with Justine's memory illustrates how the author of the memory is not passively watching the collective work during the analysis process. Writing the text in the third person and addressing the text rather than the individual in our discussion are parts of the CMW process that attempt to engage the author as a participant in analysis. In this case, Justine took up analysis of her own memory, bravely

addressing the vacuum of race and in so doing bringing us all into a deeper discussion.

This work requires the author to engage in critical self-reflection and remain open to

multiple interpretations of the memory and its construction, even interpretations that

might name racist, classist, or sexist discourses circulating in and through the memory.

For example, as a participant in the analysis of her own memory, Justine must stay open

to exploring many readings of her story—including readings that position her as an

equity-minded disrupter of powerful racist narratives, and readings that explore how her

work to ignore how race reproduces white supremacy via the narrative of

"colorblindness." During this complex and vulnerable process, we worked to engage with

the ideologies the text produces, understanding how we are a part of and complicit in that

production, rather than turning to a simple story about author intention. However, this

often proves more difficult to do than expected, as was illustrated in Kristin's question to

Justine about what she was "trying" to do in the memory, and for Justine as she grapples

with her own participation in these racial imaginaries and narratives.

Seeing and understanding the multiplicity of racial (and other) narratives about

bodies in schools is important in the ongoing work of becoming an equity-minded,

culturally responsive teacher. In a widely viewed TEDtalk, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie

(2009) discusses the "danger of a single story." Power, she says, "is the ability not to just

tell the story of another person, but to make it the definitive story of that person." The

single story creates stereotypes, flattens experiences, and positions people on a hierarchy

of power—which leads to discrimination and oppression. Collective memory work,

however, begins with the assumption that stories are always multiple, meaning is always

being made and remade, and we must work to expose the unifying, smoothing, and

eliminating of contradictions that happens when we retell our own stories. CMW, by

making explicit the multiplicity of interpretations of a story, also reveals the

contradictory narratives that live in our memories. Memory-work can help us understand

the difficult and easy ways we respond to these narratives or racial imaginaries when we

encounter them in moment-to-moment interactions and why our stories might mask or

erase certain aspects of our lived experience. When we interrogate the construction of our

memories, we can ask ourselves: How does this narrative construct a teacher? How does

it construct students? What larger narratives of teaching and learning do these

constructions reproduce and how? These questions keep the focus on the multiple

ideologies produced in and through discourse in the memory. Finally, this work asks us to

hold all of those stories at once—not to find the "truth" or figure out "what really

happened" but see all these readings as "truths" that we use to speak or write ourselves

into existence, even contradictory ones.

In our analysis of Justine's memory, one of those contradictions we explored was

competing narratives of raced bodies in schools—"color-blindness" vs. critical race

theory. We used the word "ignore" to describe a position a white teacher might take in

relation to her students' raced identities, both in moment-to-moment interactions with

them and, in a larger way, to perpetuate a color-blind approach to race. While the term

"ignore" opened up for us an engaging critical discussion of race in schools, it also fails

to fully encapsulate the social, political, historical, institutional, and cultural effects that

these powerful race narratives, pedagogies, and practices have on students in classrooms.

The end of our memory analysis led us to ask more specific, critical questions about

teachers' and students' bodies and racialization: Who has the privilege to decide when

race is "ignored" or acknowledged in school? How does a program like ENVoY "ignore" race by disallowing verbal interactions between students and teachers around issues of behavior/discipline (i.e. highly charged racial constructs in schools) while creating an elaborate system of non-verbal signs, signals, and gestures that control and manage Black and Brown students' bodies in insidious ways? When white women teachers "ignore" race as a strategy for protecting Black students, whom does it serve and what dangerous race narratives does it allow to go unexamined? Is our collective's response—to avoid reproducing the narrative of dangerous Black men—reflective of our own fears of racial intimacy, or our sophisticated understanding of and resistance to racial narratives, or perhaps both? These questions remind us that becoming a more critical and culturally responsive teacher is truly an ongoing process of "becoming" not a checklist or set of skills to be mastered, and that white teachers must attune themselves to race; acknowledging race is only the first step in this process. We are complicit in the reproduction of white supremacy even as we attempt to disrupt it.

Thus, a third aspect of the collective memory work process that is highlighted through our work with Justine's memory is the naming and analyzing of vacuums in the story. Depending on who we are communicating with and for what purposes, as speakers/writers we leave out information all the time—expecting our audience to make connections and fill in the blanks. But there is power imbued in those vacuums—both the *what* and the *why* of the unsaid. Naming and interrogating the ever-present vacuums in our lives can thus become a powerful new form of knowledge and way of seeing the world. First, the vacuum itself holds meaning; when Justine described generally her students of "all colors" and then failed to name her own race or the race of the male

student in the story, that lack held the weight of race, and all of the power, privilege, and oppression embedded in schools as racist institutions. Second, how the vacuum gets filled in also helps us see how we as readers make meaning from stories and the narratives that shape the ways we see the world. When Justine filled the vacuum with the student's race and acknowledged her own racialized identity, we were able to move forward with critical theorizing about the role of race in the story. Some of us admitted that we had imagined the student as Black, but others had left him colorless in their imagination—perhaps as a way to avoid addressing racial narratives, or to keep this a story about a new teacher who feels ignored rather than a story about race.

Finally, our work with Justine's memory reminds me of the importance of "studying up" (Meiners, 2007): focusing our research and attention on teachers, who hold institutional authority and power, rather than their marginalized students. Teachers, by studying their own bodies, can interrupt normalizing discourses of power and oppression and recognize their participation in these narratives. Women teachers can also examine how their positions have been socially and historically constructed as precarious and contradictory, via the white "Lady Bountiful" and the rational and patriarchal notion of teacher "professionalism" that subordinates and regulates them. As a collective, we developed new language for thinking and talking about teaching, race, and gender in classrooms through our work with this memory. In particular, the notion of ignoring/acknowledging race was a new way in which we attuned ourselves to the construction of race in schools and classrooms, and our roles in that construction as women teachers. We also came to a more complex understanding of what ENVoY as a behavior discipline protocol is doing the bodies of students and teachers in schools. Our

initial reactions to Justine's description of ENVoY were mixed—some were curious about the power of non-verbal interactions (especially those who were feeling that the ways they were using their voice with students was not as effective as they'd like), and others were shocked and appalled by its perceived rigidity or by imagining being purposefully silent in interactions with students. This memory allowed us to critically examine one moment of the ENVoY protocol in context—and to consider how every classroom management program, policy, or system is ultimately about power, authority, control, and bodies. Race, social class, gender, (dis)ability, language, and other factors always play a part in the enactment of control; in other words, teaching is a political act and our bodies are political actors.

**Chapter Four: "Is it good or bad if they think you're hot?":
Teaching, Hetero-normativity, and The Male Gaze**

"Ow! Got it bad, got it bad, got it bad
I'm hot for teacher
I've got it bad, so bad
I'm hot for teacher"
-Van Halen

Through the analysis of our memories, we frequently sought to understand how students, colleagues, and administrators perceived the gender identity, sexual orientation, and sexual attractiveness of our teacher bodies. In addition, our self-perceptions and identifications (in relation to gender, sexuality, age, and beauty, among other things) were important in how we constructed these memories that addressed others' perceptions of us. Discussing these bodily perceptions and constructions felt simultaneously taboo and cliché. First, we were aware of how sex and sexuality are often seen as dangerous territory in discussions of teachers and teaching. While these facets of our humanity are always present in and through bodies in schools, an explicit recognition of them has generally been deemed "inappropriate." Essentially, teachers shouldn't talk about, embody, or suggest that they know about, think about, or have sex. As a result, we learn to mask, silence, and hide the erotic or sexual related to our own bodies or the bodies of our students. At the same time, we recognized the popular cultural archetype of the "sexy teacher," which gets codified and reproduced through film, song, and media representations, as in Van Halen's song "Hot for Teacher." This imagined "hot teacher" is generally female, white, and young, as were many of the teachers in our collective. While we acknowledge that this trope is sexist and do not take it seriously, it still has power over us—suggesting that, as women teachers, we ought to desire to be sexy via a particular expression of femininity that is objectifying and offensive. Part of its power

rests in the alternative—the other popular culture option— which characterizes the woman teacher as an unfeminine "battle axe" who has masculine characteristics and is de-sexed. These contrary narratives about women teachers put us in a catch-22—if we reject the sexy teacher narrative, we risk being viewed as the "manly" teacher, prudish and unfeminine; if we desire it, we'll be perceived as immoral, impure, or promiscuous.

Ultimately, what we recognized through our memory analyses was that these contradictory stories about sex, gender, and teaching—that the sexy woman teacher is both taboo and desirable—are narratives that are produced out of white, hetero-patriarchal power. What both stories about women teachers have in common is that they are representative of the way our bodies, gender identities, sexual orientations, and sexual attractiveness are monitored, policed, regulated, and surveilled by men (and how, by extension, we learn to monitor and police ourselves and other women through these expectations). In our collective work with our memories, we took to calling this hetero-patriarchal perspective and the subsequent policing of our bodies in the classroom, "the male gaze." In this chapter, I explore our analyses of the male gaze and how it operates in our memories of teaching in secondary classrooms. First, I explore teaching as a profession characterized by being watched and the influence constant observation has on interactions between students and teachers. Next, I look closely at how we came to take up and define the male gaze and its relationship to hetero-normativity using Judith Butler's (1993) theory of the heterosexual matrix (HM) and then exploring the intersections of race and the HM in order to critically examine how the HM assumes normative whiteness. Finally, I use a description of our collective analyses of three memories that, taken together, explore how we repeatedly evoked and challenged the

narrative of the male gaze to work through memories of our women teacher bodies being

policed, objectified, and threated in the classroom by male students. The ways in which

we constructed our memories of these moments, including how we responded to them,

helps me draw conclusions about the way the male gaze gets frequently taken up to mean

individual acts of policing, objectification, or harassment from men to women. But the

male gaze is also about pervasive systemic sexism and gender expectations that get

reproduced in teaching via narratives of control and classroom management, pedagogies,

and in the ways women teachers build and maintain relationships with their students.

Teaching and Being Watched

Erica McWilliam (1996), in her exploration of the "corpor/reality of classroom

pedagogy" writes, "the overwhelming majority of kids are likely for the foreseeable

future to spend a great amount of their school day gazing at the fleshy bodies of their

teachers who 'perform' subject disciplines in classrooms" (p. 340). Teaching, perhaps

more than other professions, is about being looked at (by students, administrators,

society, etc.). Traditionally, an expectation of the school classroom is that students are to

give their teacher attention at all times or whenever it is demanded. Teachers have long

insisted on eye contact from students when they are speaking, have arranged the

classroom so that all students can see the teacher and vice versa, and have performed

their role in a way referred to as "the sage on the stage." Current day manifestations of

this construct of teacher include the use of the acronym SLANT (Sit up tall, Listen, Ask

questions, Nod your head, Track the teacher) as a "behavior management" protocol in K-

12 classrooms. Ultimately, these practices serve and reinforce the narrative that teachers

must always be in control of their students and classroom.

Conversely, progressive and constructivist movements in education have sought to disrupt the "sage on the stage" construct. These movements encourage students to look at, talk with, and learn from one another (not just the teacher), and advise teachers to arrange the desks in circles or groups; however, many teachers, especially those in schools suffering from the punitive effects of No Child Left Behind, still follow a more traditional classroom configuration and eyes-on-the-teacher ideology. In fact, in many lecture hall classrooms, the desks and chairs are bolted to the floor facing the front of the room, which is sloped to maximize students' view of their teacher. So, while this eyes-on-the-teacher narrative is an old one, teaching and the role of the teacher are still very much concerned with orientation and gaze.

In addition to being watched by their students, teachers are evaluated and judged via observation. Increasingly, test scores are also being used to evaluate teacher performance, but the primary mode for teacher assessment remains direct observation by an administrator, peer coach, or colleague. New performance evaluation programs and tools for teachers and teacher candidates also use video records as key evidence for satisfactory teaching. It is not uncommon for teachers to be warned that at any given moment an administrator, mentor, or evaluator might walk into their classroom to conduct an informal observation of their teaching practice. During testing events, observation increases exponentially. Observers from within a school, or at the state or district level (or in the case of tests like the ACT, from the corporation that produces the test) circulate in and out of classrooms watching students as they take tests and teachers as they serve as test proctors. In these many evaluatory uses of observation, the teachers

are overwhelmingly women, while their administrators (evaluators) are more likely to be men.

Certainly, observation is not inherently negative or destructive. When we are observed, we can gain insights about our practice (and ourselves) from those who watch us. We also often learn new things by first watching others do them, and then trying them out on our own. In this way, observation can be a powerful teaching tool, both for our students' learning and for the professional development of other teachers who come into our classrooms. Teaching in the U.S. is becoming increasingly collaborative; many general education classroom teachers are now paired with teachers who have credentials to teach English language learners or students with special needs. In these co-taught classrooms, teachers can use observation as a positive strategy for engaging with their students in the most meaningful ways. But in many cases, the observation that happens in classrooms feels punitive, threatening, even dangerous. In general, these were the feelings about observation that the members of our collective, myself included, brought to our CMW process, especially through memories about our bodies.

As we discussed our lived experiences of being watched in the classroom—by our students, colleagues, administrators, and others—we began using the term "the male gaze" to describe this observation. The heteroglossic nature of language (Bahktin, 1981) lent us this phrase, though none of us ever explicitly articulated or traced its history. It seemed to be useful for us in a commonsense way, and it was only in writing this chapter that I investigated its theoretical origins and learned about its history in feminist film and performance studies.

Feminist film critic Laura Mulvey (1975), in a piece entitled "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," coined the term "the male gaze" as a way of describing how, in the arts, the world and the women in it are portrayed from a masculine viewpoint. Mulvey describes three levels of the gaze present in a film—the gaze of men characters toward women characters, the view of the camera including the shots, lighting, angles, and other visual techniques, and the view of the audience watching the film. All three, Mulvey writes, reinforce the view of and serve the sexual pleasure of heterosexual men. Because this gaze gets reconstructed over and over again, it becomes regarded as the "normal" or "natural" way of perceiving the world, including the ways in which women, from this viewpoint, are positioned as subordinate, objectified, and marginalized. Mulvey uses Freudian psychoanalytic theory to suggest (among other things) that the male gaze relegates women's bodies to no more than sexual objects used to satisfy men's sexual desires. Forty years later, *The Chronicle of Higher Ed.* (2015) asked four critics to respond to the questions, "Is the male gaze still relevant?" and "How does it need to evolve?" Their responses acknowledged that, while it remains historically and culturally significant, the male gaze is, perhaps, too simplistic today to capture the complex nature of gender and sex, and leaves out intersectional markers of identity like race, social class, (dis)ability, and age. Susan Bordo (2015) makes that intersectionality critique and then responds to it:

> "we sometimes forget that without the first cuts into the undifferentiated Subject, there would be no 'sections' to re-theorize. Mulvey and other gender-centered theorists…opened the door to further challenges--for example, coming from race studies and disability studies, which have produced powerful accounts of what it

feels like to move through the social world marked by one's skin color or one's

wheelchair..."

It seems Mulvey's notion of the "male gaze" is still relevant today and perhaps has

generated similar kinds of theorizing from other identity standpoints (e.g. the white gaze);

it is also rightly critiqued and complicated with perspectives that account for difference to

examine how the white capitalist hetero-patriarchy operates in our culture. I find most

interesting how this term has become mainstream and commonsense, even for those who

have never heard of Mulvey or studied film or performance studies.

Thus, when our collective used the term "the male gaze" we did not take it up as it

was/is defined and used in the field of film studies by Mulvey (1975). Instead, we used

the term "the male gaze" colloquially to name a recurring pattern of the observation and

objectification of our teacher bodies that we experienced and identified in our memories.

We recognize as teachers that our bodies—while often ignored, erased, or denied—are

also constantly being monitored and survielled by our administrators, colleagues,

students, and ourselves. And while not all of those doing the watching take up a cis-

gender and heterosexual male identity, we continued to call this process of being watched

"the male gaze." Like Mulvey's (1975) theory, in which women also view themselves

and each other through a male gaze (essentially, there is no "female gaze"), our use of the

term also extended beyond the literal orientation of male eyes, becoming a larger

metaphor for how women's bodies—in this case women teachers' bodies—are seen and

treated as objects under the control of the white hetero-patriarchy. As evident in our

collective analysis, there were moments when we both criticized and took up the male

gaze to analyze each other's memories of objectification. I will explore this contradiction in later sections of this chapter.

The Male Gaze in the Classroom

While the hierarchy of the school system places teachers in a position of authority over students, male students also hold and enact gendered power over women teachers as they learn to perform dominant masculine roles in society. Though our analysis of memories, we asserted that one of these roles male students learn to perform in school (and elsewhere) is the male gaze—to look at, monitor, police, and objectify their female teachers and classmates. But the male gaze also puts male students in a precarious position—in order to be a man they must be heterosexual, they must be sexual, and they must view women, including their own female teachers and classmates, as sexual objects. Performing this brand of masculinity puts expectations on male students that are more constraining than generative and forces many young men to endorse and enact sexist practices that are harmful to all. These tenuous contradictions that male students experience created obstacles (real and perceived) for us as teachers as we attempted to build and develop loving relationships with our students.

The literal "look" is only the start of how the male gaze operates and manifests itself in order to monitor and police women's bodies in school. In addition, the male gaze operates through school policy when student dress codes are written to control particularly what female students wear and how their clothing covers or fits on their bodies (or not) because of concern for male students' attitudes, feelings, and desires in response to seeing female bodies—including sexual arousal and so-called distraction from learning. The rules for female dress are constructed completely from the power and

perspective of the male gaze. The male gaze also manifests itself through speech and gesture—as subtle as raised eyebrows or a wink or as overt as public comments made about woman's body parts. Women and girls in schools know and experience being watched on a daily basis through all of these means—eye contact, institutional norms, policies, and rules, gestures and facial expressions, and speech acts—which remind women that the worth of their body is shaped and constrained by the ideologies, expectations, beliefs, and values of hetero-sexual, cis-gendered men.

As demonstrated through the examples above, the male gaze is more than just the passive look of a single subject, but is agentic in the actions and outcomes that get produced through interaction: a policy in relationship to its target, a gesture and its recipient, a speech act toward an addressee. One of the ways in which actions/outcomes get produced in these male gaze interactions is what our group called "sexual objectification." We used the term "sexual objectification" to describe the perception that our bodies are being treated, viewed, and constructed as sexual objects, that is, as tools for another's sexual pleasure or desire. Through the process of sexual objectification, we assert, our bodies are reduced in meaning and significance such that we no longer feel as though we are fully human. Further, sexual objectification produces feelings of vulnerability and threat in the body being objectified, and as a result she can struggle engage in caring relationships with others. Sexual objectification, at work under the purview of the male gaze, builds a foundation for a culture of sexual violence—both literal and symbolic—in school. This culture also responds to and relies on the normative discourses of heterosexuality and the gender binary.

The Heterosexual Matrix

Sara: All the time my students will ask me, you know, do you have a boyfriend? Who is

your boyfriend? I don't know why they're obsessed with that. But they're always

obsessed with it. Like, you're married, right? No. Oh, well then you must have a

boyfriend. Who's your male counterpart? It's like I'm not really human unless I have a

male counterpart.

In *Gender Trouble*, Butler (1990) defines the heterosexual matrix (HM) as "that

grid of cultural intelligibility through which bodies, genders, and desires are naturalized

premised upon a "stable sex expressed through stable gender…that is oppositionally and

hierarchically defined through the practice of heterosexuality" (p. 208). In her theorizing,

Butler draws on Wittig's notion of the "heterosexual contract" and Rich's notion of

"compulsory heterosexuality" to characterize how our model of gender intelligibility

assumes that for bodies to cohere there "must be a stable sex expressed through a stable

gender" (p. 208). So, while gender and sex are actually fluid categories, the heterosexual

matrix works as a powerful system to link binary notions of gender and sexuality to one

another, reinforce the "normality" of that system and of heterosexuality, and stabilize the

categories themselves. As a grid, the HM simultaneously connects and separates things—

in this case, male is connected to masculine and sexual attraction to female, and female is

connected to feminine and sexual attraction to male. The HM is at work in society, and

particularly in schools. School operates within the HM by: separating boys and girls into

lines, activities, bathrooms, sports, and seating configurations; participation in activities

such as prom where royalty (kings and queens) are chosen and students couple up;

separate dress codes for boys and girls with instructions on what they can and cannot wear; the labelling of texts, classes, and clubs as geared toward girls or boys, and so on.

In the quotation above, taken from our group's analysis of Sara's memory, Sara (without naming it) reflects on how she is drawn in to the heterosexual matrix as it functions in her classroom. In this case, her students, who have learned the powerful narrative that gender and sexuality are stable categories which are fixed to one another, are monitoring and reaffirming the persistence of the grid by demanding to know whether Sara is married or has a boyfriend and display an "obsession" with the idea that Sara ought to have a male romantic/sexual partner. Dependent on the grid that works to keep Sara's gender identity and expression, sexuality, and lived sexual experience aligned is her status as a human being. Sara knows that not just any answer will do when it comes to her students' interrogations about her marital status—if she provides an affirmative answer it will satisfy and humanize her in her students' eyes, while a negative response will dehumanize her and put her gender, sexuality, and status as fully human into question. And there seems to be no option outside this yes/no dichotomy; there is no option/answer for Sara to be queer or have a woman for a romantic partner: a girlfriend, a wife.

In taking up the male gaze, Sara's students, and the students in Tali and Kathryn's memories as well, orient themselves toward their teacher in a way that works to stabilize the powerful heterosexual matrix. This direct questioning of a woman teacher's sexuality and marital status is an overt demonstration of the male gaze—and it's an example of how both male and female students utilize the male gaze as a way to monitor and regulate gender and sexuality norms, as Sara gets asked about her marital status by all students.

We all had major doubts, however, that male gender expressing teachers were peppered as aggressively with the same kinds of demands and questions about their sexuality or marital status. Additionally, we considered carefully the privilege that any cis-gender, heterosexual woman carries with her, even as she is being gazed at and asked pointed questions about her sexuality. In Sara's case, her response to her students' questions was a matter of deciding how much and what kind of personal information to share with them, rather than having to choose to lie or tell the truth, or to out herself as a teacher in that moment. These questions and this gaze quickly becomes dangerous for transgender, lesbian, bisexual, or queer teachers. Likewise, the male gaze and its regulation of the heterosexual matrix take on different significance for women teachers of color.

Race, Gender, and Sexuality

Before I explore these theories of gender and sexuality in relationship to our memories and analysis, it is important to consider the role that racialization plays in the construction of femininity and the regulation of the heterosexual matrix. It is not only important that the three teachers in the memories included here are perceived as young, cis-gender, and heterosexual, but also that they are white. As discussed in Chapter 3, whiteness has long operated as an important part of the construction of femininity and the ideal woman, and historically white women have served as teachers, linking the reproduction of gender and sexuality norms and racial hierarchies to practices of schooling (Deliovsky, 2010; Grumet, 1988; Meiners, 2007). I also argue that the heterosexual matrix (HM) operates within a system of whiteness—that is, the ways in which gender and sexuality become intelligible together depend on whiteness as the norm; non-white people do not experience the grid of heterosexuality/normativity in the

same ways. Similarly, notions of purity, goodness, and virtue that have been built into the foundation of ideal white femininity do not extend to women of color; in fact, women of color do not experience stability of their gendered and sexualized identities, only instability and otherness in opposition to white femininity (Deliovsky, 2010). In addition, the male gaze operates differently on women of color than on white women. As the male gaze has been constructed as a white, cis-gender, hetero-normative view of women working within the heterosexual matrix to reinforce alignment of gender and sexuality, women of color also experience observation and surveillance, but the different effect is that they are othered, exoticized, and fetishized by the male gaze. While in our analysis we did not explicitly discuss these three memories as racialized stories, our assumption about normative heterosexual whiteness underlies them all. Why did we de-center or erase race in these memories and not in others when the fact of our whiteness is so intricately tied up in how our gendered and sexualized bodies are perceived? Do we desire to understand our woman-ness as somehow universal or at the very least, unifying? Is there an additional danger to us and our gendered identities if we acknowledge how our whiteness is regulating the ways in which our bodies are being watched, objectified, and threatened? The absence of race-talk in our analysis of these memories raises important questions about how whiteness gets harnessed to normative narratives of gender and sexuality and how we reinforce white authority even as we resist being codified by sexual objectification and the male gaze.

In addition to the (uninterrogated) racialization of the women teachers in these memories, it is also important to note that the students in these memories are unraced. Further, in our analysis of vacuums in these stories we did not explicitly acknowledge

that race was a missing entity. Just as the racialization of those being gazed at or objectified is significant because of raced narratives about female teachers (see the opening discussion on ideal femininity and goodness vs. the sexy teacher), the racial identities of the students who take up the gaze also alters the narrative. Young Black and Brown men have historically been punished harshly, even killed, for gazing at or objectifying white women, while we white people often throw up our hands and say, "boys will be boys" when young white men take similar actions. The well-known story of Emmett Till, a 14-year-old boy who was lynched in Mississippi after reportedly winking at a white woman, clearly demonstrates the brutal racial policing of who gazes at whom (the men who admitted to lynching Emmett were acquitted of the crime). Though the murder of Emmett Till happened in 1955, our society's long history of antimiscegenation laws were only overturned in 1967, and violence—real or symbolic—toward Black men who date or marry white women continues today. These racialized narratives ultimately affect the ways in which we as white women teachers might respond to the gaze of our male students of color, including the level of perceived sexual threat, the choices we make to punish students (or not), and our concern with how other white people (colleagues, administrators, etc.) might read and interpret these stories of our sexual objectification.

Memory Analysis

The order of the memories in this chapter does not reflect the order in which we analyzed them; rather, I have arranged them here to show how we saw the male gaze acting in progressively dangerous ways: from body-policing, to objectification, and then to sexual harassment in the classroom. In the first memory, Sara describes how a male

student polices her female body by pointing out her pit stains in front of the class. In the second memory, Tali feels sexually objectified by a male student, who makes a verbal comment about her "cuteness" in a public way. Finally, the third story describes a moment when Kathryn bends over to pick up a piece of paper and gets "wolf-whistled" at by an unidentified male student sitting behind her. The following three sections work through several points of analysis for each memory as we interpreted each story from multiple vantage points, seeking to understand how the memory constructs the role of the teacher, the significance of spatiality and bodies, and the actions of the male students including specific and contextual manifestations of "the male gaze."

The Look on Bernie's Face

I don't remember what I was saying, but I remember the look on Bernie's face when his hand went up.

Sara's memory describes an interaction between a student and teacher in which the student publically points at and criticizes his teacher's body. Sara, the teacher, struggles with how her reaction to this event—and by extension, her authority as a woman teacher—is then perceived by her students. Sara characterized Bernie, the male middle school student in the story, as "that one kid." One day, in their hot, smelly, windowless basement classroom, Sara is in the midst of teaching a lesson when Bernie raises his hand and, when called upon, asks Sara if she is aware of her pit stains. Sara hears a "collective gasp" and a "collective pause" from the class and then, feigning confidence, declares, "Yeah! It's hot!" In the moment she is defended by another student, "sweet Laura," and later by Kara, her teaching assistant, and yet she continues to wonder how this interaction impacted the rest of the interactions she had with Bernie that year,

including one in which he "conspicuously" offered her his banana. Ultimately, Sara

wonders whether Bernie has learned anything in her class that year.

In the moment this memory occurs, Sara is experiencing an extreme reaction to

the space of her classroom and the bodies in it, and we began our analysis of the memory

by closely examining how the space was described in relationship to the depiction of

Sara's body. In the memory, the room is "oppressively" hot and Sara's sweat leaves pit

stains on her shirt. In the analysis excerpt below, Kristin wonders whether the excessive

description of her dark, windowless, smelly, hot classroom becomes a way for Sara to

justify or defend her pit stains. Then Kristin also questions this defensiveness, evoking a

larger narrative about what constitutes femininity and ideal women teachers' bodies:

Kristin: You defended why you had pit stains…you said, "And the dark

windowless room combined with the body heat of 25 middle schoolers was

simply oppressive." So I wrote [on the copy of the memory]: "Defending pit

stains. Unwomanly? Unprofessional?" Does there need to be a reason? I mean

that's just being human. So do you need to defend why it happened? There

is a narrative in society that women aren't human. Like women don't fart, women

don't burp, women don't poop, women don't sweat. And then there's the idea that

teachers aren't actually people.

Erin: And don't have bodies. 'Cause all those things are really bodily, right?

Kristin: Yeah. I think we've talked about when your students realize that your

teacher can break and your teacher can be hurt. And with this one it's like,

your teacher sweats.

Erin: But everyone sweats!

> **Kelsey**: But not teachers. Not women teachers.
>
> **Kristin**: 'Cause teachers aren't people.

As we discussed why, in her memory, Sara seemed to justify a bodily function that happens to all people—sweating—we landed on the normalizing narrative of women as clean, pure, and good, having bodies that do not sweat, poop, pee, experience pain, etc. When Sara's body became undeniable in this moment, she needed to find a way to defend why she was sweating (the conditions of the classroom were oppressive) in order to prove that she was a woman and a professional teacher. Yet, as Kelsey and Kristin reiterate, denying women bodily functions also denies them a sense of humanity and they become disembodied, and "not people."

Sara follows up this defense of her pit stains with another defense of why she tells this story again and again. Later in her memory she declares that her story conveys how "brutal, insensitive, and cruel" middle school students can be. This characterization of her students as mean-spirited becomes another layer of her defense. Not only must she prove her femaleness against this physical evidence that she sweats, but she also must show that she's being mistreated by her students in order to establish herself as the innocent, good, pure woman that a teacher must be. Bernie, then, plays the role in the story of the "cruel" middle school boy, who, through his actions and the male gaze, reinforces Sara's goodness.

We read the "look on Bernie's face" and his pointed question about his teacher's pit stains as a manifestation of the male gaze—that a woman's body and its appearance is always accessible for scrutiny by men. As a 12-year-old boy, Bernie is learning how and why to use this gaze on women to judge their outward appearance in relation to social

and cultural norms of beauty and as objects for male desire. In this case, Bernie uses his gaze to police Sara's body and point out what he interprets as a flaw—a woman's body producing sweat that is visible on her clothing. This feature of Sara's body disrupts the narrative that a woman's body must be perfect, and as women we must mask what all bodies do (sweat, pee, bleed, etc.).

How is the character of Bernie constructed in this memory? Sara describes him as a "two-voiced" student—one who manipulates and pushes buttons; one who is disingenuous with his teachers; and one who makes his teachers' bodies the topic of his jokes. He is living out a script of masculinity that puts men in control of women's bodies and how they get perceived, pointed at, and talked about. Sara, then, reinforces this narrative of masculinity by positioning Bernie as cruel and manipulative while a female student, Laura, gets described as "sweet" and Kara, the paraprofessional is supportive and thoughtful. Below, several of us work through how multiple characters in the memory are participating in the reproduction of narratives of female beauty, goodness, and teaching (including Sara herself as she analyzes her own actions in the story):

Justine: I'm a little confused by "sweet Laura." Bernie gets to be so many things. But Laura is a bit of a void for me.

Kristin: Laura's presence sets up this narrative that boys are bad and girls are good. Especially in this age group. Like middle school is when boys get bad and girls stay sweet to their teachers.

Tali: Yes, boys get more insensitive and girls get more sensitive.

Erin: Or perhaps there is some feminine camaraderie here. Laura and Kara are female. And Kara said that what Sara did was admirable. So there is this sense of

camaraderie between the females, the women in the story, in opposition to Bernie,

the only male voice. [pause] And when we're spending so much time

denying our bodies, we probably also then create lines in the sand between

male and female. 'Cause it takes a lot of energy to deny your body and make

it invisible all the time.

Sara: I think it's interesting that a lot of my resistance and the reason why I cared

about my observable reaction was because I was very aware about being a female

example and not reinforcing…[pause] So it's interesting that a lot of my

frustration and discomfort here is that he's pointing out that I have pit stains,

and women shouldn't have pit stains. Bernie is boxing me in by pointing out

how I don't fit into my role, because I'm a woman and I have pit stains, and I'm

boxing him in, too, pointing out exactly how he fits into his role, which is

negative.

We explore how multiple gendered narratives circulate here at once. As a

character, Bernie is complex while "sweet Laura" is flat. This juxtaposition establishes

the fixed gender binary of boys and girls and reinforced the dichotomy: boys are

bad/insensitive and girls are good/sensitive. Sara herself is focused on what her reaction

to Bernie's comment might say or reproduce about gender—she feigns confidence and

retorts, "Yeah! It's hot!" as she attempts to be a "female example," who does not

reinforce a stereotypically weak, submissive woman who might otherwise silently accept

an act of body policing from a man. In our analysis, Sara recognizes that she is being

"boxed in" to a particular kind of femininity by Bernie, but also sees how her reaction to

and categorization of Bernie boxes him in to a particular brand of masculinity and

construction of adolescence. Despite the fact that collective memory work methodologically emphasizes the importance of multiplicity, complexity, and contradictions, our story-telling tendency is to work things out and smooth over the jagged bits of our memories. In this way, we often sought to rationalize the presence of the male gaze or our reaction to it in the classroom. Below we work through several tidy conclusions we might draw about who Bernie is and why he told Sara that she had pit stains:

Sara: So many of my interactions with Bernie were so sexualized.

Kristin: Maybe he felt like you were a safe person to practice on.

Kelsey: Or he wanted to show that he didn't need a male role model in his life. That he's the man.

Erin: And if he's trying to live up to that version of masculinity, then that means offering you the banana. That means pointing out your body when he knows that it's going to make you uncomfortable.

Sara: Yeah. It was so much more about my personal discomfort. It always felt like some kind of weird sex thing, which you are so aware of as a young female teacher. I was always so aware of that, like, with every interaction, is this going to look weird? Is something that I say going to… Like maybe this isn't everyone, but it's the lens I have. It always felt so unfair, and threatening, and uncomfortable, and oppressive.

In fact, Sara's interaction with Bernie in this memory is all of these things, not one of them. Selecting a single reason or explanation for Bernie's actions epitomizes that desire we have to smooth over the contradictions and multiplicities of a lived experience

and try to make our stories mean one thing. In her reconstruction of the moment, Sara was both reinforcing normalizing gender narratives and working against the gendered story of women as passive and submissive. And in our analysis, we both resisted and reproduced the male gaze by recognizing how it operated through Bernie in the story and by turning the gaze on ourselves to explain why Bernie says the things he does—that women teachers are "safe" people for boys to practice the gaze on, or that Bernie lacked a male role model and needed to justify his manliness without one, or how I legitimate and criticize this "version of masculinity" that I see Bernie enacting. In the end, Sara even offers that she might be to blame for her body being policed as she wonders, "Is something I say going to…" What she doesn't verbalize at the end of this sentence is: attract or encourage unwanted sexual attention from my male students? Sara's memory, and our analysis of it, serves as an example of the messiness of the collective memory work process. In some ways, we reached a deeper analysis of objectification and our role in reproducing the heterosexual matrix; however, the power of the male gaze and normalized narratives of gender also crept into our discussion and impeded our ability to further disrupt a single story about Bernie, adolescence, masculinity, or the expectation that the teacher be able to control and manage the objectification done to her. To some degree, this feature of CMW—that we'll both disrupt and reproduce—will always happen, but it is important to notice when analysis seems to remain on the surface and ask why that might be happening.

30 Pairs of Eyes

In his eyes, Tali could see the shock she was sure was mirrored on her face. He quickly looked down and mumbled, "I didn't think anyone would hear that." …Tali was painfully aware of both the heat that had risen in her cheeks and the 30 pairs of eyes that were now turned towards her.

A summary of Tali's memory is as follows: it is the first week of school and Tali, a first-year teacher, is learning and adjusting, just beginning to understand what her role will entail. On this particular day, Tali works to get her talkative 6th hour class quietly writing in response to a prompt about a significant object. While they are writing, she grabs a stuffed Pumbaa that she has sitting on her desk and holds it on her lap. Just then, a female student looks up and says, "You look so cute with your Pumbaa." Without a beat, a male student comments, "She *always* looks cute." This surprises and embarrasses Tali, who calls out the young man's name and looks at him pointedly. Suddenly, all the students in the class have their eyes on Tali. She becomes anxious about what response to give this young man, ultimately deciding to say nothing. Instead, she pushes the Pumbaa away and tells the students to get back to work.

As a group, we carefully tracked references to eyes and seeing in this story during our analysis session, and these references highlight the power of sight, observation, and surveillance that characterizes teachers' experiences in the classroom. The first such reference in the memory occurs in the third sentence when Tali reports that her students are, "adjusting to the fact that their teacher looks as old as some of their peers." Immediately, it is evident that Tali is focused on how her students are perceiving her and her body—not only does "look" have the double meaning of physical appearance and the act of seeing, but the word "adjusting" is also a sight-related verb, describing how Tali is coming into focus in the eyes of her students. But what she imagines her students see is something unusual, something that breaks from the norm—Tali's students must adjust to accept/see a teacher who is young, like "some of their peers." For the rest of the memory, language related to eyes and seeing abounds—Tali is watching her students as they write,

she makes eye contact with Jadon, then Jadon breaks that eye contact by looking down, and finally, all of the eyes in the classroom are on her, waiting for her to respond to Jadon's comment. In fact, more than any physical description of the room (of which there is none) Tali and the students looking at her define our sense of classroom space in the memory. In addition, we learn nothing about the students' bodies in the room besides the fact that they have eyes; the students (besides Jadon and the female student) are described only collectively as "30 pairs of eyes."

As we analyzed the linguistic features of the story, we read the moment when Tali senses 30 pairs of eyes on her as an important narrative shift. We spent significant time working on different interpretations of the 30 pairs of eyes on Tali and her described "painful awareness" of them. What follows is an excerpt of this part of our analysis:

Kelsey: This part: "she's painfully aware of 30 pairs of eyes"—so what happened between these two paragraphs so that now everyone in the class was intent on paying attention?

Erin: Well, she exclaimed, "Jadon!" this blurting response, maybe that's when all the students' attention turned toward her. Then all eyes were on her in that moment.

Justine: I was just so in tune with this feeling of being painfully aware of the 30 pairs of eyes. The eyes get so threatening when we don't want them. But how hard did you [Tali] work before to get them, you know, to get their eyes on you, like "I need your eyes on me, shut your mouths and give me your eyes," and then you really don't want them anymore. Go away. I completely felt that feeling when I was reading it outloud. I was like, I know exactly what you mean.

Here Kelsey identifies the abruptness with which the 30 pairs of eyes land on Tali in the memory—first no one (except Jadon) was looking at her and then suddenly everyone is. Kelsey also wonders if there is some intervening description missing in terms of how those eyes got oriented toward Tali. My response to Kelsey's question is to blame Tali for the eyes watching her—she blurted out Jadon's name, therefore the students must have been responding to her voice. But Justine quickly moves us into deeper analysis of the complexity of eyes on the teacher, and it helped us all think about that sense of painful awareness that Tali is experiencing. Justine's analysis explores the contradictory nature of being watched as a teacher. She expresses the frustration she feels when she desires the gaze of her students—so that she might perform authority and have control over her classroom, as she feels is expected of her—and in a split-second can wish that their gaze would disappear because it feels embarassing or even threatening. In this moment, Tali had worked hard to get her students to listen to and respond to her as their teacher, and then she is faced with their attention in a way that makes her feel vulnerable.

While seeing her students' eyes on her puts Tali in this painful and vulnerable position, we determine that it is Jadon's objectification of her that initially causes her discomfort and embarassment. In Tali's story, Jadon is learning how the male gaze can be used to objectify his teacher. His gaze has the power to embarass his teacher and turn all of his classmates' attention toward her body as well. In the memory, it is not the unnamed female student's comment about Tali's cuteness but Jadon's words that makes Tali upset. What is the difference between the two? First, of course, is the difference in the bodies these statements come from. The operation of the heterosexual matrix ensures that students' gender identities are fixed and easily categorized in the male/female binary.

Then, gender identity linked to hetero-sexuality makes a female student's comment to a female teacher non-sexual while a male student's comment inherently sexual. In addition, we explored a few lingustic differences between the statements that also hold important meaning. The female student uses the second person pronoun "you" to address Tali directly, and she particularlizes Tali's cuteness "with your Pumbaa." In the linguistic contstruction of the student's remark, Tali is appearing cute in the moment, because of the stuffed toy she holds on her lap; this implies that perhaps it, not Tali, is the ultimate source of cuteness. Conversely, in Jadon's comment the pronoun changes to "she," shifting it to be *about* Tali rather than *to* her; in effect, this distancing is objectifying. Additionally, through his use of the word "*always*," Jadon alters the temporality of Tali's cuteness from a temporary state caused by the presence of a stuffed toy to a permanent state that exists in and on Tali's body.

After parsing out these differences, we sought to understand how Tali reconstructed a moment that we came to understand as an instance of the male gaze operating through Jadon's remark, "She *always* looks cute." First, Justine asks about a vacuum in the memory—Jadon's tone:

Justine: How did he say it?

Tali: It was like a whisper, a mumble. I couldn't tell if he was trying to say it to the girl sitting next to him or what.

Justine: I have a lot of questions here like: snarky, creepy, sly, looking for laughs...?

In filling this vacuum, the question is: what role does tone or intention play in terms of the operation of the male gaze? Justine asked questions about Jadon's motivation, but

according to Tali, Jadon's intentions were ambiguous, perhaps not even known to him. This characterizaton is in line with the pervasiveness and normativity of the male gaze. It is not that we set out to view women as objects and dehumanize them, but seeing the world that way—that a binary gender is a given, that certain traits are "natural" in men or women, and that women's bodies are primarily objects at men's disposal—has become a given. Justine—and the rest of us—want to know why Jadon made his comment to Tali so that we can individualize and properly blame him for the action. But the male gaze is not about individual intent, it's about systemic and persistant sexism; Jadon is learning how to participate in and reproduce patriarchy.

As part of his participation in this system, Jadon also learns that the construction of polite sexism requires that he objectify his teacher but appear to not want his remarks be heard by her. In the analysis excerpt below, we discuss how Jadon and his actions are characterized in Tali's memory.

> **Erin**: How is Jadon positioning himself in this moment? He seems to suddenly realize, like, shit, that wasn't cool, but...
>
> **Kelsey**: But it's what I [Jadon] think.
>
> **Erin**: Right? He didn't say, "I didn't mean that." He said, "I didn't think anyone would hear that."
>
> **Kelsey**: He's not sorry about it.
>
> **Justine**: Yeah.
>
> **Kristin**: I read it as he didn't mean to say that, it just came out. It was like an internal thought.

In the memory, Tali builds a particular construction of Jadon through the series of actions he takes after making his comment. First, Tali makes eye contact with him and pointedly says his name. Tali percieves shock in his expression before he breaks his gaze, looks down, and then mumbles, "I didn't think anybody would hear that." In our analysis of this moment in the memory, we read Jadon as sorry for being heard, but not sorry for making his comment. In this way, Jadon is learning the nuanced rules of the male gaze and sexual objectification of women: to be a man one must reproduce the male gaze and assert one's gender and hetero-normativity through comments that sexualize women; however, those comments cannot be too overt or threatening—subtlety is far more powerful than explicit vulgarity. So, Jadon feels sorry for being heard by the target of his gaze/comment, but not for the comment itself. He must remain "polite" in enacting the gaze—and he knows that he has crossed that line when his teacher is startled and the rest of the class turns their gaze to her. An alternate reading of Jadon and his actions and speech, one that might allow his desire to be alive in the classroom without it being threatening to his teacher, is missing from our collective analysis. Tali admits that Jadon's intentions are ambiguous, but as a collective we often worked to clarify those intentions in one particular way—as yet another manifestation of the male gaze. Is there room for another interpretation? What might allow that understanding to live in our memories among our constructions of hetero-patriarchal control and violence?

Thus, it is important to examine how we collectively attempted to make sense of Tali's and Jadon's actions in this story, and how we try to figure out what moments like these mean. We look to the memory for answers as to why sexual objectification happens in classrooms, who ought to be blamed for it, and how women teachers might respond

when they become an object of desire by their male students. Justine sums up the inherent contradiction in this position by asking an unanswerable question:

Justine: Is it good or bad that they think you're hot?

All: [Laughter]

We laugh in response to Justine's question, I think, because the options for answers here aren't fair—they are options constructed by the male gaze (if it's good, we admit the power in being the "sexy teacher"—consenting to or finding pleasure in being a sexual object for our students to gaze at; if it's bad, we're full of shame and/or self blame about how our bodies are being perceived by our students) and reinforced through the grid of the heterosexual matrix. When a teacher is living out any non-normative gender identity or sexual orientation, those options become uncomfortable at best and dangerous at worst. Further, when a teacher is raced as non-white, her body is always already being dehumanized—exoticized and fetishized—by white people; being sexually objectified and perceived as "hot" could further dehumanize her and create an even greater risk for violence. When or if race is ever acknowledged in these stories, the consequences of the options—is it good or bad if they think you're hot—could lead to threats of or actual violence toward teachers. So in order to avoid discussing those potential narratives, we particularize the experience to Tali as a young woman and brand new teacher:

Kelsey: This seems like a defining moment for Tali. It's the end of the first week of school. This is her first classroom. And it's her first time, we're assuming from this piece of writing, being confronted as...

Erin: as an object.

Kelsey: Yes. Yes.

In the beginning of her story, Tali qualifies her abilities as a brand new teacher: she is "*starting* to think that *maybe* she can get a handle on this teaching thing *after all* [italics added]." She uses a physical, embodied metaphor of grabbing a handle to describe her relationship to this new role, and then she is left shocked and silenced when her body becomes the curriculum of the classroom. When all eyes are on her, she finds herself caught in the middle of competing narratives about what white women teachers should be—good, chaste, and pure or young and sexy—and how she cannot be both and wants to be neither. We highlight the fact that this is a critical moment for Tali because it is her "first time" being objectified by a student—because we all know it will not be the last. Therefore, it seems, learning to be gazed at, to be objectified, is part of the process of learning to be a woman teacher. And in this way we are essentially just bracing ourselves for the next terrible thing to happen to our bodies.

Not Just a Whistle

Kathryn bends over to pick up the ball of paper and that is when she hears someone whistle. But it's not just a whistle; it's a wolf-whistle, and boys behind her laugh as if someone just made a joke. Kathryn turns around to see four young teenage boys with quickly fading smirks on their faces.

Kathryn's memory begins with a detailed description of her classroom, which has been haphazardly set up for a Socratic Seminar (two circles of desks, one inside the other). As Kathryn makes her final preparations for class, the bell rings and her students who enter the room react in various ways to the rearrangement of desks. Kathryn admits to feeling "disorganized and chaotic" that day—a reflection of how she views the classroom in this moment as well. While her students are getting settled in their seats, someone throws a ball of paper into the middle of the inner circle near where Kathryn is standing. As she bends down to pick it up she hears someone wolf whistle at her,

followed by laughter coming from a group of boys. Kathryn is flustered and speechless, and the class falls silent. Unsure what to do since she cannot determine who actually whistled at her, she tells the whole class that "whistling at your teacher is not okay" and then continues on with the lesson.

As in Sara's memory, the space and its objects in Kathryn's classroom shape the experience she is having and the ways that we begin to analyze the memory. Jaquinetta comments early on in our discussion, "I feel like the desks are people in this story…" and as a group we continue to return to this notion that, in the memory, the desks function in multiple ways: as characters in and of themselves, to mirror Kathryn's internal state, and to reproduce a narrative about control of bodies in classrooms. Kathryn's description of the desks in the memory reads:

> The circular desks confirm that today is Socratic Seminar day. The desks
> are arranged in two hasty haphazard circles. There is a smaller circle,
> which is closer to the center of the classroom, and a larger circle of desks
> surrounding the smaller one. And although most of the desks are used in
> this configuration, there are still a number of desks scattered on the
> outside.

In Kathryn's description of the desks, she begins by making them agentic—asserting that they (not her or her students) "confirm that today is Socratic Seminar day," and thus they control the pedagogy of the classroom. Though not explicitly stated in the memory, we assume that this configuration of desks for Socratic Seminar is significantly different from the usual arrangement of desks in rows, facing the front of the room. Essentially, we get a more detailed description of the desks—their positions, orientations, characteristics,

and roles—than we do of the human characters (students or teacher) in this story. These desks, "hasty and haphazard," forecast the emotion experienced by both Kathryn and her students. First, the students enter the room with a "collective sigh" and a heightened sense of anticipation about participating in Socratic Seminar. They seem to be choosing their seats at random, some even attempting to sit in seats that are not positioned in either the inner or outer circle. Through her narration, Kathryn, too, admits to feeling "disorganized and chaotic" as she monitors the classroom, gets drowned out by her students' voices, and then gets stuck, forced to "squeeze through two layers of desks, backpacks, jackets, and students" in order to move from one part of the room to the other. Not only do the desks mirror Kathryn's internal state of uncertainty, but Kathryn's attempt to control these desks (mediocre at best) also reflects her attempt to manage her students' bodies in the room. We note that the passive verb construction in the description of the desks suggests that they have been situated that way (the desks "are arranged" and "are used") without an arranger ever being named. While we fill this vacuum, making Kathryn the arranger of desks, the linguistic passivity that distances her from this process further separates her from her own classroom—and constructs a feeling of Kathryn's lack of control over this space.

The existence of teacher control (or lack thereof) is a commonsense narrative that circulates about teaching—the story says that control exists in and from within the teacher and is a necessary component of "classroom management." Despite the frequency with which we all admitted that control is an illusion, we still often returned to and relied on the story that the "good teacher" has control—over her students, her curriculum, the physical space of her classroom, and her own body. In this memory, the teacher's lack of

control over the desks, the students, their treatment of her body, and her response to being whistled at are linked together in such a way that the narrative that control is possible and the "good teacher" has it gets reproduced. Therefore, one way we interpreted the construction of the teacher in Kathryn's memory was as a teacher who lacked control. In our analysis, understanding this interpretation included a close look at how Kathryn and her students are named throughout the story and when and how those descriptors change. Jaquinetta begins this line of analysis by pointing out the changes in identifiers throughout the piece:

> **Jaquinetta**: Here…students to boys, to teenage boys. And then we go from Kathryn to woman, and then from woman to teacher. It's like there is this transformation.

Jaquinetta notices how the "students" depicted in the beginning of the story later get named as "boys," and then at the end of the memory become "teenage boys;" first the identifier is narrowed by gender and then gender and age are specifically designated. As the descriptors of students become more particularized, references to the teacher become increasingly generic and distancing. Kathryn is first referred to by her name, later to be identified as "woman," and then as "teacher." In our analysis, Kathryn notices this, too, and reiterates this linguistic feature of the memory:

> **Kathryn**: I circled my name in the memory, and I noticed how often the name is used, and then when the name is not used. Like when I say "teacher" or "woman" instead of Kathryn.

> **Erin**: Here it says, "whistling at your teacher is not okay" not "whistling at a woman, or whistling at Kathryn (or me) is not okay."

Jaquinetta: Why does it seem wrong to put "Kathryn" in there? It feels like you couldn't say "Kathryn" you had to say, "your teacher."

One way to interpret this linguistic transformation is to align it with Kathryn's increasing feelings of lack of control building to the crisis moment of the whistle. At the start of the memory, Kathryn feels anxious and the classroom is haphazard, but she is still performing the role of teacher—getting class started, checking student work, explaining the day's agenda and the expectations for Socratic Seminar. But in the moments during and after the whistle, Kathryn no longer knows how to be a teacher, describing herself as "unsure" and "at a loss for words." As the character of Kathryn gets constructed as a teacher losing control she loses her name and then her gender, becoming generic "teacher." On one hand, Kathryn's transformation to teacher might signify that this story represents women teachers beyond this teacher in this moment; on the other hand, Kathryn as generic teacher—distanced from her self and her gender identity—could also signify a greater feeling of the inevitability of teacher performance of control in schools. Kristin and Sara note:

Kristin: We have this intense…we just bow to the system and of what being a teacher entails.

Sara: …even though there's a wolf–whistle.

If the narrative says that the "good teacher" is in control of "what being a teacher entails" at all times, then getting whistled at by your students just becomes another moment in which you need to perform your role, maintain control, and manage your classroom. Likewise, getting whistled at—essentially being sexually harassed—also gets constructed as part of "what being a teacher entails."

While Kathryn's character becomes more generic in the memory, the students/boys/teenage boys gain specificity through their gender and age identification. The way these two contrary linguistic shifts happen simultaneously in the story is important because they depend on one another—as Jaquinetta notes, "You couldn't say 'Kathryn,' you had to say 'your teacher.'" As the moment of objectification and harassment of Kathryn's body is revealed, students become boys and then teenage boys. If Kathryn remained "Kathryn" while her male students are whistling at her, the danger would be close, personal, and undeniable. It would be Kathryn's body (my body) being sexually objectified or harassed by her (my) own students—a possibility that not only feels precarious but also could have serious ramifications for the students and for Kathryn's relationship with them. So instead, the students become "teenage boys," reproducing a narrative of masculinity and adolescence in which hormones, undeveloped frontal lobes, and impulsivity cause young men to do and say things they shouldn't, or don't mean to ("boys will be boys"). This narrative that dismisses the behavior also depends on Kathryn becoming teacher, so that there is no individual victim of these boys' "inappropriate behavior," and thus any necessary trial or punishment is avoided and Kathryn can still be perceived as a "good teacher" who manages her classroom and is in control of her students.

In addition to their age and gender becoming particularized, we also discussed how the male students in the memory are described as predatory and Kathryn is positioned as their prey. We worked through this interpretation of the memory by identifying particular language in the text, and using that language to construct this thematic reading of the memory:

Tali: In the language of this last paragraph…I mean, the students are predatory. And Kathryn is in this extremely vulnerable position in the middle of all of the…so like you're being seen from all angles but also you can't escape quickly and so you're kind of stuck, you're trapped, and they're all just there and then the whistle is described as a "wolf-whistle." And a wolf is the last thing you want your students…you don't want to feel like they're like that. But you're in an extremely vulnerable position and they totally pounced on it. For lack of a better word.

Erin: There's a danger in the classroom…that requires survival.

Kelsey: Yes, and the boys are in a pack.

Kristin: You're like, on a platter for them, stuck in the middle of the room with nowhere to go.

Tali: And Kathryn "stumbles out of the circle," like she's been wounded.

Noticing the predator/prey narrative in the language of the memory helped us see the complicated possibility of Kathryn (teacher) as a victim. This possibility is complicated because teacher-as-victim contradicts the narratives of teacher control over classroom management that the memory also reproduces. Can a victim teacher also be a teacher in control of her classroom? We also connected this narrative of predator and prey to an understanding of how the male gaze operates: men who take up the gaze also take on predator-like qualities of policing, stalking, attacking, disarming, and victimizing women. Tali asserts, "you don't want to feel like they're [students] like that [wolves]" but as you see the male gaze operating in and through your students, there is this sense of inevitability that they—and you—will take on these roles of predator and prey. This

allows us to individualize stories about the male gaze (these men who are doing this policing of these women) instead of seeing the male gaze in the larger systemic ways it reproduces sexism and the hetero-patriarchy.

When you layer on to this narrative of the construction of the women teacher as a kind, nurturing, and loving, her role as prey then must also include showing kindness and compassion toward her predator. Sara notes the "care and concern" that Kathryn has for her students as she is stumbling, wounded, out of the circle of desks:

> **Sara**: …"afraid of accusing the *wrong* student"—is the *wrong* student the one who whistled, or are the *wrong* students the ones who were laughing…just having that level of care and concern for your students when you just got wolf-whistled at. Like, this is so bad that I don't want to accuse the wrong person of it. Instead of—they're all right there and they could all be guilty!

This memory highlights the precarious and contradictory position of women teachers who are expected to both control their students via "classroom management" and be women: kind, compassionate, gentle, and nurturing. The contradiction here is exposed when her students sexually objectified Kathryn in her own classroom: how can she react in a way that allows her to maintain her authority and control while simultaneously shows care and concern for these students who have harassed her?

When we layered these interpretations of Kathryn's memory they helped us to understand how the male gaze is operating on a woman teacher in this moment, and what response that teacher could make to it. All of the ways that the language in the memory distances Kathryn from herself and her students—through the agentic desks controlling the pedagogy, the linguistically shifting identifiers of teacher and students, and the

reproduction of the predator/prey narrative—suggest that the memory is an attempt at self-preservation; essentially, this distancing separates Kathryn from her own body and makes the story about anything besides how her body feels exposed, violated, and hurt by her students in this moment. When confronted with precarity, danger, and vulnerability, distancing herself and denying her own body become the teacher's strategies for survival. Constructions of teaching and learning in which bodies are framed as unnecessary—that they get in the way of thinking and learning—or gross, dangerous, or distracting (particularly female bodies) also contribute to teachers' denial of their bodies. At the same time, the presence of the male gaze in the classroom is a constant reminder that our bodies are always being watched, policed, and objectified. So perhaps the disembodied woman teacher can attempt to avoid, or at least evade, being the recipient of the gaze from our male students. If I don't have a body, he cannot objectify, harass, or hurt it.

Discussion

Through our analysis of these three memories and an examination of how they tell both different and similar stories about the male gaze and the heterosexual matrix, I draw several conclusions about how white, cis-gendered, hetero-patriarchal power operates in the classroom. The male gaze has the power to operate individually within and between male students and their teachers; it also systemically constructs expectations for women teachers, encouraging us to deny our own bodies and police each other and ourselves. Across these memories, I will discuss how the male gaze functions in tandem with normalizing narratives of teacher control and classroom management, examine how the presence of the male gaze complicates our desire for more progressive pedagogies, and

explore how the male gaze creates both silence and scripts that ultimately alter the kinds of relationships that women teachers feel able to cultivate with their students.

Both in our memories and in our analysis of the memories, we saw the male gaze operating on women teachers' bodies in individualized ways. As a result, the power of the gaze diminishes us as we deny our bodies and police each other and ourselves. In our analysis of the stories it was often easiest to focus on the ways in which individual male students learn to literally gaze at and objectify women's bodies in school. In the middle school classroom, Bernie uses the male gaze to police his teacher's body, legitimating the image of the ideal woman body as one that does not sweat. His comments to Sara eventually become more sexual in nature; she recounts a future moment when Bernie "conspicuously offers her his banana." In Tali's memory, Jadon uses his gaze to draw his classmates' attention to their teacher's attractiveness. He also learns a polite sexism—to show remorse for being caught but not for the comment itself. Finally, the boys in Kathryn's memory take up the male gaze in a way that turns objectification into harassment. When Kathryn bends over, her students' whistle and subsequent laughter taps into her fears of and anxieties about sexual violence. Ultimately, just as there are rarely consequences for individual acts of objectification or harassment in our society (in fact, objectification of women in our society is quite normalized), the male students in the memories are not punished for their actions. They represent and reflect a larger culture of masculinity that perpetuates sexual assaults on women that go unaddressed. It is important that we continue to think through what these individual expressions of the male gaze mean for students and their teachers and how we might attempt to disrupt or respond to them.

But in order to challenge and disrupt individual moments of sexism or gender discrimination, we must also interrogate the systemic nature of the male gaze—the ways that it operates on an institutional level through the power of the hetero-patriarchy in schools, and how the teaching profession has been shaped to cultivate and support it. The male gaze does not come from nowhere or go nowhere—rather, it circulates in and out of schools via our histories, culture, and the normative narratives we all reproduce. Women teachers must find ways to explore how we, too, take up the male gaze when we police, shame, monitor, and objectify each other and ourselves. A powerful moment in our analysis of Kathryn's memory was when we collectively and explicitly took up the male gaze and oriented that gaze toward Kathryn during our session. Our use of the gaze here occurred when we were identifying a vacuum—a common practice in collective memory work—and as a result we reproduced the narrative of blaming the victim of sexual harassment:

> **Kelsey**: One vacuum in this story is…when Kathryn is bending over, what is she wearing?
>
> **Kristen**: Mmm. That's a good point.
>
> **Kelsey**: I wear a lot of dresses to school, and when I imagine bending over in a dress I think, what a terrible idea.
>
> **Kristin**: This might just be me but I totally imagine a pencil skirt.
>
> **Kelsey**: That's the sexualized teacher thing that's coming through here I think.
>
> **Jaquinetta**: Yes, what was the teacher wearing?

Through our desire to know what Kathryn is wearing in the story, as if that information could somehow help us understand this moment when a teacher gets whistled

at by her students, we evoke the narrative that if we know how provocatively a woman is dressed we can determine whether she deserved to be sexually harassed. This blaming the victim narrative is a story about women's bodies that is so engrained in us that we don't even notice that we are using it to police each other. When Kristin says, "This might just be me but I totally imagine a pencil skirt," it, in fact, isn't "just [her]" doing that imagining, but a larger imagination/sexualization of women, constructed systemically through the male gaze. This is an example of one way the male gaze works through women, too, as we took it up to gaze at Kathryn's body in and through her memory. Did focusing on moments of individual male students gazing at, commenting on, or whistling at their women teachers' bodies allow us to conceptualize the male gaze as an individualized act, thus ignoring the symbolic and systemic ways that hetero-patriarchal power perpetuates in schools, and reproduces itself in us? The rest of this discussion section takes a closer look at how the male gaze operates systemically through narratives of classroom management and control, pedagogical moments, and the silence and scripts that influences how teachers build and maintain relationships with their students.

First, the male gaze works in tandem with narratives of teacher control and classroom management. Essentially, the male gaze genders teacher control and authority so that as women teachers we must aim to control our students, our curriculum, and ourselves, but we can never fully achieve that control in part because the male gaze diminishes our humanness and our bodies. This systemic power of the male gaze is exemplified in Justine's story:

> **Justine**: I think about how many times every day I hear the word "bitch." I got
> called a "bitch" by a boy running down the hall today. I am so sick of hearing

"bitch" and being called "bitch" and, you know, that's a level one behavior, so if I

called someone about it they'd say, "I'm sorry, that's a level one behavior and

you have to handle level one behaviors in your classroom." So, okay. But I feel

demeaned and dehumanized. So.

Here, Justine tells her own story of feeling sexually harassed at school through students'

use of the word "bitch." But the behavior protocol system prevents her from treating this

harassment as seriously as she feels it ought to be. Since negative verbal interactions

between teachers and students or students and students are considered level one if they do

not become physical, Justine cannot call on administrators, deans, counselors, or other

support staff to intervene when students use the word "bitch" or call their teacher a

"bitch." Unfortunately, this policy treats all language as if it is the same—rather than

reflecting the belief that some language is considered generally rude or disrespectful,

while other language is pointedly threatening or demeaning towards women, people of

color, the LGBTQ community, or people with disabilities. As evidenced by the way we

differentiate between free speech and hate speech, language can do different kinds of

damage or violence towards different people. Of course, there is little language that

specifically dehumanizes cis-gendered heterosexual men, so the power of the male gaze

categorizes all language offenses as level one, even when a marginalized community is

being targeted. Though these memories depict circumstances in which the language or

actions of students might not be considered hate speech towards women, in all cases the

women teachers clearly felt the weight of managing and controlling their students' sexist

language and behaviors by themselves. Further, sharing these memories with the

collective was an act of bravery and vulnerability, as the closed-door, deal-with-it-

yourself narrative of the good teacher in control discourages teachers from talking about these moments with colleagues or administrators.

Next, the male gaze complicates our beliefs about pedagogy by placing teachers with progressive pedagogies in increasingly vulnerable positions in the classroom. In the following exchange, Kathryn expresses how the arrangement of her classroom, connected to a more student-driven pedagogy, shifts the way the male gaze operates on her.

> **Kathryn**: It's interesting how our teacher space has shifted from the front of the room to the center…
>
> **Erin**: But the ways teachers are being objectified and positioned is the same whether you're in the middle of the room or up in the front and being the expert teacher.
>
> **Kathryn**: It's not the same because in the front it's safer. Because there is just one dimension of you that can be seen. But when you're in the middle, you're vulnerable from all sides and angles.

Progressive education theories ask teachers to disrupt the construction of the teacher as the 'sage on the stage,' and Kathryn has done this by arranging the students' desks to face each other instead of her—she wants her students to look at, learn from, and depend on one another rather than simply watching, learning from, and depending on her. I suggest to her that this change in pedagogies does nothing to change the way male students might position or objectify her, but Kathryn explains how actually, the student-centered approach creates a greater sense of danger. When her classroom is in a traditional arrangement of rows of desks facing the front of the room, Kathryn can see each of her students and they can all gaze at her. But with the desks arranged in concentric circles for

Socratic Seminar, Kathryn becomes vulnerable from all sides—she can be gazed at from every angle, even from those she cannot see. This new formation and orientation has left her vulnerable to sexual harassment in her classroom, as it is the students sitting behind her and outside her view who wolf-whistle at her and laugh. These boys are learning about the power their gaze has over their teacher, that through a gaze and a whistle they can reduce their teacher's body to an object. The Socratic Seminar setup in the classroom allows them to do so with greater anonymity.

This is not to say that teachers should abandon progressive pedagogies that de-center the role of the teacher, encourage collaboration, and position students as meaning-makers, but I think it is fair to say that these pedagogies have additional consequences and if they were developed by white men, perhaps those consequences were never considered. Ultimately, women teachers in our patriarchal culture are never truly safe from body policing, objectification, or violence, even in their own classroom, and queer women and women of color face additional dangers of sexual and racial violence as teachers.

Finally, the male gaze puts women teachers into contradictory positions—expected to be both pure and chaste and the "sexy teacher" and to simultaneously control her students and be controlled by the patriarchal school system. Trapped in these impossibilities, women's teacher bodies are always wrong, and often this wrongness leads to moments of pedagogical silence. In Sara's memory, the teacher is able to respond to the student in the moment, but is left with unresolved feelings about the interaction—and doubts that Bernie understood the full impact of his actions, especially considering his future behavior with the banana. In Tali's memory, the teacher's silence is palpable as

all eyes are on her, waiting for her to respond to Jadon's comment. But, completely unsure about what she might say or how to say it, she stays silent about the incident and tells her students to get back to work. In Kathryn's memory, there is also silence—while Kathryn does tell her students that, "whistling at your teacher is not okay" she also quickly moves forward with the lesson, deciding not to directly address the boys who whistled and laughed at her. The teachers' silence in these moments is also a product of the male gaze, which aims to shut down women teachers' attempts to make their voices heard or to speak out against the policing, objectification, or harassment they have endured. In order to normalize the perspective of white, cis-gendered, heterosexual men, women teachers must stay silent in response to being marginalized, thus allowing the male gaze to remain the "natural" and "neutral" way of seeing the world.

An alternative to pedagogical silence is a script, in which women teachers practice a set response to students who police our bodies or sexually objectify or harass us. In our collective, the script was framed as a better alternative to silence, but not that much better. After not knowing what to say to her students when she was whistled at, Kathryn talked with a colleague and wrote out a script so she would be prepared the next time it happened. Her script read:

> **Kathryn**: "Do not whistle at me. When you whistle at me you turn me into an object and I can longer be the teacher who helps you. So plea…no. Do not whistle at me." I say please a lot, so I try not to say please because it's not a request. And I want to be taken seriously. Please do not objectify me sounds too accommodating.

Kathryn has thought carefully about what to tell her students and how to say it if/when she is ever whistled at in class again. This script could also be altered to address a student's objectifying comment, or some other sexist or misogynistic act. However, this script also requires teachers to suppress their emotions and depersonalize the experience of being violated in the classroom. While she does include personal pronouns in the script, it's written generically enough to get used in response to many different students or occasions. This decontextualized nature of the script distances teachers and students, disallowing them from forming relationships based on love, trust, and connection. The script is also void of emotion—the teacher never tells the students how being whistled at makes her feel. Instead, the consequences of the script are related to how it will impact the student—"I can no longer be the teacher who helps you." These two possible responses—silence and scripts—offer women teachers very little and lead to us turning away from our students in moments of crisis and pain, not toward them. Sexism is harmful for our students, too, but responding to it with silence or a script only masks and ignores the violence happening in our classrooms.

Conclusion

Justine: I think it's really important to hang on to this—that we are positioned by these spaces and the histories of women's bodies as teachers. Those histories live in our bodies and we carry them with us.

The histories of women teachers that live in our bodies continue to be reflected in the systemic and institutional operation of the male gaze in our classrooms today. Living inside our teacher bodies is the woman teacher who was paid three times less than a man, the pregnant teacher who was fired because her body exposed the existence of her

sexuality, and the teacher whose administrators feared would never be shown respect by her students because she was physically small and appeared young. We carry with us a social anxiety about women teachers, known as "woman peril," in which male educators made dire prophesies about the emasculating effects of women teachers on boys (Johnson, 2008). There is a woman teacher in us who is regulated by the heterosexual matrix—asked again and again are you married, do you have a boyfriend, and why not? Our white, women, cis-gendered teacher bodies are both advantage and liability. On one hand, there are dangers we will never know and violence we will never experience based on our unearned social privileges of race and gender identity. On the other hand, white men *must* police our white women bodies as they work to protect and uphold white supremacist culture, beliefs, and values. We each contain Sara's bodily "imperfections," Tali's anxiety about being too young, too attractive, and therefore not good enough, and the skirt that Kathryn threw away when it was no longer safe to wear again.

Chapter Five: Teaching as Invasion: Emotions, Boundaries, and Entanglements

Prologue

Based on her account of agential realism, post-humanist Karen Barad (2007) depicts the world as made up of entanglements between humans and nonhumans, both agentic in their intra-actions (agency, according to Barad, is not something one "has" but a relationship, something one is in, that is, the intra-action). However, things or objects do not precede their encounter, rather, their possibility emerges from the intra-actions in which they are entangled. Because everything is deeply entangled with everything else, the observations we make about the world are cuts that include some things and exclude others. We make these temporary cuts so that we might look at something long enough to construct knowledge about it. Using this concept to understand the boundaries in our teacher-student relationships that we build and invade helps me to see the ways materials, humans, and discourses are entangled and to think about why, in our encounters, certain things become more visible and other things are more difficult to see, or completely invisible, in a given moment.

The memories in this chapter can all be interpreted (and indeed, as a collective we understood them) as stories about the invasion of borders and boundaries related to teacher-student relationships. Through encounters between humans, non-humans, discourses, and spatial landscapes, these boundaries get established and constructed, invaded, disrupted, and resisted, and often re-established and fortified. Sometimes one boundary gets solidified as another is challenged. Wrapped up in these invasions are the politics, histories, and sociality of emotions that get produced and practiced through an encounter, and that also construct our very surfaces and boundaries—our emotions are

both psychological and social, individual and collective (Ahmed, 2004, p. 10). In this chapter, post-humanist theories of entanglements and intra-actions (Barad, 2007) and Sara Ahmed's (2004) theory of the sociality of emotions help me to extend our collective analysis and continue to theorize teaching as invasion.

This chapter begins with our collective's constructed writing prompt and a post-humanist analysis of the notion of bodily perception, which was the topic of our prompt. Then the chapter is organized into three parts: each part alternates between the full text of a memory we produced in response to the prompt, and analysis I bring to the stories with excerpts from our collective's analysis woven into and through it. After the three memories are presented and analysis is offered for each one, I end the chapter with an epilogue that discusses the possibilities for using post-humanism and the theory of the sociality of emotions in tandem to understand our memories of teacher-student intra-actions and teaching as invasion.

Writing Prompt

Write about a moment when you felt your teacher body being perceived in a very particular way (by students, parents, administrators, colleagues, or yourself).

Davies et al. (2013), in their most recent published iteration of their collective biography work, began with the trigger questions, "What is your first memory of being recognized? What is your first memory of not being recognized?" (p. 684). These prompts about the concept of recognition stemmed from the prevalence of awards given to those who excel or perform above the expectations of the norm in schools and workplaces. In schools recognition for students might manifest itself in many ways: awards each quarter or semester for grades, attendance, participation, behavior, or

excellence; Student of the Week/Month, or daily prizes for sitting still, being prepared, completing assignments, or being kind to others. Davies, et al. were interested in the ways that this recognition constructs our subjectivity. Through analysis of their memories, they came to see recognition functioning as a regulating force, an act of subjectification, and most importantly, a practice of differenciation (p. 681). For their collective, Barad's concept of *entanglements*—understanding "being as the ongoing emergence of entangled beings" served as an important tool for seeing recognition as intimately tied to the production of difference (p. 681). Likewise, I see how our prompt is a question about the subjectification of the body as it is *perceived* and therefore comes into being through its entanglements with other humans, non-human objects, discourse, and spatial landscapes. Perception builds and creates its own sense of difference—and a particular set of boundaries around roles, positions, power, and expectations of students and teachers to highlight that difference.

Our decision to write about *perception*, like Davies et al.'s (2013) *recognition*, stemmed from our lived experiences as women teachers who have been constructed, via the gender binary, as the "other" sex—marked in opposition to "normal" maleness (Grosz, 1994). Because of this normalizing narrative of gender, we have come to recognize our bodies as constituted through the perceptions and judgments of others and in opposition to bodies discursively constructed as "male." At the same time we recognize that, intersecting with our perceived gender identity, is a host of other identity markers—including race, social class, (dis)ability, sexual orientation, and age—which each contain a multitude of narratives, create a new set of inscriptions on/for us, and draw new boundaries around who we are expected, allowed, or disallowed from being. Being

perceived as "Black woman," "young woman," or "queer woman," for instance, each carries a different range of possibilities, and requires us to accept, ignore, or disrupt boundaries differently.

The concept of perception also assumes relationship and depends on encounter (which we then explicated in the parenthesis of the prompt through the naming of those doing the perceiving—students, parents, administrators, colleagues, or self). While a "self" and an "other"—both humans—are usually identified within an encounter in which our bodies are being perceived, there were also non-human objects, discourses, and spatial landscapes that played a role in our stories of perception. In this way, Barad's (2007) notion of entanglements can help me read how our collective came to understand these bodily perceptions, including why some aspects of the intra-actions were made visible or invisible to us during the production of our remembered moments and in our collective analysis of them. Additionally, we looked closely at the boundaries that were built into these perceptions and our analysis functions as cuts we make in our entanglements as we work to make sense of them.

Finally, our prompt about perception links these bodily expectations and boundaries to emotion, as notions of perception are also tied up in the ways we feel able to express (or not) emotions on and through our body and how those affective interactions are read and understood by others. Perception itself has emotion circulating through it. But when we rely on individualized and autonomous conceptions of emotion, not only does "reason" get positioned in opposition to and above emotion, but humans are also expected to have the ability to control their emotions and to "experience 'appropriate' emotions at different times and places" (Ahmed, 2004, p. 3). Other's

perceptions of our bodies, then, include their judgments about how we're "handling" our

emotions, and whether we're embodying "good" emotions or "unruly" ones. Perceptions

of emotions, as attributes of bodies, become "bound up with the securing of social

hierarchy" (p. 4). We wrote the following memories with the triggering concept of

perception of our teacher bodies, but complex encounters, material objects, and theories

of emotions became part of how we told our perceived bodies into existence and the work

our bodies do to invade the boundaries and social hierarchies that have been constructed

between and around our students and us.

Kelsey's Memory: *It Makes Me Feel Better*

Kelsey was sitting at the front of the room on an uncomfortable metal stool. This

is the signal to students that Kelsey needs their attention. Sitting teacher = attention. One

student who was not a member of Kelsey's class was in the room because she was feeling

more anxious than usual. The student, Karen, often shared problems at home and at

school with Kelsey. She and the student had an arrangement: if Karen needed somewhere

to go, she was always welcome in Kelsey's classroom as long as she was not a distraction

to the learning. Since Karen was extroverted and chatty by nature, sometimes she needed

a little reminding.

This particular day Karen needed more support than usual. Similar to many people

who suffer from some sort of mental illness, Karen had a few strategies that she

employed to help her remain calm. Her favorite: playing with hair. During one-on-one

conversations with Kelsey, Karen would often stand behind Kelsey and talk about her

problems and things that were bothering her. While doing this, Karen often played with

Kelsey's hair. Both parties were fine with this arrangement.

While Kelsey was sitting on the stool this day, Karen walked into the classroom and immediately made her way to the front of the class where Kelsey was sitting on the stool. As Kelsey was giving her lecture and instructions, Karen stood behind her and played with her hair as had happened so often previously. This time, however, Kelsey was very uncomfortable. Now, there was a class of 36 students staring at her while another student played with her hair. After a few minutes, one student in the classroom raised his hand.

"Miss, why is Karen playing with your hair?"

While thinking of how to answer the question, Kelsey heard other students in the background murmuring and muttering many of the same questions.

Karen answered, "It makes me feel better. I'm very anxious today."

"Anxious about what?" another student asked.

"Well, my mom is being a b--"

"Karen," Kelsey cut her off, "you know what the deal is. You want to be in here, you can't be a distraction."

Analysis: A Stool, Hair, and Emotional Reciprocity

In the institution of school, boundaries and borders get drawn between nearly everything: teachers, students, families, groups of students, subjects, grade levels, "ability" levels, diagnoses, time, knowledge, etc. It is within, through, and across these boundaries—some figurative and others physical, some that appear fixed, and others porous and changing—that teachers and students perform their roles and intra-act with one another and the material and discursive world around them. These boundaries determine how teachers and students build relationships with one another; however,

school boundaries and borders are also constantly being tested, disrupted, broken, and re-established. When teaching is conceived as an act of invasion, this disruption of institutional boundaries is viewed as an important part of the encounter between teachers and students. Each invasion opens up a new questions and possibilities for how our bodies experience entanglements with other bodies, materials, and discourses in the classroom. In Kelsey's memory, membership in one class or another is an institutional boundary reasserted between Karen and the students in Kelsey's classroom (in this case, Karen does not belong in this class—her name is not on the roster). Both Kelsey and Karen have invaded this boundary, allowing Karen to sit in Kelsey's class even though she doesn't have institutional membership in it. This invasion creates the possibility for an encounter that can be perceived and interpreted in multiple ways.

Because Kelsey's memory begins with an introduction to a non-human character (the metal stool), an opening was provided for us to consider how our experiences in the world include and are shaped by the non-human things that surround and intra-act with us. From a humanist standpoint, it is Kelsey who sits on and acts on the "uncomfortable metal stool," but from a post humanist perspective, the stool also works to prop up Kelsey's body, supporting and positioning it. The descriptor "uncomfortable" when attributed to the stool, could suggest that the stool is in a precarious position in this intra-action, shaping Kelsey's role as teacher in its encounter with her body. Perhaps it is not just the materials and construction of the metal stool that makes it uncomfortable for Kelsey to sit on, but there is also something discomforting in this entanglement of teacher and stool—an encounter that Kelsey describes as constructing the authority of the teacher ("sitting teacher = attention"). Indeed, as the memory continues, Kelsey's perceptions of

teacher authority and the role she feels must be lived out in her teacher body are far from comforting as she works to build and develop relationships with her students within and across these authoritarian boundaries.

Erin: Okay, let's look at the language. What do you notice?

Tali: The language of discomfort. Being uncomfortable. The uncomfortable metal stool. The uncomfortable teacher.

Erin: Is that a discomfort with being at the front of the room as a teacher, or just discomfort in the role in general…?

Sara: Or physical discomfort. Comfortable seats are hard to come by. Teachers will steal them.

In the CMW analysis process, we look closely at repetition in our stories to see if it tells us something important. In this case, the repetition of "sitting on the stool" is important because an agential object (the stool) is entangled in an encounter between Kelsey, Karen, and the rest of the class. The stool holds and positions Kelsey's body in a way that creates space for Karen to stand behind her and play with her hair. But Kelsey also associates any encounter with the stool as a signal to the class that she, the teacher, needs her students' attention so that she might teach them. Therefore, the stool's agency includes the way it works to elevate (literally and figuratively) Kelsey's teacher authority and build a relationship between Kelsey and her class that fits within normative boundaries of teacher-student relationships. Karen, standing behind Kelsey and playing with her hair, is in an encounter with Kelsey, her hair, and the stool that fits another set of

boundaries they've built, but comes into conflict with the teacher control boundaries that Kelsey practices as she intra-acts with the stool.

At the end of the memory, this feeling of discomfort has shifted from the "uncomfortable metal stool" to Kelsey as she finds herself attempting to maintain one boundary (teacher authority with a whole class of students) while invading another (physical touch and intimacy with a student). The possibility there is something discomforting in the entanglement of teacher and stool is relevant here as Kelsey expresses that she is uncomfortable in this moment. Thus, the separateness of stool and teacher—via the uncomfortable-ness of both—is blurred. The teacher body on the stool is a signal to students to give Kelsey their attention, but suddenly her students' eyes on her as she sits on the stool and as Karen plays with her hair is a disruption to her authority in the classroom rather than a reaffirmation of it.

Kristin: I noticed that Karen has a safe seat, but Kelsey only has an uncomfortable stool. Like, the student has a safe place to be, but the teacher only ever has an uncomfortable seat. And the two in relationship to each other makes the difference seem important.

Kelsey: Yeah, so Karen's safe seat was actually my teacher chair at my desk in the back of the room, and I often thought about bringing that chair up to the front of the room and sitting in it and putting my feet up and, maybe, teaching the way I would feel most comfortable—like physically and in other ways—but I did that once and I got in trouble for it. So then I just sat on the metal stool.

Here, Kelsey offers an alternative way she might intra-act with material objects in her classroom in order to experience authority as a teacher in a different way. Instead of perching on her uncomfortable metal stool, Kelsey describes a time when she brought her teacher chair up to the front of the room and put her feet up—as a way to feel more comfortable, physically and otherwise, as she taught. While this chair she describes is still a "teacher chair" (thus, imbuing her with teacher authority) it also allows the teacher body to be oriented differently—in a more relaxed position, perhaps with her eyes on the same level as the eyes of her students sitting in their desks. But, Kelsey admits that she "did that once and got in trouble for it" and has hence used the stool. This comfortable chair has since become Karen's safe seat (the chair still gets to provide refuge for someone), and the stool has worked to raise Kelsey's teacher presence and has, perhaps connectedly, made her less comfortable with her role and authority.

Thus, there are two "arrangements" in Kelsey's memory that construct a different set of boundaries around Kelsey and Karen, boundaries that work to disrupt the institutional hierarchy between them. This first "arrangement" states that Karen can come into Kelsey's classroom, even if it is not during Karen's class, as long as she is not a "distraction." While one boundary has been invaded (who belongs in what class), the arrangement creates a particular set of circumstances in which the boundary can be invaded—in this case, because of her anxiety, Karen is welcome in Kelsey's classroom as long as she is not a distraction to others (Karen's anxiety itself may also be seen as a boundary—characterizing Karen's mental health/state in order to draw lines around her student identity). The fluid nature of "distraction" means that on any given day what counts as a distraction might look, sound, or feel different. Ultimately, as the teacher,

Kelsey has the power to determine whether Karen is a distraction. When we consider the role that authority plays in the invasion of institutional boundaries and the establishment and monitoring of new borders and boundaries, the discomfort of the metal stool takes on heightened meaning. In this encounter, and in the innumerable encounters that teachers experience on any given day, Kelsey feels compelled to enact her teacher authority, which sometimes means simultaneously upholding and disrupting institutional boundaries between herself and her students. These encounters can produce relationships of love and care, or cause harm to herself, her students, or their relationships.

In Kelsey's memory, hair takes on a role that is both body part and object as it participates in the encounter between Karen and her teacher. "Hair playing" is also the second arrangement between the two of them—and represents another boundary disruption. As teacher, Kelsey has invaded the boundary that disallows physical touch and intimacy between students and their teachers by letting Karen play with her hair. But the invasion of this boundary, again, creates new boundaries through their "arrangement." Hair playing can happen, despite its violation of normative student-teacher boundaries, if it occurs when Karen is talking to Kelsey about her problems during one-on-one conversations. These new boundaries are drawn up to protect Kelsey's authority as the teacher and preserve the hierarchy of power between herself and her student. In these encounters, the hair intra-acts with Kelsey and Karen, opening space for the two to talk about difficult subjects and for Karen to be open about her anxiety. From a post humanist approach, the hair is playing with and between the boundary between Karen and Kelsey, even as new boundaries and borders are being constructed. The hair plays with their

relationship as it allows for physical touch and intimacy; the intra-action is reminiscent of sisters, mother-daughter, or close girlfriends, rather than teacher-student.

Erin: What else do you notice?

Sara: There's something about the hair, and playing with hair. There's something girly or feminine about that. And intimate, too, because of the hair. I remember when I taught middle school the female students always wanted to play with my hair and, like, I never knew, you know…if it was okay. I had a similar moment to Kelsey's when another teacher was watching…and it wasn't a female, you know, and a different level of comfort would have been there if the male teacher wasn't watching. Because there's something weirdly intimate about it.

Kristen: Because it's reciprocal. She's getting something out of playing with your hair and you're getting something if your hair is being played with. Both people are feeling cared for in the process.

The notion of emotional reciprocity that we discuss in our analysis session, in this case, the feelings of love, care, pleasure, intimacy, and security that are exchanged in an encounter between teacher, student, and hair while "playing with hair" can be further understood through Sara Ahmed's (2004) theory of the sociality of emotions in *The Cultural Politics of Emotion.* Ahmed writes, "feelings do not reside in subjects or objects, but are produced as effects of circulation" (p. 8). Emotions, therefore, are social and cultural practices. The word *emotion* comes from the Latin word *emovere*, which means, "to move, to move out" (p. 11). Emotions are about movement—between subjects and

objects—but also about "attachments or about what connects us to this or that" (p. 11). Those attachments have histories and politics. Ahmed argues, "emotions show us how power shapes the very surface of bodies as well as worlds" (p. 12). Her purpose, which is to move the conversation about emotion from what they *are* to what they *do* complements and pushes our theorizing about the reciprocity of emotions. In several of these analysis excerpts, we work to challenge commonsense narratives about what emotions can or should be shared in relationships between students and teachers. But the notion of emotional reciprocity does rely on a conceptualization of emotions that is individualized. While reciprocity relies on sociality, it also assumes that emotions are things that individuals can have control over and then give and receive with others. Ahmed would argue that our emotions are always already transferring between people and are always being and doing, circulating in social, cultural, and political ways.

Erin: So there's something intimate, feminine, but also maybe pleasurable about having someone play with your hair or touch your hair. Which can be dangerous, then, in a classroom or with a student.

Kristen: With the reciprocal thing, I was thinking that it breaks down this idea that the teacher is only there to give things to her students.

Erin: Right. Yeah, I think the reciprocity thing is really interesting. Because the commonsense narrative about teachers is that we just give, we're The Giving Tree, right, like cut off our branches, cut us down to a stump, you can take all of us. But the fact that we might also benefit or get pleasure from our interactions with our students, get something in return, it's kind of taboo to think about that.

Justine: Yeah, about reciprocity, it's like maybe teacher-student relationships being reciprocal is pushing too far past the boundaries, like it almost seems…indecent isn't the right word, but that idea of teachers getting something from students, like we shouldn't ever be taking pleasure from our relationships with them, even if that helps make us whole or sane, that we should only be concerned with them, and what they're supposed to be doing.

Erin: Like, this is not about your feelings as a teacher, this is about your students' learning?

Justine: Right, like that's the only thing we ever think about or care about.

Sara: And thinking about bonding again, like how would a male adult bond with his student, like I can imagine it being throwing a ball around, and how dignified that seems, and if someone came in and saw that they might think, "how noble of him for bonding with his students by playing catch." But there's a difference here, because we're all worried about how inappropriate it might look for someone to see a female student playing with a female teacher's hair. They might think, "That doesn't belong in a classroom!" or something like that.

When we individualize emotions as things that we can own, have, give, and take, then another set of narratives develops about who can give what emotions to whom, who is worthy of receiving what emotions, and when it becomes okay or not to have them, give them, or display them. These narratives are inherently problematic because they work to reinforce privilege and oppression that is socially, economically, and racially

constructed. In our analysis here we refer to one particularly powerful narrative—the danger of teachers "having" or "receiving" pleasurable emotions from their interactions with students. We work to question that narrative and understand its effects on teachers, particularly how it distances teachers from their own bodies and their students, by forcing them to deny pleasurable emotions that may be moving through them. While our analysis seeks to disrupt commonsense narratives of who gets to feel what and when, we also rely heavily on a conception of emotions that fixes and flattens them (so that they might be given and received) rather than understanding them as always moving, containing and collecting histories, and dynamically shaping the surface of things (i.e. what emotions *do*).

When Kelsey writes that she "cut [Karen] off" in the memory the word "cut" holds meaning in relation to the agency of the hair. In an attempt to stop the hair from playing within the intra-action and invading the borders drawn between students and teachers interacting physically, Kelsey needs to "cut" off Karen's comment. This has an effect of both silencing Karen and extricating the hair's role in this encounter. Essentially, Kelsey attempts to reconstruct boundaries that have been disrupted/rearranged because the tug toward teacher control is too strong. In order re-establish her teacher authority, she must cut the hair out of the entanglement and cut Karen's voice out of the encounter.

As the memory ends, Kelsey re-establishes normative boundaries between her students and herself. In her initial arrangement with Karen, one that invaded typical boundaries, the meaning of "distraction" was not specified. However, because of this encounter and the ways that hair has played with their relationship, Kelsey has now

designated "distraction" to include physical touch and intimacy between a teacher and a student when it threatens the teacher's authority.

Erin's Memory: *I Don't Belong Here*

She drives them in one of those Jeeps with plastic for windows and tires that move like arms, grabbing the ground as the car rumbles down the street. It's the kind of car meant to be driven over dirt hills, through creeks, and across sand. But they stay mostly on urban streets, except when she jumps the car onto a curb, across a sidewalk, and parks it on someone's grassy front lawn. Erin is belted in tight in the passenger seat; sweat is trickling down her back in her too-hot black pants and crisp, long-sleeved, purple shirt. Her hair is brushed into a perfect bob. She is trying to look professional. With one hand, Erin clutches the side of the door and with the other she holds a list of names and addresses. The sweat on her hand is turning the papers into a clammy damp mess.

She has given her trust to this woman, who is navigating streets Erin does not yet know and can speak a language that Erin cannot. She drives recklessly, with a confidence Erin lacks completely. Finally, she slams on the breaks and without a word, turns off the ignition and marches up the driveway of a duplex. No, her body doesn't march, it flows. Her colorful dress is layered, wrapped, and pinned around her. With high teased black curly hair, dark brown skin, and dramatic eye make-up, she is the Latina Goddess, and tripping behind her, Erin is the new, young, white woman teacher. It is the second week of school. They are making house calls.

She rings the doorbell, knocks hard, and then tries the door, which is unlocked. Inside, a television is blaring, shades drawn, lights off. "Hello?" she shouts inside. "Hola?" A man appears from behind the doorway. "We are looking for Jesus Archuleta,"

she says in Spanish. The man does not respond. "My name is Dr. Alvarez and I am the vice principal at North High School. Jesus has not attended school and we need to know where he is." Erin stands there thinking, "I don't belong here." In that moment she wishes she hadn't agreed to do this. The man studies them, than turns toward the inside of the house and yells, "JESUS!" After a few awkward minutes, Jesus emerges. Their list tells them that he is a 10th grader. His hair is spiked up and his clothes are far too big, but his face still looks round and soft like a child's. When he catches sight of them, his gaze drops to the floor.

She asks him why he isn't in school and he says, "I dunno."

They repeat this pattern: reckless driving, knocks on doors, lots of questions, hard conversations in Spanish and English. There are crying mothers, crying babies, eviction notices, empty apartments, lots of "I don't knows." They are rounding up bodies, counting them, checking them off the list. Erin stands there awkwardly and wonders, "Who am I to knock on their doors, to ask why they aren't in school, to put my white middle class body onto their threshold, to demand answers?" She lets Dr. Alvarez do the talking and she tells herself that it's because she speaks Spanish and Erin does not. But the truth is, Erin is deeply afraid and she cannot hide it.

Analysis: A Jeep, a List, and Racialized Fear

Erin's memory, like Kelsey's, can be read as a story about teaching as invasion in which material objects have agency in their encounters with humans. A non-human object—the Jeep—opens the memory and participates in the encounter. Erin's memory also places the teacher as a secondary human character to "she" who is driving the Jeep, and whom we later learn is the school's vice principal, Dr. Alvarez. It is important that

Erin is not the only human in this entanglement because in her intra-action with Dr. Alvarez, we come to see how Erin's racial identity plays a role in how she imagines and begins to enact relationships with her students, including the boundaries she constructs as her racialized fears work to shape her identity and the identities of the other characters in the memory.

As the memory opens, the object of the Jeep, the list that Erin clutches, and the discourse of being "professional" are entangled together. In contrast to Erin's fearful body that seeks stability—belted in tight and clutching the door—the body of the Jeep is all arms and movement; it is in control, confident, moving with purpose. The Jeep and its driver are entangled with Erin's body—propelling it down the streets of the city and challenging Erin's sense of comfort. Inside the wildness of the Jeep, Erin is offered an opportunity here to disrupt the contradictory and precarious boundaries that contain a "professional teacher," but instead she attempts to re-assert that narrative through her body's appearance—wearing crisp clothes and a perfect bob hairstyle. But the admiration with which Erin describes the Jeep and the human-like qualities she attributes to it suggests that perhaps she desires to disrupt her "professional" teacher body, even though she seems uncomfortable or afraid of doing so in this moment. Another agential object in the encounter is the list of names and addresses. In the memory, we get introduced to the list as something Erin holds in her hand. But it's not just being held, it also holds power—it tells the two of them (Erin and Dr. Alvarez) where to go, and whom to look for. Along with Erin's "professional" clothes and hair, this list functions to establish their authority to perform this task on behalf of the school institution.

"This woman," who has a key role in the story but in the beginning is unnamed, is positioned as Erin's foil; she knows what Erin does not, speaks what Erin cannot, has confidence when Erin does not. We also she how she is characterized as Erin's racialized foil: she is Latina and Erin is white. In the memory, Erin draws boundaries between their two races and raises questions about the kinds of relationships that can be built between teachers and students of the same or different racial backgrounds. Erin begins to see herself, a white women teacher, as an unwelcome outsider and invader of her students' lives, cultures, and homes; this is perhaps contrary to what she imagined or intended when she learned how to be a teacher. It is one of many sources of her fear and uncertainty.

Dr. Alvarez is also a boundary invader in several ways. First, she has left the school and has come to students' homes. The boundaries established between home and school are strong. Sometimes teachers or administrators try to evoke home at school—to draw a comparison or connection between the two. Indeed, culturally responsive teaching practices ask teachers to make space in their classrooms for students' lives, homes, and cultures. But more often, school and home are positioned against one another (e.g. English is the language of school, Spanish is the language of home). The narratives that get told and retold about school and home are powerful—from parents and families who feel like school seeks to destroy the values of the home, to teachers blaming a "deficient" home for anything their students do in school that does not fit the "norm."

Dr. Alvarez physically disrupts the boundary between home and school, and all its complexities, when she shows up at students' homes. This invasion could be read as noble and supportive (she shows students that they are valued, important, and missed

when they do not come to school) or authoritative and invasive (students and families cannot be trusted and need physical authoritative intervention from the school—essentially, school is more important than home). In fact, there is a huge difference between visiting students' homes because you want to learn more about their lives and funds of knowledge, and knocking on doors to round up the bodies of students who have been declared truant from school and put on a list.

When Erin and Dr. Alvarez are standing in Jesus's doorway, the authority of the list as a material object with agency in the encounter comes to life. In the opening scene, Erin holds the list and the list holds institutional power that directs Erin and Dr. Alvarez where to go and who to find. Now, as they stand in the threshold of a house, announcing their institutional affiliation and questioning a student who has not come to school, the list *tells them* who he is. What matters to the list is not what kind of life this boy has, not how he feels or what he's been through, not *why* he isn't in school. The list only reinforces that Jesus is a name and a number in a database. He is worth money to the school if he is in attendance on count day. He is under of the age of 17 and legally obliged to be in school. Here is what the records show. Get the body to school. The legal, institutional, and authoritarian power of the list eclipses Dr. Alvarez's or Erin's care and concern for the boy and his family. For a second, Erin sees his humanity, his round and soft face and his spiked up hair, but he quickly looks away. Ultimately, the list holds the power in this encounter and dictates the boundaries in place between teachers and (potential) student.

Kristin: I wonder what is motivating you all to do this. I think about the politics of school, like the push to get as many students in by a certain point, to get your funding.

Erin: Count day!

Kristin: Yeah, that's what I thought of. Whose responsibility is truancy? And why? That sort of thing.

Justine: Well yeah, and all we need are their bodies. "Rounding up the bodies, counting them, checking them off the list." That is what you're doing on this mission, and some days that seems like all I can do in my classroom. Like, is everyone in here? Count the bodies. Okay.

Sara: Well that's the only thing we HAVE to do, right? Take attendance. Like legally that's the only thing we have to do.

Justine: Some people are like, "Getting them there is half the battle. Just getting them there. As long as they're coming." Like if I've had a bad day they'll say, "Well, at least they're in your classroom." Sometimes that's it. We just need to count the bodies. That's all we can do. But it doesn't feel good.

Kristin: Your story, too, Justine, of patrolling the halls. How do we treat students and their bodies? Just get them into the right spot, no matter how you have to do it. There's just this very weird thing about school as a space where everything else has to stop and we have to play these roles for a while. 'Cause we'd never treat people's bodies this way anywhere else. I just don't like this idea that if students aren't in school they're getting into trouble, you know, like how many of these kids have jobs? How many kids didn't go to school because they have to babysit their little brothers and sisters?

Sara: Or they were at a protest!

Kristin: So, like teachers don't get to have bodies, and students don't get to be connected to their bodies in school, it feels like.

Sara: Well, and there's a disconnection from bodies in the story here, too, when the list tells them that he is a 10th grader. Like the list is speaking for him. The list *tells them* that he is in 10th grade. Who knows if that list is right? And why does the list have this authority to say who he is? We hear from Erin that "he has spiked up hair and his clothes are far too big but his face is still round and soft like a child's." That tells us more. But the *list* says…so will Erin follow what the list says about him or what she sees in him?

While Dr. Alvarez's boundary invasion can be read as complex and multifaceted, Erin's perception of herself as an invader at first seems much more simple: she does not belong in the threshold of students' and families' homes, she can't speak their home language, she is new to the school, the community, and the profession of teaching, and she is white. A common narrative about teachers like Erin is the teacher as white savior—a benevolent white person who feels that it is her calling to work with students of color or of low socioeconomic status in order to "help" save them from the negative conditions of their lives through education. The white savior narrative is problematic in many ways, including its reproduction of white, patriarchal, and colonial values and deficit narratives of students of color. In her memory, Erin seems to reject this narrative—she believes it is not her business to save these students ("I don't belong here")—and yet there she is anyway, an accomplice on the mission, with a woman she admires and sees as an insider to the culture. The contradiction in this moment, and the feelings of uncertainty about

what it means for Erin to do this job also become marked by Erin's fear. Clearly her role as an invader is *not* a simple one.

Sara Ahmed (2004) writes that "fear does not simply come from within and then move outwards towards objects and others…rather, fear works to secure the relationship between those bodies; it brings them together and moves them apart through the shudders that are felt on the skin, on the surface that surfaces through the encounter" (p. 62-63). In this memory, Erin's fear manifests itself in several ways, but is only named as fear in the final line of the story. First, there is fear in the Jeep—of the danger presented by the principal's driving that disrupts the boundaries of what Erin understands as safe vehicle navigation. In response, Erin's body sweats, clutches the car door, and braces itself. There is also fear circulating in Erin's relationship to Dr. Alvarez—through this fear Erin exoticizes the vice principal's body; she separates their bodies by fetishizing the "Latina Goddess" as a mystical woman who knows and can do things that Erin cannot. She creates a set of racial boundaries between them that others and essentializes them both. Finally, there is fear on the threshold: Erin's fear of what invasion means in this context, to whose or what ends they are doing this work, and of what this experience says about the Erin's new role as a white woman teacher of students of color.

Erin: What do you notice about the language?

Kelsey: The comparison.

Tali: Yes, the comparison between you and Dr. Alvarez—when she's flowing, you're tripping, and I sense this vulnerability in your physical body because of your whiteness

and being out of place. It shows in the actions—clutching on to the door, tripping, standing in the background.

Kelsey: And there's the language of you *trying* to do something and Dr. Alvarez isn't trying, she just *is* it. She is. She is herself and she is in charge.

Justine: I see a lot of othering of Dr. Alvarez here. I think she's being exotified, and there's this insider/outsider thing, and I think there's an assumption that because she is Latina she's an insider, and her race makes her fit in. Like there is some reference to intersectionalities but also a blurring of intersectionalities. It's like, since she's Latina, she knows where these people are coming from. She can drive her car up on their lawn. She gets it. We don't know a whole lot else about her. She's a doctor. She's a vice principal. She's a successful lady.

Erin: She can speak Spanish.

Justine: Right. But there's definitely like this—it's her race that makes her powerful. Her race and her language.

Kristin: Well, and in the story we don't know the specifics. Like, there are lots of groups of people that fall into the category of Latino. And there are even huge divides and tensions between people of different origins. Like being Mexican versus being Guatemalan versus being Nicaraguan, people have fought and died over those differentiations. So what happens when it gets said, she speaks Spanish and she's Latina, so…

Erin: It gets essentialized to being one thing.

Kristin: Racial politics are so much more complex than that. Race gets lumped here into one static thing, that's not really based on anything about Dr. Alvarez at all.

Ahmed writes, "fear envelops the bodies that feel it, as well as constructs such bodies as enveloped, as contained by it, as if it comes from outside and moves inward" (p. 63). But that fear does not come from Jesus nor out of Erin; instead, Ahmed writes "fear opens up past histories of association, which allows the white body to be constructed as apart from" other bodies in the present (p. 63). There are racialized histories living in Erin that open up in this memory in order to establish distance between herself and Jesus, whose differences are then read off the surface of their bodies. Ultimately, Erin's fear constructs the "apart-ness" of white bodies, the boundaries built between races that reify white supremacy. The fear in the Jeep and the fear of the principal are part of the politics of fear; Erin uses it to build a case for her racialized fear. Without naming it explicitly, Erin establishes "others" as fearsome insofar as they "*threaten to take the self in*" (p. 64, italics in original). Even as Erin acknowledges the problem of her whiteness, she works to preserve it. Where there is potential to invade boundaries, the politics of fear keep Erin working to protect *what is* rather than resisting or disrupting it.

Jaquinetta's Memory: *It's Just A Hug*

It was hard for her to imagine the next steps. She envisioned this moment differently. One can't imagine what it feels like to see such an incident take place. She hugged her student! No one could understand why she did this.

One day prior to this event, her student approached her with a problem. She walked toward that student, placing her hand on the small of his back (pack) asking him to stop. The student refused. She continued to walk along with him. The student refused.

Next, no one could believe what took place. The student violated his teacher with profound vulgar words.

You stupid _____, I hate you _____! That's why _____!

With a smile on this teachers face, high heels seeping into the grass, his teacher walked behind him for a quarter of a mile back to school from the long bus lane. The student continued his rants as the teacher began to feel as though she was no longer human. She must remain calm, uninfluenced by his word. This teacher shocked all that were watching, she had a smile pasted on her face, repeating the same comments, "I'm sorry you feel that way," "when we speak to admin." The student continued with his rants, and his teacher somehow remained calm.

My ex- fiancé was the last person who made me feel little. He made me feel extremely small. I felt as though he was superior and I was inferior. This was mainly because he reminded me of this all the time. What bothers me the most right now is not the student calling me names, it is how I felt the last time a boy/man called me these names. My blood is boiling; I can feel the vein popping in the middle of my forehead. If my heart do not calm down, Lord Jesus, I am not responsible for the results of this child when we make inside of the building. Ooh, someone I know, "HELP!" I feel so unsafe right now. "HELP!" Is that bitch really ignoring the fact that her student is cursing me out yet she is always asking for help? Ok! Never again will I assist her when she asks. I swear if this tear fall, it will be the last. I will not let this little person see a tear fall. I refused to let him see this. I need to calm down; I cannot talk to his mother. She really just said he does not need to apologize. Oh, he will apologize, no student get away with this type of behavior without apologizing to me. He was asked several times to apologize

and he refused. The next day, I was asked to be nice when I spoke to him. "I'm always nice," was my response. I took a deep breath and remembered that he was missing a core piece after speaking with his mother. He was missing reprimanding, love and embrace. That's it. I know what to say. He apologized on his own, thank god, but next, I took another deep breath walked toward him and said, "we need to hug it out." We walked toward each other, with open hearts and forgiveness. He hugged me. Something he admitted to not doing with his mother. For me, that was powerful. I am able to give him what he needs in this moment. In this moment, we need comfort. He needs love, and that I can give him.

Staff members nearby were amazed with the amount of control she had. This teacher, not once lost their composure. Not one time did this teacher's face show frustration. It appears she is blocking the sun out of her face as she walks to the building. If this happened to other staff, it is likely that teacher would react immediately to that student. Another teacher who is familiar with the student begins to submerge herself into the situation. The entire time this took place, the teacher never loses the smile on her face; it just stays there. It appears as if she and the other teacher are close colleagues. They walked into an office, called the boy's mother who insisted his behavior was justified. The end result of this day was no consequences. The following day, the student approached this teacher for mediation. Words were exchanged between the two of them that resulted in a hug. No one understood why she did that. No one could figure out why, after all that was said, did this teacher take time out to hug him.

Analysis: Rage, a Hug, and Fixers of Brokenness

Erin: Okay, what is this a story about?

Kathryn: Hurt people.

Kelsey: Parts of ourselves. Like we see two parts to the unnamed boy, and two parts to the unnamed teacher.

Kristen: That makes me think about what each part needs.

Kristin: A lot of this story is based on impossibility.

Erin: How so?

Kristin: Like, the first paragraph: "It was hard for her to imagine. One can't imagine. No one could understand. No one could believe." And then at the end of the paragraph: "Not once did she lose her composure. Not one time." And she's even blocking the sun from her face, so a lack of sun keeping something away. And then "The teacher never loses the smile on her face. No consequences. No one understood." There's this void. And then the impossibility of the situation that she hugged this student.

Sara: There is also a lot of refusal.

Kelsey: The impossibility of walking through grass in high heels. A quarter of a mile!

Kristin: There's impossibility and negation. Everything is based in what isn't or what can't be.

Kelsey: I think it's about power in a lot of ways. Who's got the power here? Is it the child, the teacher, the mother, the people watching, the administration?

Erin: The ex-fiancé?

Kristin: Another negation—a not-fiancé. And we don't get what the student actually said. It's a void in the memory. And then in the second paragraph the teacher is no longer human.

Erin: Mmmm. Not human.

Kristin: And then, even when she realizes, she says, "I took a deep breath and realized he was *missing* a core piece. He was *missing* reprimanding, love, and embrace." It's what he's missing.

Kelsey: She gets a sense of power in that realization that lets the rest of the story unfold.

Kristen: I think it's also about the struggles we hide and what students get to see of us. The boundaries between what we can and can't express as a teacher. The inside/outside.

Kelsey: How we change our body to fit the situation. Or don't change it.

In some ways, Jaquinetta's memory is unlike the other memories generated in our collective; for one, it has multiple parts—we identified two parts as the "outside" and "inside" version of the story written in 3rd person (regular font) and 1st person (italics), respectively. We quickly concluded that this dual-narration allowed the narrator to explore how she is experiencing others' perceptions (3rd person) of her teacher body during a conflict with a student, as well as how she self-perceives (1st person) her body through her own memories of violence and pain. But the two parts actually did not fit this neat categorization and caused a great deal of confusion for us as we analyzed the memory. We wondered: Was there a "real" Jaquinetta and a "not real" one? What does she say aloud and what remains internal? Do these two parts actually clearly delineate outside/inside after all? As we worked to draw these boundaries, we quickly realized that, in fact, they were blurred. There were no easy answers. Yet, we continued to push to draw simple conclusions—about what's "really" happening and what's not—even when it became obvious that the cuts made in the construction of this memory would never be clean. In our analysis, we came to see that the entanglement between Jaquinetta, her

colleagues, the student, a long walk through soft grass in high heels, a hug, and normalizing discourses about how emotions can or cannot be "held" in teacher-student relationships also contained gendered histories of violence and trauma. And Jaquinetta's plastered smile was not either/or, but both fake and real, inner and outer, as was all the residue of emotions circulating and surfacing in the memory. In effect, Jaquinetta's memory was ultimately different because it was most like memory (and thus least like story)—nonlinear, contradictory, an image here, a sensation there, with unnamed characters, unclear descriptions, and lots of blanks that do not get filled in. As a result, the cuts Jaquinetta made when writing this memory allowed for ambiguity and disorientation among us, because the rest of us had written stories that progressed chronologically, told a traditional narrative, and ended with some sense of resolution. The more we discussed Jaquinetta's memory, the more we realized that we wouldn't be able to make sense of it, not in the ways we had analyzed the other memories.

Kelsey: This part reminds me of writing referrals, when you're supposed to use impersonal language—this student, the teacher, etc.—but when it's something really personal, it's hard to make the pronouns so distanced.

Erin: So this paragraph feels like the language of a referral. In contrast to the part in italics which feels really personal—well, and uses the first person "I."

Kelsey: A lot of it feels like it's about the boundaries of language and teaching—what you can and can't say, what students can and can't say.

Sara: There's a robotic feel to it, with the smile plastered on the teacher's face.

Kristen: I wondered why she smiled there.

Erin: The presence of the body in this first person section is so visceral, so real, so there. And when I think about that in contrast to this pasted smile, this robot, kind of nonhuman in the third person piece…I mean, the blood is boiling, the vein is popping, there's the tears and the deep breaths and the embrace and all of that feels so…in the body. But it's also connected to pain and trauma. And feelings of being unsafe, which I connected back to the ex-fiancé.

Kristin: Sometimes I question what kids are really doing. Cause I know Jacqui you teach middle school, right? Sometimes the kids are just acting out what they see. Or acting out feelings of anger or frustration and they don't even know where its coming from.

The sense of time in Jaquinetta's memory is also unconventional. The story starts at the end: "She hugged her student!" and then travels back in time, and then further back in time. At the end of the written memory we return to the moment of the hug. Ahmed (2004) writes that "emotions tell us a lot about time; emotions are the very 'flesh' of time. They show us the time it takes to move, or to move on, is a time that exceeds the time of an individual life" (p. 202). Jaquinetta's emotions persist on the surface of her body through space and across time, and she reacts by covering them with her "smile"—she must continually remind herself to paste the smile, to remain calm. Jaquinetta is raging inside, and that emotion, we learn, is persisting as the flesh of time, despite her attempts to quell it.

Ahmed (2004) also reminds us that it is important to acknowledge how "emotion has been viewed as beneath the faculties of thought and reason" (p. 3). She writes that traditionally, "to be emotional is to have one's judgment affected: it is to be reactive

rather than active, dependent rather than autonomous" (p. 3). This normative and individualized construction of emotion also works to subordinate the feminine and the body. So, not only are emotions traditionally positioned as something one "has," they are also something one doesn't want—and Jaquinetta takes up that narrative in her memory when she pastes a smile on her face and works to remain calm, to mask her emotions during this interaction with the student. When Black women express their emotions it carries a greater risk for them to be positioned as lacking intelligence, reason, or capability (Meiners, 2007). First, their femininity makes them subordinate and associates them with emotions and thus, weakness. Then, their blackness makes them doubly marginalized and further dehumanized—so that any emotions Black women express are both a sign of weakness and a potential danger to others. Jaquinetta notes in her memory that she is feeling "that she is no longer human," which leads her to describe herself as "calm" and "uninfluenced" by the students' words. Having an absence of emotions, (a possible description of calm, uninfluenced Jaquinetta with her pasted smile), is not hardness or stoicism, Ahmed (2004) writes, but a "different emotional orientation towards others" (p. 4). Emotions stick to and shape our hardness—or Jaquinetta's "calm" demeanor—just as much as they shape our feelings of rage, grief, or pain.

Ahmed (2004) writes that "women's testimonies about pain—for example, testimonies about their experiences of violence—are crucial not only for the formation of feminist subjects, but to feminist collectives, which have mobilized around the injustice of that violence and the political and ethical demand for reparation and redress" (p. 172). Our collective memory work became a space for Jaquinetta to make connections between the perceptions of her teacher body and the structural relations of racial and gendered

power that circulate through the politics of emotion—including her fear, pain, and anger in this moment. Ahmed calls us, in our collective feminist work, to "learn to remember how embodied subjects come to be wounded in the first place, which requires us to learn to read the pain as well as recognize how the pain is already read in the intensity of how it surfaces" (p. 173). Anger requires a reading of pain; it translates pain; it turns pain into action by interpreting that pain as wrong and insisting that something must be done about it. In her interior monologue, Jaquinetta translates the pain of her history of gendered violence into anger—her blood is boiling, the vein in her forehead is popping, her heart needs calming—but rather than this translation of pain to anger generating into action, it pushes her toward fear. "HELP!" she cries out, "I feel so unsafe right now."

Kelsey: What I am stuck on is feeling so unsafe. This boy in the story, whose words we don't know, is making an adult woman feel unsafe.

Kristen: I was wondering about unsafe, too. That to me is a void. Is she feeling unsafe because of the memory or because of the situation with the student, is it unsafe because she doesn't know how she's going to react?

Kelsey: Or is it unsafe because no one is helping her?

Kristin: I took it as this is unsafe because, lord help me, I'm going to smack this boy.

Erin: But to call out "HELP!"

Kelsey: Was that happening internally?

Jaquinetta: No, I actually yelled, "HELP" to her, his advisor, and she just kept going.

In contrast to this rage and fear, the description of the hug is poignant and especially interesting to read through Ahmed's (2004) theory of the politics of emotions. This moment plays with the various theories of emotions (cognitive, psychological, social, evolutionary, etc.) that Ahmed simultaneously refutes and integrates in her theory of emotions. The emotions described in the hug are both individual and social— Jaquinetta names "love" as something the boy lacks and needs, and that she can provide for him. But at the same time, it is the collective *we*—both Jaquinetta and the boy—who have open hearts and forgiveness, and who need comfort in this moment. In contrast to Jaquinetta's descriptions of herself as void of emotion—calm, uninfluenced, with a pasted smile—this description of the hug is tender, vulnerable, and physical.

It feels a little wild to name a hug as a non-human material object in a post-humanist encounter, but in the case of Jaquinetta's memory, that is indeed what it has become. The hug gets reported right away in the memory, before we even know who hugged whom or what the circumstances around the hug were. It's described as a news item—something no one could make sense of. It's a thing in and of itself. But as the memory shifts into first person, we do get to understand why it happened, and in fact we get to see it happen with play-by-play commentary: she took a deep breath, she told him they needed to hug, they walked towards one another, and with open hearts and forgiveness, they embraced. The agency of the hug in this encounter is strong—it is the thing no one thought could happen, the disruption to everyone's narrative about this teacher and this student, it is what the story hinges on. It acts as a counterbalance to all of the rage, violence, and pain present in the memory. And it also imbues Jaquinetta with power; by hugging the boy she imagines that she is giving him something he otherwise

would lack, and that feels empowering to her. Whereas her prior interaction with the boy felt out of control, triggering feelings of trauma, pain, and fear, the hug puts her back in control. It reinforces her teacher role as a "fixer of brokenness" and seems to support her decision to mask her own feelings and paste a smile when the circulating emotions were difficult ones.

Erin: Thinking about this commonsense notion of brokenness, broken students: is it teachers' jobs to fix broken students, or to figure out what the missing parts are and to fill them or heal them, to heal the brokenness? Because the thing is, all people have missing parts; all people have brokenness, right? It's part of being human. In the story the teacher is broken, too. She has pain and trauma.

Jaquinetta: But teachers don't get to be broken. That's why I like to be myself in other places, because in those spaces I can be broken if I feel broken.

Erin: Yeah. That might be one of the most difficult things about teaching.

The narrative of broken students parallels a conceptualization of teaching and learning in which students are empty vessels whose brains need to be filled with knowledge. Freire (1970) calls it "banking model" teaching, and puts the teacher in the position of making the deposits in the bank (students' brains). This theory puts students in a position of always lacking, needing to be fixed or filled up. Conceptualizing students as perpetually broken puts teachers in a banking position as "fixers of brokenness." It's the emotional banking model, in which students are always in need of "help" and teachers are tasked with filling students' emotional "voids." This narratives reflects a

boundary drawn between students and teachers in which, as Jaquinetta says, students are almost always in some way broken and teachers can never be broken. Interestingly, we identified the commonsense narrative "Our students come from broken homes and are lacking," (these narratives, of course, need to be interrogated, disrupted, and challenged) and yet, we then relied on that very narrative to explore Jaquinetta's experience with this student who, according to the memory, had things missing from his life, like "reprimanding, love and embrace," and it was her job to provide them, to fix him. Brokenness is a deficit way of framing students, particularly students of color or those who are from marginalized communities. In response to the reproduction of this deficit-oriented narrative, I asked the questions above about the notion of brokenness—not only whose job is it to heal or fix students' brokenness, but in what ways do we all, teachers and students, experience brokenness? How is that boundary between the broken and the not broken actually false?

In part because Jaquinetta's story left us flummoxed—we struggled understand it how and why it didn't contain the characteristics of a traditional narrative, when it did things that resisted sense-making, when the borders between things were blurry—we eventually quit doing critical discourse analysis of the memory and moved into collective memory-sharing of times we, as teachers, also felt broken in our classrooms. In this way, Jaquinetta's memory facilitated a conversation between us that both reinforced and disrupted narratives of brokenness. But Jaquinetta's memory also worked to silence our group. We did not have an explicit conversation about the role of race in the story, despite the fact that the memory was written by the collective's only African American member. Conversations about race seemed to come easier when we were talking about

whiteness; but to have a conversation about Blackness would be to talk about the "other" and as "good white people" that prospect may have made us uncomfortable. We also mostly stayed silent about our confusion about the memory itself, perhaps there was fear to name it as different or admit that we didn't get it. So, while Jaquinetta's memory resulted in the least amount of discourse analysis, it alternately created a space for more collective embodied story telling, and led me to consider the role that emotions play across our memories as I wrote about the research.

Even when these emotional moments led to feelings of brokenness, or to powerful interactions with our students because we opened up and shared our vulnerabilities with them—we still framed them as "teachable moments" in which the teacher provides the lesson about others' emotions, or how to develop empathy, and the students receive it. In these moments, the emotions circulating through us and constituting our surfaces become the subject of the lesson. In the case of Jaquinetta's memory, she kept a calm demeanor and a pasted smile over feelings of pain and trauma so that the student might learn an important lesson about humility, love, trust, and connection. It seems that the hardest boundary for teachers to invade is the one that so strongly separates a conception of knowledge and the roles of teaching and learning—a teacher teaches (gives knowledge), a student learns (receives knowledge). This boundary is not only built around curriculum, knowledge, and pedagogies, but emotions as well. In our analysis of Jaquinetta's memory or our telling of other memories and stories about ourselves, not once did we discuss what we as teachers learn from the emotional lives of our students or conceptualize the emotions in motion in our classroom as producing action that both students and teachers can learn from. Similarly we did not suggest that we as teachers have something to learn

about our own brokenness, only that we can use those emotions to teach our students something, even students who have participated in our emotional pain in the first place. The stories below elucidate this memory-sharing process and our inability to invade the teaching/learning binary boundary.

Kristin: Well, I broke down in class one day and just had to leave the room. I felt myself losing it and I had a [certified staff member] in the room that hour so I just told her that I needed to step out and as soon as I said it I started to cry. So I walk out of the room, and there's a staff bathroom across the hall and when the door shuts I just started to ugly cry in the bathroom, just, like, I couldn't catch my breath I was crying so hard. But some students had followed me out into the hall and I could hear them out there and I thought to myself, do I have to go out there and reprimand those kids and tell them to get back into the classroom and stop making a scene? And later I heard that one kid was being Paul Revere, running down the hall and going into each classroom and telling the teachers, "They made my teacher cry." Kids were banging on the door yelling, "Ms. C, it's okay! Come out? They're quiet now!" And then I heard from the cert that some kids started punching each other and saying, "You have to apologize, you're the one who said this to her!" "No, you said that!" …I just don't know…what do you do when you've left the room in tears?

Jaquinetta: I go back in and explain it to them.

Kathryn: Me too. I have literally cried in front of my students, like I couldn't hold it together and I just started crying in front of the students before I could get out of the classroom. And when I pulled myself together I said, "Okay, so I'm really sensitive, you

know that about me now." And I talked to them about it, and they were like, "Oh shit. We went too far this time."

Kelsey: Dealing with your emotions and understanding others' emotions is really something you have to learn. You don't just know it.

Jaquinetta: And that's the best teachable moment I think we can give. When we're in those moments and we can be totally open and honest with kids about what's happening. They won't learn as much from hypothetical situations, or even really good stories, as they can learn from their teacher who is standing in front of them with tears on her cheeks.

Sara: It's so interesting how students react most strongly to the teacher and her emotions, they learn the most from our emotional reactions—whether it's anger, or sadness, or annoyance—that's when they're like, "Whoa."

Erin: But even in those moments, it's like the teacher is still expected to figure out—how am I going to help my students work through this thing—when that *thing* is you. In the memory Jaquinetta was like, this triggers my trauma, and yet I still have to figure out not how to take care of myself in this moment, but how to take care of this kid in this moment. And deal with all these colleagues who are doing this shit that's not helping me.

Sara: And much of this responsibility we feel for our students' emotional health and teaching them about feelings and about our feelings, is it a gendered thing? I want to ask male teachers about whether they feel it's their job to do this, too.

Erin: I think it goes back to the construction of teacher as the fixer of brokenness.

Kristin: And how students respond to men vs. women teachers.

Tali: Right, like because we're already constructed as female, some part of our interaction with students is already pre-determined.

Kristin: I let some boys come into my room at lunch and one of them yelled, "I love you!" and the other one gave me a waist hug, just smashed himself into my stomach. And I thought to myself, "I don't think they're hugging Mr. Meyer like this." I'm gonna go ahead and say that's not his instinct.

Erin: So, what power does it give female teachers to be perceived or constructed in that way and yet how does it also at times render female teachers powerless? Because as women in society we still take second class status to men who get to be whatever they want to be and how they want to construct it (of course, masculinity does limit them in some ways, too. If they want to be the huggy teacher they can't just jump into that).

Jaquinetta: It goes back to the way women have dominated the teaching profession.

Kristin: Especially teaching younger students.

Sara: But the higher it gets, the more men there are—in high school and college. They are the masters of their craft, of the content.

Erin: Because the perception is that you don't have to take care of college students, that you don't have to fix their brokenness or give them hugs and love.

Jaquinetta: That's what my male friend says, he teaches in Detroit. But he says that teaching for him is simply critiquing his students' work on designing vehicles. He says my students have problems and issues, and I have to help them with those, that's my main job. But *he's* a teacher…I don't see the difference.

Epilogue

Writing this chapter has helped me learn new things about these memories, and how a reliance on humanism and a concept of emotions as individual, autonomous things one can have, give, and receive can limit our understanding of memories of our bodies and reproduce normalizing narratives of teaching and learning. In the moments when we pushed against these commonsense narratives to consider the role of a nonhuman object, as in the stool, the hair, or the list, our potential interpretations of the memories deepened and developed. Likewise, when we tried to view emotion not as something one has but something one does, like Erin's fear as constructing and reproducing racial differences, we were working on more critical and complex readings of the memories.

Drawing on these moments, I layer on post-humanist theories to see how the role of non-human objects—materials—have agency in our encounters and assist or prohibit teachers from invading the boundaries and borders built between ourselves and our students. In each memory, there are material objects that, when read as agentic, reveal new possibilities for interpreting the memory. In Kelsey's memory, the stool holds the teacher's body in ways that establishes a normative sense of teacher authority and control while other chairs in the room might function to disrupt that same sense of authority. In addition, Kelsey's hair has agency in the encounter between herself and Karen—the hair gets played with and the hair itself plays with the boundaries of intimacy and care in this teacher-student relationship. The hair builds and develops a relationship between Kelsey and Karen when it is just the two of them, but produces shame when others are watching and when Kelsey is to be held in authority by the "uncomfortable metal stool." In Erin's memory, the Jeep takes Erin and Dr. Alvarez on their mission with human-like qualities,

and they contrast with Erin's feigned "professionalism" and expose her fear. The fear cultivated in the Jeep then sticks to Dr. Alvarez, to Jesus, and to Erin herself as she worries about being a racial, cultural, and linguistic outsider to her administrator and her students. Another important object in Erin's story is the list of names and addresses that she and Dr. Alvarez use to enact their mission. This list is held by Erin but also holds a great deal of institutional, economic, and legal authority—and it exerts that authority not only by guiding their journey, but also by telling them (the institutional truth) about the students they encounter. Finally, in Jaquinetta's memory, the hug becomes a material object; it's power and agency is palpable—no one could believe its enactment brought together Jaquinetta and the boy, perhaps least of all Jaquinetta herself, who was feeling so much pain and rage about the situation that she worried about what she might do to him inside the school (a hug being the last thing on her mind). While a hug literally necessitates participation by at least one human, the idea of a hug can take on it's own discursivity and material weight—so though it may be a little different from a stool or a Jeep, in Jaquinetta's story it functions as a non-human material object in the encounter that ultimately works to empower Jaquinetta and reinforce a narrative of teachers as "fixers of brokenness."

I chose these three memories for this chapter because we read all of them as stories about teaching as invasion, but I was surprised to discover what borders and boundaries the teachers in these memories were invading (or not) as I re-read them, listened to our analyses, and theorized them. For instance, all three memories present a moment related to teacher-student relationships: Kelsey's memory is about cultivating a relationship with Karen—one that disrupts normative teacher-student boundaries of

intimacy and physical touch while reproducing teacher authority; Erin's memory is about how one teacher begins to identify the boundaries (institutional, historical, cultural, and emotional) that exist in relationships between white teachers and their students of color, and then worries about and fears being an invader of those boundaries; finally, in Jaquinetta's memory, a teacher confronts her own boundaries of emotional expression in a conflict with a student who acts and speaks in hurtful ways to her. In all three memories there is a boundary drawn between the emotions women teachers experience in their relationships with students, and how or whether they feel able to express them. That boundary sets up an expectation that teachers must control, mask, or ignore certain emotions—like rage, compassion, or fear—in order to properly play their role as teacher. Though teachers are invading boundaries all the time, these boundaries prove difficult to disrupt because they are tied up in conceptions of teaching and learning that reside at the historical and cultural core of our institutions and roles as teachers.

First, Kelsey has to be wary about receiving pleasurable feelings of care from her interactions with Karen; she has to shut down Karen's hair playing, though it creates a sense of reciprocal love and compassion between them, when other students call it, and thus Kelsey's teacher authority, into question. It is risky for Kelsey to be seen gaining something on an emotional level from one of her students; a teacher is supposed to give emotional support, not receive it. Next, Erin is experiencing a racialized fear of herself and her students that she cannot hide, but feels she is supposed to. Her fear manifests itself in her reassertion of "professionalism," the exoticizing and othering of her vice principal, and her inability to act or speak when standing in the doorways of students' homes. Complicating her fear and uncertainty of being an outsider—to students' race,

culture, community, and language—she has been sent on a mission whose purpose troubles and confuses her, too. Finally, Jaquinetta is in a volatile situation with a student who is verbally abusing her, yet she feels she must remain calm and keep a pasted smile on her face. Inside, she's seething, raging with anger at this student, at male violence against women, at her colleagues for abandoning her, and at the system that put her in this position. But she recognizes the line between what emotions she can and cannot show. She is "not allowed to be broken."

While students are often constructed as perpetually broken—lacking knowledge, expertise, and skills, undeveloped emotionally and physically, and often suffering from hurt by way of their families or communities—teachers are positioned as quite the opposite. That's why commonsense narratives like, "Don't let them see you cry," "Teachers cannot react," or "No smiling until Thanksgiving," are so pervasive; teachers are to be perceived as emotionless, objective, neutral, and disembodied. But teachers, too, lack knowledge and skills. We often struggle emotionally or become physically ill. And we likely have experienced hurt or trauma in our own lives, by way of our families or communities. Yet, over and over again we are reminded that we are "not allowed to be broken," because teachers must be the givers, the bankers, the fixers, and the experts in the classroom. Exposing our brokenness threatens our authority, and as young women teachers, our authority is already precarious. One minute an administrator is asking to see our hall pass, and the next minute we are being told that our classroom is too "chaotic" and needs to be more tightly controlled.

The pertinence of Ahmed's (2004) theory of the sociality of emotions lies in the ways it can help us reframe emotions in the classroom and think differently about the

emotional role of the teacher. According to the theory, emotions are cultural practices, not psychological states, so the emotions that we practice in the classroom are part of the cultures, histories, and politics that are always circulating in and through our students and us. Since individuals do not own emotions, they cannot be given to or taken from others. For instance, if Erin could see that her fear was not owned by her, but that there was fear circulating through her, Dr. Alvarez, the man at the door, and Jesus, she could come to see how the politics and histories of race, school, capitalism, and violence and the emotion of fear were sticking to one another and creating the social and material world in that moment. Fear was not Erin's emotion to express or hide—fear was moving through the bodies and material conditions of the moment to form the boundaries between her and Jesus that she identifies in her memory. Erin positions herself against the institutional list of names as an object that holds emotional capital (Zembylas, 2007), to separate her body from other bodies. In this way, she uses the list and the list uses her to maintain fear, rather than attempting to cultivate love, kindness, or compassion instead. Perhaps the fear is working for Erin—it allows her to hold on to her whiteness, to exoticize Dr. Alvarez, to feign "professionalism" and to stay silent in the doorways. She believes she is an invader, but really, her use of fear works to reproduce dominant power structures and normalized narratives, not challenge them.

Likewise, if Jaquinetta and Kelsey saw emotions not as things they were responsible for controlling, hiding, or managing (in themselves or their students), but connected to and circulating through their bodies and the collective body of the classroom, some tension in their teacher-student interactions may have been quelled. The care and love moving between Kelsey and Karen and sticking to Kelsey's hair—not

taken or given between them—may have been used to bring teacher and students together, rather than as a reason for Kelsey to reassert her power and authority, silence Karen, and separate the two of them. And Jaquinetta and the boy might have come to see that their rage was the same anger, not different, individual emotions, but a collective feeling of pain that sticks to the bodies of those who have experienced violence and trauma. Instead, the view of anger and pain in the memory remained individual, isolated, and internal, and it worked against each of them and kept them apart. Even as they came together to hug it out, Jaquinetta held the power in the hug—because though there was an apology and forgiveness between them, there was never a shared sense of the painful emotions that were shaping both of their bodies, because Jaquinetta was only able to perform the role of disembodied and unaffected teacher whose job it was to fix her students' brokenness.

Theorizing emotions as social, discursive, imbued with power, political, and corporeal, as well as constantly moving and circulating, sticking themselves to objects, bodies, and signs, creates a bridge between Ahmed's (2004) view of emotions and post-humanist (Barad, 2007) approaches to understanding agency and power in our entanglements. In a post-humanist encounter, agency is not something one "has" but something to be in, and to be in relationship with during an intra-action. Things to do not proceed an encounter, but are made possible through the encounter. The same is true for socially constituted emotions—they are not individual, isolated, internal psychological states that one has, but social and cultural practices that one does. They do not exist prior to an encounter, but get produced and used through an intra-action to mark difference and sameness, cultivate power, create social and political resistance, and shape the surface of

both human bodies and non-human materials. In both theories, material objects come to life with meaning and agency—circulating emotions can stick to them and they can act on the humans they are entangled with. These theories offer us new ways to tell stories about who we are as teachers that complicate an individualist, human-centered, de-politicized, disembodied story of teaching and learning. If we can start to see how emotions and material objects are productive, making us into "socially and culturally specific persons, engaged in complex webs of power relations" then we can really begin invade and disrupt the powerful narratives that shape teaching and learning and resist and transform normalized boundaries of power and authority in student-teacher relationships (Zembylas, 2007, p. 294).

Chapter Six: The Study

"It wrote itself through me. 'Women must write through their bodies.' Must not let themselves be driven away from their bodies. Must thoroughly rethink the body to re-appropriate femininity. Must not however exalt the body, not favor any of its parts formerly forbidden. Must perceive it in its integrity. Must and must-nots, their absolution and power. When armors and defense mechanisms are removed, when new awareness of life is brought into previously deadened areas of the body, women begin to experience writing/the world differently" (Minh-ha, 1989, p. 36).

In this chapter, I will describe this study from conceptual and design perspectives, weaving together frameworks, questions, and ways of gathering and analyzing empirical material that allowed me, in collaboration with beginning teachers, to study—collectively and generatively—our embodied experiences. In more traditional and neo-positivist qualitative research, this chapter, perhaps called "Methods" would appear toward the beginning of the dissertation. However, Patti Lather and Elizabeth St. Pierre (2013), in their introduction to a special issue of the *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* discuss the need for a post-qualitative approach to research that complicates where a "methods" section might go. In traditional qualitative studies, they write, "the doer exists before the deed, so the researcher can (and must for IRBs) write a research proposal that outlines the doing before she begins. The assumption is that there is actually a beginning, an origin, that she is not always already becoming in entanglement" (p. 630). And the trouble is that the entanglement makes all our classifications problematic. How can we identify a "research problem" in a shifting, de-unified world? How can we separate our "self" as researcher from the "subject" of the research? How do the very categories we create for research—literature review, data collection, data analysis, and representation—assume a stable world and reinforce positivist and humanist ontologies?

Lather and St. Pierre (2013) wonder whether we've forgotten that we made up

qualitative research and therefore we can unmake it. In the spirit of unmaking my own

research and being entangled, I am placing this chapter at the end of my dissertation

because, as Lather and St. Pierre write, methods *always* come at the end—too late to help

us. That said, I don't fault a reader for coming here first to learn about the processes and

practices of my research design—the "methods"—before reading the empirical analysis

chapters (Three, Four, and Five). This chapter, called The Study, traces my memories of

the processes and practices of my research: how I framed the decisions I made as

researcher; how I worked in collaboration with teachers to write, laugh, talk, and theorize

about bodies; and how I attempted to do the good and hard work of putting words

together differently to tell about this experience in writing. Sometimes the language in

this chapter reflects a traditional paradigm of qualitative research and sometimes it looks

a little different. While it is difficult to completely shed the language of order that

characterizes qualitative research, I make small attempts to be conscious of how and

when the qualitative paradigm seeps into my research as I continually work to disrupt it.

Conceptual Framework

A combination of sociocultural theories of language and discourse and feminist

and poststructuralist perspectives on the body informs this study. The conceptual

framework for my research reflects and expands on the assumptions that Haug (1999)

established as a guide for CMW analysis: (1) our identities are constructed, (2) we

attempt to eliminate and smooth over contradictions in our memories and constructions of

self, (3) all meaning is constructed—through language, gesture, appearance, and

expression, and (4) language is not simply a tool we use, it also uses and shapes us (p. 9-

11). Sociocultural theories of discourse, language, and identities (Bakhtin, 1981;

Foucault, 1978), and feminist poststructuralist theories of embodiment (Grosz, 1994; Butler, 1990, 1993; Davies, 2003; Jones, 2013) complement and support these assumptions.

Discourse. Through a Bakhtinian (1981) social approach to language, I assume that language use is not individual, static, or neutral, and is imbued with ideological meaning. Additionally, Volosinov (1973) reminds me of the "two-sidedness" of words and utterances; the orientation of our conversations or writing as utterances toward an addressee is highly significant. Our choice and arrangement of the words we exchange, including their expressive intonation and other co-locational patterns of grammar, are based on our desire to communicate and mediate our understanding with one another. Therefore, our influence as each other's addressees is significant in analyzing our use of discourses and their impact. As a collective, we served as addressees to one another, shaping each other's use and choice of words and thereby constructing identities in and through our oral conversations, written memories, and analysis of those texts. Bakhtin's theory of language serves as a theory that guides our approach to understanding the ways discourses construct our memories, identities, and communities.

A Foucauldian (1972) theory of discourse was also important to our work because it allowed us to challenge dominant narratives of the body that are based in biology and psychology (i.e. the Cartesian mind/body duality). Foucault's approach to discourse led Haug et al. (1987) to shift the focus of their research from sexuality to the discourses that constitute sexuality—the system of language, objects and practices that construct what we come to think of as 'sexuality.' In other words, a Foucauldian approach hypothesizes that sexuality exists within discourse and through its mediations; it has no stability, but

changes in accordance with social conditions (Haug et al., 1987, p. 191). Likewise, our

discourse about teachers' bodies in our collective, including the memories and stories we

tell about our bodies and their relations to others bodies and the world, constructs those

bodies and inscribes identities, roles, and other markers on them. In order to understand

our teacher bodies, we must explore and interrogate the discourses that constitute

teaching, learning, and bodies. As a collective, we set out to conduct this discourse

analysis on our own memories and stories of our bodies.

   Embodiment. "Embodiment" is described as the methodological and ontological

field through which we can address familiar topics—like literacy practices, teaching, and

learning—from a new standpoint: through the body (Bresler, 2004). Liora Bresler writes

that theories of embodiment can have profound implications on the study of education,

including the ways we come to think about how students learn, teachers teach, and how

schools are organized, and I agree. It is through theories of embodiment that we can

begin to challenge our commonsense narratives about the body. For the purposes of my

study, embodiment as a conceptual framework will prioritize an understanding of:

1) The body's relationship to space and landscape: embodiment theorists insist that there

is a complex relationship between bodies and space—that our material bodies are

constituted and shaped by their surrounding space and landscape, and that the space itself

is organized and unified, in fact it exists at all, because of the bodies that inhabit it.

2) The materialization of students' and teachers' bodies as inscribed by powerful

discourses: In *Gender Trouble*, Judith Butler (1990) makes it clear that bodies are not

"mute facticity" or facts of nature, but are, like gender, produced by discourses that etch,

mark, write, and inscribe them into existence (p. 176). There is no natural body that pre-

exists its cultural inscriptions. So, just as gender is not a thing but a performance, the body is not something one *has*, but something one *does*. Even when we attempt to erase or rewrite ourselves, traces of those inscriptions (historical, cultural, social, political, and personal) will always remain as we "do" ourselves bodily in the world. At the same time, and perhaps somewhat contradictorily, the material stuff of the body—the living blood, bone, and flesh that each person moves and carries with them everywhere they go.

3) The construction and disruption of the mind/body binary: the mind/body dichotomy has profoundly shaped our (Western, individualist) thinking about the body. In *Volatile Bodies*, Elizabeth Grosz (1994) explains the effect of dualistic thinking: it hierarchizes and ranks two terms so that one becomes privileged and the other, marginalized. The subordinate term is the "negation, denial, or absence of the primary term, or its 'fall from grace'" (p. 3). The primary term, then, is able to define itself in any way it wants, "establishing its own borders and boundaries" and creating an identity for itself (p. 4). In this case, body is what is not mind; it is what the "mind must negate and expel in order to maintain its integrity" (p. 4).

4) The possibilities for tending to students' and teachers' bodies in educational contexts: Margaret Latta and Gayle Buck (2013) find tremendous hope in the turn to embodied knowledge in educational research that promises to address the current problematic state of the body in school: as separate from space and landscape, inscribed and managed through regimes of power, and split dualistically. They see a theory of embodiment as a point from which we can begin to recognize what is at stake for teaching and learning when we start with understanding our own bodies and bodies of others/"the other" (p. 316). More recently, research on literacies and the body (Jones, 2013; Hughes-Decatur &

Jones, 2012; Enriquez, et al., 2015) allows for a broader understanding of how bodies and literacies are intertwined and helps us explore teacher and student bodies as disciplined, read as social texts, and mobile, in flux, and affective in the classroom.

Collective Memory Work

This research study utilizes the collaborative feminist research methodology of collective memory work (CMW) that values the lived and embodied experiences of women as legitimate sources of knowledge (see Chapter Two, Review of Literature, for a more detailed account of the interdisciplinary scholarship that has taken up CMW as a methodology and for what purposes). In order to take up this methodology, my participants and I formed a collective and examined our teacher bodies through the memories we construct about them. The aim of our work was to consider how, through discourse, our body is constituted in schools and classrooms and how we (re)construct narratives about identity, teaching, learning, and literacy in relationship to our bodies. The follow section describes in detail the CMW process, including theoretical justifications for how collective memory work is practiced and the insights our collective used to do the work.

Building on Haug et al.'s (1987) work, Bronwyn Davies and Susanne Gannon (2006) assert that the aim of collective memory work (CMW) is to capture the "richness, subtlety, and complexity of...embodied thinking and being in the world" through an analysis of memory and language (p. 3). Davies & Gannon (2006) believe that memories are always already part of qualitative research (i.e., in the form of interview responses and observational field notes); CMW simply makes those remembered lived experiences the central focus of the method. CMW does not position memory as "the truth," but

rather uses the literacies of writing, telling, listening, and analyzing our own and others' memories to produce truths in relation to what cannot actually be recovered—the moment as it was lived (p. 3). These particular, local, and situated truths help us to understand how we are socially constructed and discursively constituted through the moments we remember and the ways we retell our stories.

In 1999, Haug published what she calls "a detailed rendering of memory-work method" or a "Research Guide," but she frames this process-oriented piece as a "set of considerations" rather than a 'how to' manual (1999, p. 1). Haug (1999) felt that the methodology in its current state was still in need of improvement, and she wanted to preserve others' space and freedom to reconstruct the methodology and critically expand its theoretical framework for their own purposes (as Davies & Gannon, and others were already doing). In our collective, we used and adapted Haug's (1999) Research Guide to create a process that fit our specific needs and desires as a group. The steps of the methodology we used and revised are described below.

The first step for a CMW group is the development of a research question. In my study, the question of how bodies matter in teaching and learning contexts guided the formation of the group (see "The Collective" section of this chapter for more details about recruitment and selection of participants to build the collective). Next, the group writes a short, simply stated writing prompt to activate the memory-writing process. Haug (1999) suggests that a prompt focusing on the tangible—a moment, an experience, an object, or an emotion—usually works best to jump-start memory writing. Our prompt read: *Write about a time when you felt your teacher body being perceived in a very particular way (by students, parents, administrators, colleagues, or yourself)*. Haug et al.

(1987) suggest that each writer should focus on one situation, a single moment in time, in order to free herself as much as possible from the present and her contemporary analysis of the event. The writer should rediscover the exact moment—including all of its sights, smells, sounds, emotions, thoughts, and sensations—and allow herself to be drawn into the past. Writing memories well is not so much a question of "having a good memory" but of practicing it (p. 47-48).

Haug (1999) also encourages participants, and we followed this tenet as well, to write the memories in the third person. She calls this strategy "historicizing or distancing the narrator" which allows writers to "explain themselves as not self-evident, and therefore, unknown persons" (p. 3-4). Creating this distance is not an attempt to produce a sense of objectivity, as 'objectivity' as a concept is not theoretically congruent with the aims of CMW. Rather, the third person strategy is meant counteract the ways in which women have been constituted not to value themselves or view their own experiences as legitimate knowledge. Paradoxically, creating this third-person distance enables the collective to be more attentive to themselves. Finally, both for practical reasons and to support the theoretical stance that memory writing is not an exercise of reconstructing the truth, Haug (1999) recommends limiting the length of the written memory to one to one-and-a-half double-spaced, type-written pages (p. 5). This will make the length of the analysis sessions more manageable, require the writer to hone in on a moment lasting 1-2 minutes, and support an acceptance of a "certain sketchiness" of the work (p. 5).

After allowing time and space for the memories to be written, the collective gathers together to analyze and interpret the texts. According to Haug (1999), all memories should be heard and experienced through a read-aloud before the memories are

analyzed, one at a time. The analytical approach to the text should do just that—approach

the text, not the author. Haug et al. (1987) characterize the discussion process as a

"peeling away of the layers of material sedimented in our minds" (p. 51). Haug (1999)

provides a sample template for working though the steps of the analysis process in her

"Research Guide" (p. 13). We used this template only as a suggested list of textual

qualities to consider as we discussed each memory—but each analysis session prioritized

and elaborated on different aspects of the text. The author of the memory is encouraged

to participate in each part of the process as well—again, focused on analysis of the text,

not herself. In the initial discussion of the meaning/theme of the text, all members are

encouraged to express their reactions, opinions, and judgments (including the

commonsense notions that the stories/memories brought forth). It is important to note all

of the interpretive models, feelings, thoughts, snippets of popular wisdom, judgments,

etc. that each member of the collective brings to the story. By recording and

contemplating those mental tracings, we can make conscious the ways in which we have

unconsciously interpreted the world and then develop resistances against this

"normality." The process allows the collective to catch a glimpse of how their own

beliefs, values, and ways of seeing the world have been shaped by dominant and

traditional narratives and patterns of thought (Haug et al., 1987). Haug (1999)

recommends writing an initial "thesis statement" for the piece, and translating it into a

"commonsense theory" statement to expose the presence of dominant narratives in our

lives (p. 12). As we always began with many initial statements of meaning and

commonsense narratives, we did not limit ourselves to choosing or prioritizing one over

the others.

The next part of the analysis process is a close examination of the language employed to re-tell the memory, including the linguistic features of the text. Haug's (1999) list of linguistic features includes: verbs, linguistic peculiarities, emotions, motivations, character traits, vacuums, and contradictions. A systematic look at language helps the collective steer away from cultivating "therapeutic discourses of sympathy" or relating "connecting stories by way of 'psychologizing'" (p. 14). Again, this collective analysis is not about psychologizing the author of the story or her "intentions," but taking a closer look at how language is used to construct the memory and how discourses are operating to constitute the subject, "she." At the same time, the group is not tasked with using textual analysis to search for the "real meaning" in the memory as those objective "truths" not exist (1987, p. 65).

The tracing of contradictions help the group to avoid reshaping the memory as a harmonious whole. Haug et al. (1987) write, "the more closely we examined it, the more we saw the contradictory cracks below the surface. Using writing to re-tell our memories allowed the contractions always present to be made visible. Harmony is detrimental to knowledge; learning requires discomfort, ambiguity, and living in tension and inconsistencies" (1987, p. 68-69). Next, analysis of verbs (types, passive and active construction, negated verbs) allows for greater understanding of who has agency and power in the memory; attention to emotions—named and unnamed—reveal the author's relationship to her own or other's feelings; character traits help us to consider how different persons are positioned and how the unitary subject is constructed in the story; searching for characters' interests, motivations, and desires (which is mostly in vain) sheds light on the self-presentation of the author; and gaps and vacuums reveal the

unnamed, the censored, the silent, and the absent in our memories. This close attention to language, and the collective approach to analysis, moves CMW work beyond traditional notions of narrative analysis; often for the first time women see how they actually use language (and how language uses them) when they narrate their lives (Haug, 1999).

Finally, the group returns to the initial conversation of the meanings or themes of the text and considers new critical perspectives spurred by their close analysis of discourse. In this discussion, reference to the linguistic features of the text is key to thinking outside and beyond the commonsense interpretations that were stated at the beginning of the analysis. It is often quite shocking how different these interpretations are from the original reading of the memory. At the end of the session, the group might formulate a new thesis or set of theses that help them understand the memory given how language and discourses have worked to shape the narrative and the subjectivity of the author. For our collective, this process included thinking about which of our initial statements of meaning still seemed important to our understanding of the memory, and what new statements had arisen in the discussion and analysis that we did not see at the start.

Haug et al. (1987) take time to note that writing stories and collectively analyzing them is an enjoyable process. The experience "expanded their knowledge, sharpened their social perceptions, improved their use of language, and changed their attitudes about themselves and each other" (1987, p. 71). They also considered this work a "politically necessary form of cultural labour" that made them live their lives more consciously (1987, p. 71). Haug et al. end their methodology chapter in *Female Sexualization* with a call for imagination. "The heterogeneity of everyday life," they write, "demands similarly

heterogeneous methods if it is to be understood" (p. 71). Through my collective memory work with beginning English teachers, our exploration and practice of CMW aimed to be all of these things: enjoyable, expansive, illuminating, consciousness-raising, and imaginative political labor. Indeed, we did share lots of laughter during the process, as well as a sense of relief that we no longer needed to hide these difficult, complex, or confusing memories about our teacher bodies.

Ethnographic Concepts

In addition to my participation in and facilitation of the CMW process with teachers, as the researcher of this study I used ethnographic practices to collect and analyze empirical materials in order to represent and further theorize about our group's CMW sessions and to understand the CMW process as a critical pedagogical tool for new teachers to raise their consciousness. This part of my research design drew on participants' written and oral memories, our collective experiences during the CMW process, video and audio recordings of the CMW sessions, and participants' reflections and insights on the work told through recorded one-on-one conversations with me.

Questions

This study seeks to understand how beginning teachers can collectively explore how their bodies matter in teaching and learning contexts. First, my participants and I formed a collective and acted as co-researchers as we investigated the subject of our teacher bodies in schools. Together, through the process of collective memory work (CMW), we produced empirical material in the form of written and spoken memories of our lived experiences, analyzed our written memories using Haug's (1999) methods, and drew on critical and sociocultural theories to help us understand how we use discourse

(and how discourse uses us) to construct memories of our bodies in teaching and learning contexts. The purpose of this CMW was to explore teachers' lived experiences as a legitimate source of knowledge as we collectively analyzed the social, cultural, and historical discourses of the body that shape our material bodies and our lives and work as teachers. Finally, I investigated our group's use of collective memory work as a pedagogical tool in order to understand how the methodology of CMW, when used pedagogically with beginning teachers, can challenge, resist, or disrupt normalizing and commonsense narratives of teachers' bodies that are reproduced in schools and classrooms.

The following research questions guided my study:

- How and why do teachers construct and analyze memories of their bodies in teaching and learning contexts? How does writing and analyzing these memories constitute teachers' bodies through both normalizing discourses and counter-narratives?

- What can we learn from these memories of bodies about our roles, identities, and experiences as teachers? What can we learn from these memories about the social, cultural, and historical body of the schoolteacher?

Our Collective

In "Memory-work as a Method of Social Science Research: A Detailed Rendering of Memory-Work Method," Frigga Haug (1999) prioritizes the formulation of the research question over the formation of the collective. She acknowledges that a pre-established group could decide to take up CMW as a project together, as she and her collective did, and that mutual trust and familiarity between group members would be

advantageous. But alternately, a researcher can put out a call for members who are interested in the process and in exploring a particular research question together (1999, p. 2). In other words, there are multiple ways to build a collective. In the research question first, collective formation second approach, the initiator of the group would establish herself as the facilitator. Haug (1999) describes this person using Gramsci's label of an "organic intellectual" who assumes a general leadership role and the intellectual tasks for the group (discussing the steps, leading a brainstorming session, facilitating the analysis of memory, etc.). In this dissertation study, I took up this position as facilitator of the CMW process in our collective.

My selection of members for the collective was predicated on each individual's interest in writing, talking, and collectively exploring how bodies matter in relation to teaching and learning. While the question/focus of the research came first and took priority in this study, I was also thoughtful about participant recruitment. I considered woman-identifying and woman-perceived teacher candidates from the UMN's English education secondary licensure program who worked in a mix of metro-area urban and suburban middle and high schools. I drew on teachers who were in their first through third year of teaching English/language arts. These teachers had all worked with me in the post-baccalaureate English education initial licensure program in some capacity (I served as their instructor, practicum or student teaching supervisor). To form our collective, I sent recruitment emails, first to eight potential members, and then to an additional six individuals until I had eight total interested teachers. In my call I asked potential members about their interest in joining a group of new teachers to learn about and practice collective memory work together in order to study our memories of our

teacher bodies. After getting a positive response from eight teachers, we established a time and date for our first meeting and then created a schedule for two-hour biweekly meetings over the next four months, for a total of eight sessions of CMW.

There are several reasons I decided to limit the criteria for the members of the collective to first through third year English teachers who identify or are perceived as female. First, I drew on a nascent population of teachers because they have been identified as a group in need of additional support that is both personally and professionally fulfilling in order to sustain themselves and their work in the classroom (Kidd, Brown, & Fitzallen, 2015). It is apparent that new teachers who were trained in critical and sociocultural pedagogies and theories are in need of more community-oriented support as they move into positions in public school systems (Lewis, Pyscher, and Stutelberg, 2014). In this study, the CMW group served as a collaborative and reflective space for beginning teachers to negotiate the tensions and challenges they face—what Deborah Britzman (2003) calls the "competing chronologies" or "contradictory realities" of learning to teach. While Britzman writes specifically about these tensions during student teaching, the "teacher as the site of conflict" is an experience that extends beyond student teaching into the first years of the profession (or longer) (p. 27). I further address the role of this study as a pedagogical tool for new teachers in Chapter Seven of this dissertation.

Additionally, I recruited potential members who teach English because of the relationships I had formed with these teachers through their enrollment in the secondary English licensure program at the U of MN. These prior relationships helped us begin our work together with some established trust and rapport, and enabled me to facilitate trust

building between members who came from different cohort years of the program. The process of writing, sharing, and analyzing memories, especially memories of the body, asks participants to be open and vulnerable in both expected and unexpected ways. As we built a collective based on compassion, care, and vulnerability, and discovered how our bodies have been constituted and inscribed in different and similar ways, we were sustained by what connected us, including our identities as English teachers and women. I would also be remiss not to mention a particular impact that forming a collective of English teachers had on this research study. Since the CMW process relies heavily on narrative and linguistic analysis of text, English teachers, who are trained through content and pedagogy to do critical text analysis, move into this work with certain ease, and definitely with personal interest, motivation, and passion. While this confident approach might result in generative analysis work, it also, perhaps, allows for participants to feel overly comfortable in the process and take for granted the work that is being done.

Finally, I chose to limit my criteria for members to teacher who identify as or are perceived as women because of my particular interest in the construction of the cultural and historical body of the woman teacher (Grumet, 1988; Meiners, 2007). Men's teacher bodies, too, have important stories to tell, and some researchers have used CMW to work with male teachers on their memories related to of masculinity (Johnson, Richmond, & Kivel, 2008). Mixed gender-identifying or perceived CMW groups are also a generative possibility, and might allow for interesting comparisons between body subjectivities and experiences across gendered discourses and inscriptions. But for the purposes of this study, the focus on women teachers allowed us to theorize the ways in which the complex and contradictory histories of women teachers still live in our bodies today. The

particular precarity of women's teacher bodies interests me and lives in my body, too.

Table 1 presents summary information about the nine members of our collective:

Participant	Year(s) Teaching	Grade Levels	School Context
Justine*	1	7th	Urban Middle School
Tali	1	10th & 11th	Suburban High School
Kristen	1	7th	Urban Middle School
Kristin	1	7th	Urban Middle School
Jaquinetta	2	6th, 7th, & 8th	Urban Magnet School
Kathryn	2	9th, 10th, & 11th	Suburban High School
Kelsey	3	9th & 10th	Suburban High School
Sara	3	9th	Urban High School
Erin	6	9th – 12th	Urban High School

Table 1: Summary information about the collective members
*Members of the collective have chosen not to use pseudonyms for this project. Specific identifiers for the schools in which we teach have been masked.

As a collective, the nine of us have had diverse social class experiences, and growing up we lived in rural, urban, and suburban communities in and outside Minnesota. All of us except Justine grew up in the United States (Justine is from Canada and went to secondary school in the U.K.). Our ages range from 23 to 37, though at the time of the study Jaquinetta and I were the only two members in our 30s, and Jaquinetta the only member who is also a parent. Racially we are fairly homogeneous; all but two of us identify as white. Kristin identifies as mixed race (Iranian and white) and Jaquinetta as African American. Though we think differently about our gender and sexual identities (including the ways some of us see ourselves queering notions of gender and sexual identity and expectations), we all generally identify as heterosexual cis-gender women. For the Afterward: Our Collective, each of us wrote a short introduction, choosing what

to tell readers about ourselves. Like the memories, these should be read as partial texts—

one of many truths or stories that tell us into existence in a moment in time.

Gathering and Creating Empirical Materials

My sources of empirical materials for the study included notes and memos on our

collective memory work sessions, audio and video recordings of sessions, written

memories from members, and individual conversations with members of the collective.

Each of these sources is described below.

Collective memory work sessions. A summary of our CMW session activities

appears in Table 2 below:

Date and Time of Meeting*	Activities
September 15, 2015	Introduced ourselves; discussed the purpose/goals and benefits/risks of the study; scheduled future meetings; introduced CMW; reviewed and signed consent forms
September 22, 2015	Discussed research questions; developed grounding assumptions for our work; brainstormed the topic of teachers' bodies; created writing prompt; discussed theoretical assumptions of CMW
October 6, 2015	Checked-in, read the memories aloud; reviewed the step-by-step process of CMW
October 20, 2015	Analyzed Kristin and Kathryn's memories
November 3, 2015	Analyzed Justine and Tali's memories
November 17, 2015	Analyzed Sara and Erin's memories
December 1, 2015	Analyzed Kristen's and Jaquinetta's memories
December 8, 2015	Analyzed Kelsey's memory; discussed themes and narratives across the memories

Table 2: Summary of CMW meetings and activities
*All meetings were held in a classroom in Peik Hall at the University of Minnesota from 5:00-7:00 p.m.

Notes and memos. I facilitated and participated in each CMW session. Afterwards, I wrote field notes describing what happened during the session, including reflective/theoretical memos about the meeting. In these memos, I used writing to begin to theorize about our experiences, my observations, and responses to my research questions.

Audio and video recordings of sessions. I audio and video recorded the group's collective memory work sessions. These recordings allowed me to go back to particular moments in our CMW sessions to re-listen to and re-watch the ways in which we were working through the analysis of our memories as we sought to understand bodies in more complex and critical ways. I transcribed the audio-recordings of our sessions so that I could use excerpts from our discussions in my writing and representation of the study and our findings. These recordings supplemented my notes and memos as I sought to answer my research questions pertaining to how and why teachers construct and analyze memories of their bodies and what this work affords us in terms of developing counter-stories or acknowledging our participation in normalizing discourses and systems of oppression.

Memories. Our practice of the CMW process yielded one written memory from each member of the collective, including myself (nine memories total). In addition, we spent some time at the beginning of the process orally telling stories when we brainstormed our writing prompt. The written memories of each member and subsequent notes on copies of those memories are empirical materials from my study. The full text of all nine memories is included in Appendix A.

Presentation of Empirical Materials

The memories from the collective in this dissertation are full text or excerpted as they were originally written. All of members of the collective chose not to use pseudonyms for the study and so first names appear in the dissertation; however, they did request that I mask all identifying information about their schools (we agreed to use pseudonyms for students and other characters in our written memories). Throughout the dissertation (Chapters 3-5 and 7) I use excerpts from the audio transcripts of our collective analysis sessions to explore the analysis we conducted together as well as the affordances and limitations of collective memory work. While I did video record each of our sessions together (except the first one), I have chosen to focus on our written and spoken discourse (memories and transcripts) as materials for analysis in this dissertation. The written and verbal discourse we produced in the study provided more than enough empirical materials with which I explored critical and complex answers my research questions and theorized about women teachers' bodies in relation to our CMW work. The video recordings offer additional perspectives on the work and require different methodological and theoretical frameworks, which I hope to be able to explore in future iterations of the work. For instance, using mediated discourse analysis and geosemiotics to examine the video footage, I can attune not only to the ways in which we used discourse (and discourse used us) to tell and analyze memories about our bodies, but also the ways in which our bodies engaged with the process of CMW, which is an aspect of the methodology that is under-theorized and could be quite generative.

Thinking With Theory

So what to do with all of this empirical material? From a post-qualitative (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013) perspective, it is theory that informs the analysis process of the study, rather than systems of coding data, triangulation of data sources, and member checking. In *Thinking With Theory in Qualitative Research*, Alecia Jackson and Lisa Mazzei (2012) provide an approach to analysis that assumes empirical materials are "partial, incomplete, and always being retold and re-remembered" (p. 3). The thinking with theory approach mirrors the assumptions that Haug (1999) asserts are central to the CMW methodology, and allows for poststructuralist researchers to interpret qualitative research materials— including notes, transcripts, and recordings—in ways that destabilize rather than stabilize, search for difference instead of sameness. In order to do rigorous and analytical readings of my empirical materials, I drew on various theoretical perspectives (including sociocultural theories of discourse, language, and identities, feminist-poststructuralist theories of embodiment, critical race and critical whiteness, post-humanist theories, and a theory of the politics and sociality of emotions) to understand the materials, and examined the materials with and through these theories (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012).

In using the thinking with theory approach, I chose theories to think and write with based on my interpretations and understandings of our group analysis; for instance, when our collective drew on socio-historical race narratives and imaginaries to analyze Justine's role as white woman statue teacher in the hallway (Chapter Three), I studied feminist and critical race theorists (Frankenberg, 1993; Grumet, 1988; hooks, 1994; Meiners, 2004; Deliovsky, 2010) to further analyze the role of whiteness, white femininity, and the production of these narratives in historical and contemporary teaching

and learning contexts. Further, in writing about the analysis sessions in which we discussed the sexual objectification of the woman teacher (Chapter Four) through the "male gaze" (a term we used without citing a source), I first went to the source to understand its theoretical construction (Mulvey, 1975), and then complemented that theory with Butler's conception of the heterosexual matrix (HM). On top of that analysis, I also layered on an intersectional critique of the HM to complicate and extend Butler's (and our collective's) work. The thinking with theory approach allowed me to extend the theoretical work of our collective, complicate and challenge some of the analysis we did, and learn more about the theories and their potentiality for educational research as well.

Jackson and Mazzei (2012) write that this approach "creates a different relationship among texts: they *constitute* one another, and in doing so create something new" (p. 4). In this way, empirical materials are not centered or stabilized through coding or thematic analysis, but "continually transformed and exceeded;" the theory turns the materials into something different and the materials push the theory in new directions (p. 5). I believe that the thinking with theory approach allowed me to continue to conduct multiple, partial, and contingent readings of empirical materials during my writing and representation process, just as our collective did during our group analysis of our memories.

Conclusion

In her afterword to *The Teacher's Body*, Madeline Grumet (2003) improvises, replacing the article "the" from the title of the book with the pronoun "my" to assert that "in this discourse about the embodied experiences of teaching, every body is simultaneously a subject and an object" (in Freedman & Holmes, p. 249). In this way, she

writes, "*my* teacher's body" points to both the body of the teacher herself and the body of the person who teaches me. This body is both subject and object at the same time and creates a doubled categorical effect: *my* teacher's body is "embedded in cultural meanings, sedimented in history, and reinforced by ideology and emotion" (p. 249). There is tension in being both subject and object at once, both the gazer and the gazed upon. When used in educational discourse, a "subject" refers to a topic of study, and an "object" refers to the goal, the objective of a lesson. Teachers' bodies, and embodied ways of being in the world are reduced to vessels that reproduce these subject matters and learning goals. Grumet declares that the exploration of this tension of teacher as subject and object is pedagogically important, and I believe that collective memory work is an exploratory method that, by its design, lives in that tension. As we worked collectively to examine our memories and lived experiences, we took on the complicated work of being simultaneously the subject and object of the research. The interplay between the materiality and discursivity of the body was highlighted in our research process. Through the written construction and analysis of memories of our bodies, we examined the ways we construct our bodies through discourse, how our bodies are constructed through the discourses that make us, as well as the moments when the material body seems to transcend discourse and language through its very flesh and bone.

Chapter Seven: Conclusions

Our Stories

> *All Stand.*
> **Justine:** These are stories about...
> **Erin:** women teachers
> **Sara:** living breathing bodies
> **Justine:** resisting and participating in systems of oppression
> **Sara:** resilience. persistence.
> BEAT.
> **All**: These are the stories that make us (Mixed Blood Script).

On March 15, 2016, Justine, Sara, and I performed our memories on stage at the

Mixed Blood Theatre in Minneapolis, Minnesota as part of Teachers Take the Firehouse.

The purpose of the event was to give teachers a microphone and a stage with which to tell

their stories. The three of us each performed a dramatic reading of one memory for a

crowd of about 50 audience members, other performers, and the coordinators of the

event. In between each story, we collectively narrated excerpts from our analysis sessions

(drawn from our initial statements of meaning: "This is a story about…") to give the

audience a sense of the multiple voices that were present as we wrote, shared, and

analyzed these memories, as well as to disrupt the notion that there is a way to draw

conclusions about what our memories might mean. We also chose to anonymize our

stories, calling ourselves "she" or "the teacher," and we read each other's memories

instead of our own because we had come to feel as though the stories were ours

collectively, and we didn't want the audience to easily know whose story belonged to

whom (or, if they were trying to figure it out, we wanted them to live in the discomfort

and tension of being unsure).

In these memories, the teacher experiences fear, discomfort, annoyance, trouble,

hurt, surprise, amusement, and uncertainty as her body is perceived in particular ways, by

others or herself. Through the collective memory work process we talked about these

embodied emotions, working through many different interpretations of how and why the

teacher in the story felt the way she did. We could often trace these feelings back to

commonsense narratives in our memories that we saw ourselves reproducing and

disrupting—about teacher authority, teachers' bodies, race, gender, sexuality, and age,

students' bodies, developmentalism, and the mind/body dichotomy. Our analysis of these

stories, including the ways in which the text both accommodated and resisted

normalizing narratives, was thoughtful, thorough, funny, difficult, and illuminating. Each

reading and analysis session drew on and reflected the sessions before it; our stories first

became connected and then truly became collective, belonging to us all. And yet. It

wasn't until this moment on stage, when I sat behind Sara as she performed my story, as I

watched her body be my body, that I was able to locate those remembered emotions—

fear, uncertainty, discomfort, trouble, pain—still lingering in and on me. I watched as

Sara read and performed these lines from my memory:

> They repeat this pattern: rounding up bodies, counting them, checking them off
>
> the list. The teacher stands in the shadow of the door, of the principal, and
>
> wonders: "Who am I to enter their homes, to ask why they aren't in school, to put
>
> my white middle class body onto their threshold, to demand answers?" She lets
>
> Dr. Acevedo-Barron do the talking and she tells herself that it's because the
>
> principal speaks Spanish and she does not. But the truth is, she is deeply afraid
>
> and she cannot hide it (Mixed Blood Script).

Chills ran up and down my body. Because I was sitting behind her, I could not read

Sara's expressions or identify on her face those feelings I experienced as a brand new

teacher. But I could see the way she held her body tentatively in the threshold of those imaginary doorways, just as I did once upon a time, feeling ambivalent about what it meant to be a white woman teacher of students of color. Sara hunched her shoulders a little, the way I do when I'm insecure, when I'm trying to disappear. I saw in her body and remembered in my own a complex and contradictory story about whiteness as simultaneously invisible and visible, powerful and fragile. In that moment, I could identify emotional literacies that, as Stephanie Jones (2013) writes, are *in* and *of* the body—through Sara's body, in her performance of my memory, and in/of my body, too.

Our Findings

The following chapter offers a temporary conclusion to our collective work—it is a place for me to stop and consider what I learned as a researcher, what new ways of thinking and being we might take with us from this study, and what new directions we might go to continue to pursue an understanding of our teacher bodies through memory work. As in all research, the choices I made, the questions I asked, and the circumstances of the study constructed boundaries around how and why I researched and wrote this dissertation the way I did. With new choices, questions, and encounters come new possibilities, and I will discuss some of those here. First, I will revisit my research questions, not just to re-summarize answers to them, but to take a step back and reflectively consider how they operated in this study, and what other possibilities might be available for asking research questions about teachers' bodies. Then, I will consider several lessons I learned through the process and make suggestions based on them. Finally, I will explore the boundaries around this study and the limitations they create,

and a few future directions I/we (our collective) might go to continue to live out this work in various ways.

Revisiting the Research Questions

This study began with two sets of research questions that, in turn, shaped the framework and processes of the project. The first set of questions examined the methodological particularities of doing collective memory work with women English teachers to study our bodies: *How and why do teachers construct and analyze memories of their bodies in teaching and learning contexts? How does writing and analyzing these memories constitute teachers' bodies through both normalizing discourses and counter-narratives?* The second set of questions focused on the theoretical analyses our collective did together about the memories: *What can we learn from these memories of bodies about our roles, identities, and experiences as teachers? What can we learn from these memories about the social, cultural, and historical body of the schoolteacher?* Chapters Three, Four, and Five of this dissertation addressed, in various ways, both sets of questions, through a close examination of the empirical materials of this study—the memories we wrote and our collective analyses of them. First, Chapter Three traced our work with one memory—Justine's. This chapter functions as an example of the *how* and *why* of our work together by providing an account of how our analysis of one memory evolved through several readings of it, each interpretation becoming more critical and moving our discussion from the individual experience of one teacher to a deconstruction of larger normalizing narratives of race, gender, and teaching. The analysis excerpts and my exploration of our group analysis also serve as a response to the second set of questions; from Justine's memory we learned about the construction of whiteness and

white femininity in the profession of teaching, and the ways in which, as women teachers, we continue to participate in and resist racial narratives through the strategies we employ (in this case, what we called acknowledging and ignoring race in the classroom).

In Chapter Four I took a different writing approach to answering the research questions—this chapter weaves together three memories of increasingly intense experiences in which we felt that our teacher body was being policed, objectified, or harassed in the classroom by our male students. In our analysis of these stories, we came to see how normalizing narratives of gender, sexuality, and age, intersected and complicated how we constituted our teacher bodies and our students' roles and identities in these moments. Unlike Justine's memory, which stands alone in its chapter, these three memories speak to one another; together they became part of our collective history of experiencing bodily harm, and the multiple ways we tried to respond to that harm, both in the moment it happened and in the *how* and *why* of our construction of memories of the event.

Finally, in Chapter Five I took yet a third approach to answering the research questions, using post-humanist theories and Ahmed's (2004) theory of the sociality of emotions. The memories in this chapter can all be read as stories about the boundaries within and around teacher-student relationships and what the invasion of these boundaries (or not) means for teaching and our teacher bodies. Wrapped up in this invasion is the political, social, and historical circulation of emotions and the presence of agentic non-human material objects that we encounter. This chapter moves back and forth between the memories, our collective analysis transcripts, and my theorizing as

dissertation writer. In this way, new perspectives are presented to explore *how* and *why,* through collective memory work, we constructed and analyzed our body memories and how nonhuman objects and emotions played important roles in those stories. Thus we entertained new interpretations and understandings of our teacher roles, identities, and histories through these body stories.

Reaching the conclusion of this dissertation offers me an opportunity to reflect on what these questions enabled and constrained in this study. Certainly, they enabled the nine of us to engage in meaningful ways through the collective memory work process. There was never a shortage of body stories, and we often lamented the fact that we would only have time for one round of memory writing and analysis. During our second session, the development of our writing prompt could have taken our remembering and writing in various directions, including writing particularly about body parts, beauty/appearance, illness and injury, motherhood and reproduction, sexuality, race, and even death. On one hand, my research questions allowed for this openness of possibilities for our collective, and thus the construction of our prompt about bodily perceptions. On the other hand, I wonder how a research question about sensation or materiality might have directed us toward the body differently, resulting in different analysis and theorizing of emotions or corporeality, or how a question about our embodied encounters might have created the possibility of decentering the role of humans altogether, leading us toward memories that explored non-human objects or spatial landscapes. A question within my research questions remains: What do we mean when we say "the body"? The tension between discourse and materiality in theorizing embodiment seems especially alive in the ways we write research questions to study the body, and I wonder how the construction of my

questions created space (or not) for that tension—for multiple, complex, and contradictory ways of understanding the body—to live in our collective analyses, versus re-creating individual, essential, or binary ways of conceptualizing the body. Reconsidering how my research questions built boundaries around the study is one important lesson learned. There are several others that I will describe as well.

Lessons Learned: New Pedagogical Imaginaries

What Research Counts? What Counts as Research? After one of our early collective memory work session, Kristen hung back to ask me what it's like to get a Ph.D. Though I had just begun the dissertation process, having watched several colleagues complete their studies and write their theses, I felt like I could say with at least a little certainty what this process might be like for me. Kristen's line of questioning, though, surprised me—she seemed to want to know how I managed to "get away" with doing my study. "So how did you convince them to let you do collective memory work?" she asked, "What's the precedent for this?" "There isn't any, not here at least," I said. "I mean, doctoral students have done participatory research for their dissertation, like working with groups of students on an action research project. And another classmate of mine is writing a novel. But collective memory work is unique, as far as I know." "But this kind of research," Kristen continued, "It means something. It's engaging. It's helping me as a first-year teacher…and it counts?" I laughed, because in that moment I understood where her question was coming from. For her, research seemed to be all about the researcher, about an individual studying something or someone else, and then writing a report about it that may or may not ever get read or used by anyone. As a first year teacher, research felt utterly disconnected from what she was doing in her classroom

every day. There have been moments when I've looked at research the exact same way. "Yes, it counts," I told her. "And if it were up to me, this is what educational research would always be—collective, engaging, participatory, critical, transformative, and with and for people, not on or about them." "Oh, I agree," she replied. "I think it's amazing and I love being in your study. I just…knowing academia…I just still can't believe this counts."

I have done my best in this dissertation to demonstrate why, in a world that values individualism, "truth," "objectivity," and a belief that the best things can be measured, sorted, coded, and generalized, it is this good hard work—including our memories—that really ought to count. In that spirit, I've made some specific intentional moves to alter the language of my study to find alternative ways of describing "data" and "methods"— constructs that have become strategies to move qualitative research toward a Western, humanist, neo-positivist paradigm. In a keynote address at the Literacy Research Association's annual conference, Elizabeth St. Pierre (2015) suggested that as we attempt post-qualitative inquiry and as we train traditional qualitative collection and analysis approaches out of ourselves, we can start by changing our language. So in this study, "data" became "empirical materials," and analysis was theory-based, rather than dependent on systems of coding and categorizing. I've also placed the chapter that describes the research study *after* the analysis chapters rather than before them. In the same keynote address at LRA, St. Pierre (2015) remarked that post-qualitative researchers *do* have "methods"—that is, ways of doing their inquiry—but that they usually come, "too late to help us." So, the movement of my chapter about my research

approaches and practices is symbolic—appearing perhaps too late to help the reader, either.

Next, in order to transform what research counts and what counts as research, it's important that we continue to create communities of researchers who believe that lived experiences are valuable and legitimate forms of empirical material—that is, the knowledge that we hold because we live in the world, including the ways our bodies know and learn must be seen valuable, but also not reduced to quantitative data sets or even neo-positivist qualitative data. When experiences get commodified in these ways, with stories condensed into lists of frequently used words, or emotions turned into numbers on a Likert Scale, teachers' lives get flattened and essentialized. This is particularly true for teachers who already face marginalization because of their identities: race, gender, sexuality, social class, or (dis)ability.

I call for scholars to gather stories and memories as empirical materials, and in all their complexity, contradictions, and incompleteness, to make those stories count. We need to deeply consider what the purpose of our work might be, whom we want it to address, and why. I believe that many teachers, like Kristen, want to participate in and learn from research that treats her and her students not as objects of study but producers of knowledge and collaborators in the work. Kristen does not need another person to observe her or her students from the back of the room, apply interventions to/on them, or measure her teaching or their learning through standardized means. She does not need her worth as a teacher to be described as a value added measure. But when asked to collaborate, when listened to, and when offered the opportunity to be in community to learn more about herself and her teaching with her peers, she was thrilled to engage. The

with/for approach to research not only produces more meaningful scholarship, but also influences the lives of teachers and their students in generative ways.

    Doing Critical Literacy. The English education initial licensure program at the University of Minnesota takes a critical sociocultural approach to teaching methods courses to pre-service teachers (Lewis, Pyscher & Stutelberg, 2014). When the teachers in our collective were students in my course or when I supervised them as student teachers, their learning (and my teaching and mentorship) was framed by sociocultural theories of language, learning, and literacy and critical literacy pedagogies for the secondary English classroom. In their book *Designing Critical Literacy Education through Critical Discourse Analysis*, Rebecca Rogers and Melissa Mosley Wetzel (2014), define critical literacy as "approaches to literacy instruction that place an emphasis on helping people develop agency so that they can accomplish goals they deem important and resist the coercive effects of literacy" and a political "stance toward texts, discourses, and social practices" framed by the relationship between language and power (p. 4, 7). But while much research has been done about critical literacy practices and pedagogies in K-12 classroom settings or with youth in their communities, Rogers and Wetzel argue, "we know very little about how pre-service and in-service teachers themselves gain the pedagogical knowledge for critical literacy" (p. 1). In response they implore, "Who will teach critical literacy teachers? And, what will these educational practices look like?" (p. 7).

    Their answer lies in the inextricable link between critical literacy and critical discourse analysis (Rogers & Wetzel, 2013, p. 99). The relationship between them depends on a particular understanding of "text." Hilary Janks (2000) writes that, "Texts

are constructed. Anything that has been constructed can be deconstructed" (p. 176). This description of texts fits both the definition of critical literacy and critical discourse analysis. By extension, Rogers and Wetzel assert that " critical literacy is not possible without discourse analysis" because key to critical literacy is the inquiry into discourse practices, including the power embedded and circulating through language and identity (p. 1). Thus, Rogers and Wetzel take up critical discourse analysis as both a research and pedagogical tool in the teacher education classroom. Part of their work includes the use of pre-service teachers' analyses of written and spoken personal narratives to aid their exploration and understanding of culture, race, power, and language diversity.

Rogers and Wetzel's (2013) work is an example of how teacher educators and pre-service literacy teachers can *do* critical discourse analysis as a pedagogy for learning to teach critical literacy. Similarly, collective memory work can also serve as a pedagogical tool for critical literacy practitioners: it combines the enactment of a critical analysis of language and discourse that focuses on the sociopolitical, draws on multiple perspectives, and identifies and disrupts normalizing narratives through a critical and collective reflection of teaching practice via the analysis of our memories. Several times during our work together someone in our collective made this connection between critical literacy pedagogies and collective memory work explicit. For example, during one of our first meetings together, I explained the CMW analysis process by drawing on critical literacy theories and practices (Freire, 1970; Janks, 2000; Janks, 2002; Luke, 2012; Shor & Freire, 1987) to describe Haug's (1999) methods to the collective. I reminded our collective of critical literacy questions that we often worked with in the methods course I taught: How does this text position its readers? How do readers position this text? How is

language working in this text to reproduce dominant narratives? Counter-stories? How are identities, histories, and sociopolitics shaped by and through this text? I made this connection between critical literacy practices and collective memory work overt to tap into the teachers' prior knowledge and experience as students in the licensure program where they engaged with critical literacy theories as they learned "methods" of teaching English/Language Arts.

As our work together continued, occasionally one of the members of the collective would explore the connection between collective memory work practices and their work as a middle or high school literacy teacher. For instance, in one analysis session we constructed multiple interpretations of a memory largely based on how verbs in the story—active or passive, action or helping—were positioning characters as powerful/agentic or not. We then considered how the histories and identities of the characters were imbued with agency and power and the normalizing narratives about race, gender, and teaching that those histories and identities reproduced. At the end of the session, Kelsey eagerly discussed how she planned to ask her 9th graders to do similar work with a short story they would be reading in class the next day. The way we theorized about how the language of the memory worked to constitute a teacher who felt she had authority (or not), and students who were positioned as able to be controlled (or not) was powerful analysis in and of itself. When atop that analysis we layered the histories of race and gender that the teacher and students carried in and on their bodies, more diverse and disruptive readings of the memory were entertained. Kelsey saw this practice as both a concrete way for her students to engage with the story they were reading (locating, naming, and categorizing the verbs), and also a way to push their

reading of the story beyond comprehension or new criticism and into the realm of critical literacy. Several times, the members of our collective suggested that they could imagine their students taking up a similar kind of work—writing memoirs and then doing critical collective analysis of them—as a way to learn and practice critical literacy. This seems like a potentially powerful application of collective memory work, but also presents important ethical questions about the practice. Adding elements like teacher assessment and institutional pressure and accountability to the CMW process shifts its aims and outcomes, and potentially puts participants in a position to perform engagement of the practice for a grade.

Thus, while I believe that collective memory work provides teacher educators and teachers with another pedagogical tool for researching and teaching critical literacy teachers, I also caution its use as a workshop, professional development model, or institutional training session. Meaningful as the practice can be, when taken up in short-term, evaluatory, and mandatory training situations it creates the potential to do harm and violence to the participants. Collective memory work practices necessitate care, compassion, trust, and vulnerability. If those participating in the methodology did not elect to do so, or if the process gets condensed into a three-hour workshop, there will not be the time or emotional space to those build relationships that enable deep and critical engagement in the work.

Our Bodies Matter. "Once we start talking in the classroom about the body and about how we live in our bodies, we're automatically challenging the way power has orchestrated itself in that particular institutionalized space" (hooks, 1994, p. 136).

Kristin's memory describes a moment when a new teacher asks an administrator for help because of the "level of disrespect and chaos" in her classroom. In this meeting she is in tears as she tells him, "I can't do it." The administrator's response is to come into Kristin's classroom unannounced to observe her teaching. During the observation, Kristin and a female student, Ariel, get into a verbal power struggle. Eventually, Ariel apologizes to Kristin and asks for a hug; then, without consent, she hugs Kristin, snuggling "her head right in [Kristin's] bosom." Surprised at this hug, Kristin exaggeratingly pushes Ariel's arms away and immediately fears the conversation she will have with her administrator after class. "Shit," she thinks, "that's gonna come up," as she continues on with her lesson.

Our embodied teacher memories will always "come up": when we retell them in conversations with our colleagues or over the dinner table at home, when we write about them in our journals, during quiet moments when that thing that happened in class nags at us, and in unexpected ways, when our body suddenly reacts, reminding us of something we experienced days, weeks, or years ago. Memories live in our bodies, on the surface of our skin and in the movement of our muscles. When Kristin writes "that's gonna come up," she means that this hug from Ariel will probably be a topic of conversation with the administrator observing her class. He might ask her: Why did it happen? Why did Kristin react the way she did? What's happening with Ariel? Further, Kristin worries that he will think there is something wrong with her as a teacher if students feel free to hug her and that she will be scolded or disciplined as a result. But in a broader sense, Kristin's comment that it's "gonna come up" is also about the ways our stories about bodies in our schools and classrooms have a way of coming up again and again. Because despite all the

work that normalizing discourses and the institution of school have done to eliminate, ignore, or denigrate our bodies, they still come up.

Sometimes we speak in codes about our bodies that "come up." When we talk about students, we talk about bodies. When we talk about test scores, value added measures, calibration, performance assessments, data-driven instruction, standardization, and response to intervention, we talk about bodies. Classroom management, discipline, development, protocols, and behaviors are really about bodies. Equity, justice, relevance, culture, marginalization, and oppression are about the body, too. Literacies live in our bodies and are performed by bodies, and they're "gonna come up"—because that's what happens when we teach and learn. Our bodies are always already coming up. In order to do what bell hooks suggests—to challenge the institutional power of schools by honoring the body—we need to acknowledge the ways our ever-present bodies matter in schools and classrooms.

First, we need to recognize the codes we use to talk about the body and acknowledge how our teacher bodies and the bodies of our students live in and through school, including the ways bodies are political, curricular, pedagogical, material, discursive, marked and inscribed, collective and intertwined. Then we need to work to find ways to honor, embrace, and learn from our teacher bodies and the bodies of our students and work to oppose the singular and developmental way—the "body-not-enough-ness"—they most often currently experience teaching and learning contexts (Hughes-Decatur, 2011). This is not just about deciphering "body language" or attuning to the physical and emotional needs of the body—though those things are important. It also requires us to disentangle our belief in the mind/body binary and question the ways

we view the relationship between the body, learning, and knowledge. Finally, we need to critically engage with the histories and politics that live in our individual and collective bodies. Our bodies hold particularities based on the ways they are constituted, marked, and perceived by others and ourselves, and our bodies carry collective stories of the people who came before us. Each of us has different histories that live in us—a body that has experienced different markings, traumas, perceptions, and subjectivities. There is no one way to honor and hold all these multiplicities. But perhaps there are a few ways to move forward and allow bodies to matter.

Learning from and about our teacher bodies can start in the teacher education classroom, when we begin to study educational institutions and systems of schooling and contemplate our future role as teachers in those systems. This process includes interrogating and understanding the experiences we had in our student bodies, and how our bodies were ignored, denied, or denigrated in the process of learning. Then, teacher education can be shaped to characterize the teacher as en embodied being and the processes of teaching and learning as whole-bodied literacies. Stephanie Jones (2013) works with pre-service teachers to encourage them to be in, explore, and experience the literacies they perform with their bodies. She has her students ride the city bus, go on pedagogy walks, and attune to the ways their bodies respond in her classroom when she engages them in literacies like writing, round-robin reading, or singing. In addition to coming into a different relationship with our own bodies and the way they learn, we can notice how histories of race, sexual orientation, class, and gender play out on the bodies of teachers and students in schools, and complicate how we resist and participate in the reproduction of privilege and oppression of and with our bodies. Talking about the body

and how we live in it, as hooks suggests, might be the first step; it's also a continuously important one. And it requires that we work together in solidarity to do so.

Collectivity. During rehearsal before our performance at the Mixed Blood Theatre, Justine, Sara, and I were asked to write out our own introduction for the audience. After listing our names and the places and grade levels we teach/have taught, we worked together to describe our relationship. We wrote: "Justine and Sara first met Erin when they were students in her English education class at the University of Minnesota, and then met each other when they became participants in Erin's dissertation study. These stories were written for Erin's study about collective memory work and the embodied memories of women teachers." We paused there and looked at each other. There was something else we needed to say about us. Sara smiled and added, "and through the practice of collective memory work, they have become students and teachers of one another."

In *Getting Smart*, Patti Lather (1991) writes: "a more collaborative approach to critical inquiry is needed to empower the researched, build emancipatory theory, and move toward the establishment of data credibility within praxis-oriented, advocacy research" (p. 69). In the early 90s, she cited the "present turmoil" of the human sciences (the move from positivist to post-positivist/qualitative methods) as an opportunity to construct new designs, tenets, and commitments for research, including greater collaboration and reciprocity between researcher and researched. Twenty-five years later, we are at yet another moment of change, and Lather has once again taken up the call to challenge, resist, and transform our research practices through the post-qualitative and post-humanist paradigms (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013). Within these paradigms, the need

for more collaborative inquiry approaches remains, and, I argue, collectivity that can help us reject neo-positivist qualitative processes and work toward justice-oriented and emancipatory research practices.

What's the difference between collaboration and collectivity? Aren't they both essentially about working together toward similar aims? In the first part of our introduction for the Mixed Blood performance, Justine, Sara and I described a kind of collaboration—we worked together as teacher and students in an English education program, and then in my dissertation study. Within this collaborative environment, there was a sense of reciprocity between us, a relationship of care and generosity, and a set of similar goals, aims, and values. Collaboration, group work, or learning communities are made up of individuals coming together to solve problems, support one another, and learn together. But this description was inadequate to capture the collective memory work process, because together we experienced something beyond collaboration.

Collectivity requires a certain refusal of individuality. In traditional research, the individual's story is about a human (often male), positioned as a knowable object, who is autonomous and self-directed, moving from ignorance to enlightenment. Ultimately, collaborative practices do not ask us to disrupt this master narrative of individuality, but collectivity questions and refuses it. In collective memory work, we are all both subjects and objects of the research, and through the analysis process we deconstruct the image of the fixed individual who exists autonomously in the world. Instead, we examine the human experience as discursive and socially constructed, always dependent on other humans (and non human objects, discourses, and spatial landscapes) for its existence. We have identities because of others and those identities are in a constant state of becoming

in and through our entanglements. This is truly a paradigm shift from individualist and humanist ways of thinking and doing inquiry. It is increasingly important for us to consider how our work can refuse the master narrative of research through a white, middle class, heteronormative, Western perspective, but that does not mean refusing those who identify in these ways. Rather, through solidarity, working collectively, and finding ways to decolonize, deterritorialize, and refuse individuality, we can deconstruct harmful practices, oppressive knowledge systems, and colonizing institutions.

Boundaries and Possibilities

Construction of the Collective. Many long-term collective memory work groups, including Haug et al.'s (1987), Davies et al.'s (2001), and Gannon et al.'s (2012) were constructed out of members' mutual curiosity, engagement, and commitment to one another and the process. These collectives worked collectively to produce any material outcomes (books, articles, chapters, performances) from their research. Alternately, I individually constructed (designed, recruited members, organized, led) our collective for the purpose of my study. Further, the stakes and outcomes for production based on this work were different for me than the other members of our collective. For me, there was always an anticipated product of this study, a dissertation, which was bound by a set of institutional expectations and a timeline for completion. This was certainly not the case for the other teachers in our group, who were not expected to participate in the dissertation writing process or any other form of publication, representation, or dissemination of the work.

What boundaries get drawn around the study because of this important difference in how and why the collective is constructed? One of the ways the construction of our

collective altered the methodology was that I took on the role of facilitator of the group. As dissertation researcher and writer, having the facilitator position and doing the organizing labor was appropriate, but it also created a set of norms and expectations for our group that were different from collectives formed out of shared interests and more flattened hierarchies. For example, I organized the meeting times and spaces, sent out email reminders, kept us on schedule for completing our analysis work, and provided food and copies of the materials at each meeting. Under the circumstances of a dissertation study, these were all expectations that I was glad to take on, but they certainly differed from the ways in which other CMW groups have functioned, with those responsibilities and norms distributed, negotiated, or completed collaboratively.

I was also the member of the group who had prior knowledge of the CMW process and brought that knowledge to the collective. Essentially, I taught the group the CMW methodology (though we all also learned about it by doing it together), connecting it to their experiences with text analysis and critical literacy practices. I assured the group that there is no one way to do collective memory work and that if Haug's (1999) methods weren't working or didn't suit us we could change them. But each time we analyzed a memory, we did take certain steps together (naming initial statements of meaning, uncovering commonsense narratives, doing linguistic analysis, and returning to initial statements of meaning), and while that structure was helpful in our process of learning something new, it also created a set of boundaries around what our collective might view as the "best" way to proceed with the methodology. In other iterations of this work I've done, our collective came together with all members having knowledge of the methodology and an interest in pursuing it. Under these conditions, the group then

negotiates how the analysis process proceeds, what parts of the process are privileged and which are altered, and who will complete certain tasks or take on particular roles—and those can shift from moment-to-moment or from one session to the next. That fluidity does create a different kind of practice than my study was able to have considering my need to take on the role of facilitator and collective memory work "teacher." For the most part, that role remained mine throughout the study; though the analysis process became more habitual for everyone and thus the need for me to facilitate explicitly became less important as time went on.

While having a facilitator of the collective did draw some boundaries around the division of labor, responsibilities, and knowledge of the study, there were also some potential benefits to having one member responsible for certain tasks and processes. As beginning, full-time middle and high school teachers, the eight other members of the collective could focus on their stressful, often overwhelming day-to-day teaching responsibilities while I took on administrative tasks for the project. This created greater ease for the teachers who only needed to show up to our sessions and participate. During our CMW sessions, it was apparent how crucial this was—at the beginning of each meeting, we would take some time to check in, each member sharing something about her life, personal or work-related. At several of our check-ins, teachers expressed grief, frustration, stress, fear, and sadness about heart-breaking situations at work: a three-hour-long lockdown because a student brought a gun to school, the suicide of a former student, colleagues suffering from illnesses or family trauma, or a particularly challenging class or student interaction. In addition, the teachers were all dealing with the daily difficulties of teaching and frustrations of working in public school systems. In these moments when we

shared our pain and comforted one another, I was so grateful to have the role of facilitator—to have made all the plans for the meeting, welcomed, listened to, and encouraged the teachers, and provided them a space to connect with and support one another in these meaningful ways.

Time. Another important boundary this study drew around our CMW was the timeframe with which our collective was able to work together. While relationships between myself and each member of the collective, and for several participants with each other, were built on multiple years of interaction in the teacher licensure program at the U of MN, as a whole group we were only able to work together for approximately four months. In my previous experiences working with a collective on this process, our full engagement with one another developed and deepened over the course of several years and iterations of the CMW process. However, our collective was only able to complete one full round of prompt writing and memory sharing, writing, and analysis. Practically and logistically, this four-month process enabled me to collect more than enough empirical materials (memories and recorded analysis sessions) to write a dissertation, and it put an important limitation on the project for the eight practicing teachers, who were volunteering approximately 20 hours of their time to participate in the study. In those 20 hours, we were able to make great strides in cohering as a group, building strong relationships as a whole and between particular members who continued building a friendship after our work together was done.

That said, in a second round of CMW with this same group I can imagine the expectations shift such that roles, responsibilities, and norms would be more evenly distributed among members of the collective. I can also imagine relationships developing

and deepening to create even more possibilities for co-construction of manuscripts or other forms of representation of our work together (like the Mixed Blood Theatre script and performance). Ultimately, time is an important part of the CMW process, because as research, the collection and analysis of empirical materials are one in the same. In addition, anything done in the spirit of collectively simply takes more time—to engage with one another vulnerably, to consider multiple perspectives and make decisions together, and to try out new ways, alter them, and try them again to discover what processes might work best for the group. Time is probably a limitation that plagues many research studies; of course, it is a necessary boundary to draw in the design of a project, but I also believe that the most meaningful research transcends some of those boundaries through the developments of relationships that continue to flourish even after the project is complete.

   Homogeneity of Collective. Considering the time we had to work together on this project, I thought carefully about how I would build the membership of the collective. Relying on my existing relationships with practicing teachers was essential to building a group that could come together with at least two things in common—they all completed the English education initial licensure program (ILP) at the University of Minnesota and they all knew me. I believe that these commonalties did facilitate an expedited sense of trust and spirit of collaboration among the members of the group. However, because of this boundary I drew around my study through participant recruitment, I constructed a fairly homogenous group—in the last four years our cohorts have been made up of a majority white, cis-gender, men and women in their early to mid-twenties. In addition, they all experienced similar pedagogies and ideologies of teacher education in the post-

baccalaureate program, framed by a critical sociocultural theoretical approach (a handful

of doctoral students, including me, have been the instructors and supervisors of the

program over the last four years). To compound that homogeneity, time and travel

commitments for participation were also prohibitive for some teachers to join the

collective, particularly women with families and those who lived and/or had teaching

positions in suburban or rural communities outside the Twin Cities Metro.

As a result of these limitations and boundaries, our collective included only two

teachers who did not identify as white (one mixed race, the other African American), and

all eight teachers identified as heterosexual and cis-gender. The majority of the teachers

were also in their early to mid-twenties, with the exception of one member who also had

a child. I worked to create some heterogeneity in the group by recruiting participants who

had been teaching between one and three years, who taught at both the middle and high

school levels, and who taught in various contexts—urban and suburban school districts,

public and magnet schools. However, the relative homogeneity of the group limited the

kinds of memories produced and perspectives represented in our analysis sessions (for

example, we never had a conversation about what it was like to be perceived as a middle-

aged or older woman teacher or the embodied experiences of a lesbian or bi-sexual

teacher). Further, since the members of our collective shared similar educational

philosophies, it is easy to reproduce certain discourses, often without even noticing or

naming them, rather than critically identifying, interrogating, and challenging them. As a

collective, I believe we made more assumptions about one another because of our

commonalities than we would have if we had less connecting us. While we maintained a

group norm of questioning our own and others' assumptions and disagreeing with one

another respectfully, I noticed that we challenged each other even less when Jaquinetta, who is African American, was absent from a group meeting.

    Dependence on the Literacy of Writing. In addition to the boundaries presented by and through the composition of our collective, our dependence on the literacy of writing as a means to share our memories also created a boundary around the possibilities of this work and who may or may not have access to it. A common critique of collective memory is that, while it does have deterritorializing aims, it has been used most frequently by white, middle-class, Western women in Europe, Australia, and the United States, and draws almost exclusively on writing and text analysis, which privileges those who have historically had access to and culturally value those literacy practices. In one way, writing as a boundary could impact a group of teachers who do not identify as writers or lovers/experts of language, the way secondary English teachers often do[4]. On a larger scale, the traditional-text heavy aspects of CMW, especially writing, could easily alienate or exclude communities, cultures, and participants who value and engage in other forms of literacy, do not have a written language or histories of writing, or have had past trauma based on their exclusion from traditional "school" literacies.

    For example, during and after the colonial slave trade, white Americans legally barred African slaves from learning to read or write in English and prevented them from interacting with one another in their African tribal languages. When slaves responded by

---

[4] I don't mean to imply here that English teachers have some kind of command of language or writing ability that other teachers do not; in fact, I have frequently talked back to those who have insisted that other groups of teachers couldn't do the kind of writing or analytical work necessary for the CMW process. All written or oral memories have rich linguistic aspects to discuss and can generate deep, critical analysis. In fact, sometimes the less a writer pays attention to (self-censors) her craft in this process, the more opportunities there are to see the ways in which discourse operates in and through us. That said, there is a socially constructed identity of an English teacher that, for better or worse, positions us as "language experts" and "good writers."

developing their own language systems and English dialects, whites worked to systemically marginalize these ways of speaking so that the Black community would continue to be identified by whites as uneducated and uneducable. This history of violence and oppression around language and literacy practices has created collective historical trauma in the Black community. Because of the systemic racism and white supremacy that perpetuates from the institution of slavery into schools and classrooms today, writing and speaking as forms of school literacy carry political, racial, and classist trauma for the Black community. This also is true, then, for research practices that utilize writing and speaking literacies for the collection and analysis of empirical materials. Similarly, indigenous communities whose languages have been nearly obliterated by white colonial genocide, and other cultures and communities that share stories orally, artistically, and performatively, also may not have equitable access to the literacies of CMW.

This troubles me. I see so much generative power in the CMW process because of the way it has disrupted taken-for-granted assumptions and ideologies that are based in individual, Western, hetero-patriarchal ways of knowing and being—including what counts as research. But as it challenges, it also reproduces. Recent work with CMW, including Gonick & Gannon's (2014) *Becoming Girl*, has pushed the boundaries of written literacies in the methodology, integrating drama, dance, photostorying, and movement into the sharing and analysis aspects of the collective biography process. Other researchers, like Richa Nagar (2014), do work that is theoretically and conceptually like CMW but with larger modifications to the process to increase participant access and draw on the needs and assets of the collective. Nagar has worked with women from

India's lower castes to respond to the problems they experience and complicate and critique the work of NGOs in India. Stories in her research are told orally, performed, and represented via non-traditional texts like plays and film. Nagar does not call her methods collective memory work, but explicitly uses memories as sources of data for her collective activist research projects. I cannot make CMW something it is not, nor can I change the histories of trauma around literacies, but awareness of these limitations is important to me as I consider the recommendations I make about this methodology and understand what privileges our collective had in access to and comfortability with the particular kinds of literacies we took up to do this work.

Reconstructing Normalizing Discourses. The final limitation of this study I will discuss is the danger of reconstructing rather than disrupting normalizing discourses through CMW. Just as the dependence on the literacy of writing in CMW can privilege and give access to some over others, the writing and analysis processes of CMW can privilege dominant and normalizing narratives instead of challenging them. This potential limitation is perhaps a broader critique than the previous ones—it could be applied to any CMW study rather than being particular to this project. In fact, *all* research has the potential to lack criticality, and thus affirm and support systems of oppression (and in some way, all research probably does). But despite its broad stroke of a critique, it feels important to address it because, like other critical methodologies, CMW aims to expose power, privilege, and oppression, and so the possibility of doing the opposite feels that much more dangerous.

There were moments in our work together where it was clear that we were okay with letting an assumption go unexamined, or we felt better about all supporting the

reproduction of a narrative than for someone to stop us and ask if there was another way

of seeing it. I remember, especially, when we asked Kathryn to tell us what she was

wearing when she was whistled at, reproducing a narrative of victim blame for sexual

harassment. There were numerous times when we relied on stories about "at risk" kids or

theories of developmentalism to explain why our students were acting in a particular way.

The power of normalizing narratives means that they sneak into us even when our only

task is to identify and question them. Every discussion we had about a memory in which

we didn't talk about race was an example of the normalizing power of whiteness living in

and through us.

In addition, we brought into our CMW sessions everything that we carried with us

throughout the day and week. Whatever our last interaction with a student was like—

kind, hard, or sad, a frustrating power struggle or a loving connection—it entered into our

work with the memories. However we felt about ourselves as teachers that week—

confident, overwhelmed, or disappointed—it framed our interpretations and perceptions

of the teachers in each story. Members of our collective often acknowledged the things

they carried by saying, "I'm reading the student this way because of the exchanges with

students I've had today. I just don't have very much patience right now," or "All of my

interactions with administrators this week have been frustrating and it's impacting the

way I'm reacting to this memory." Not only does our memory writing and re-telling

constitute our subjectivity, but the ways we interpret and understand others' memories

also builds our identities as teachers. And just as our memories change to reflect the

fluidity of our identities, so do our readings change with each encounter and through each

new entanglement. The things we carry with us can lead to the reproduction of

normalizing discourses, but acknowledging them at least creates the possibility for criticality.

The reproduction of normalizing narratives will always be part of the process of collective memory work; it is a both/and situation, where we will move back and forth between participating in and resisting systems of oppression. Sometimes, reproducing those dominant narratives brings us clarity about their power and might offer us ways to move toward disruption. Other times, that reproduction might hurt us, too. Kathryn left our session that day feeling like she was positioned unfairly; she also recognized and was troubled by the ways in which she participated in the narrative of victim blame, too. Rather than seek to rid ourselves of these powerful stories, which is not possible, we can work to notice when we feel willing to disrupt and when we don't, and even start to notice when those narratives are so invisible we don't even recognize them. I believe that we are a greater force for disruption and deconstruction when we do the work together, hold each other accountable, and challenge one another with love and compassion.

Future Work

This study builds on my previous and ongoing collective memory work experiences and encourages me to continue to turn to CMW as a research methodology and pedagogical tool to understand complex and critical questions about bodies, learning, teaching, and learning to be a teacher. I believe that the memories in this dissertation study, and our analysis of them, deserve to be shared with a wide audience in many different ways. Taking three of our stories to the stage of the Mixed Blood Theatre was one way of doing that, and I hope that, as a collective, we will continue to find ways to share these stories, and perhaps even to write and analyze more memories together. My

future work with Justine, Sara, Kristin, Tali, Jaquinetta, Kathryn, Kelsey, and Kristen includes me continuing to be their teacher and student. I will be a person who will support the work they do in and out of the classroom, encourage them, listen to them, and remind them to pay attention to their body, especially in moments when they feel most disconnected from it, or when seems to disappear, or is made invisible, denigrated, or ignored. Likewise, they will always be important teachers for me, as I learn from them about what it means to become a teacher in schools and systems that increasingly take on neoliberal values of individualism, standardization, accountability, competition, and capitalism. In our ongoing relationships, our future work has and will take on many forms, including happy hours, yoga classes, classroom visits, coffee dates, and reading, writing, and theorizing with one another.

But the work of this dissertation was not just done by me, and so the future work made possible by it is also not mine alone. Eight beginning women English teachers, teaching at different schools and in different contexts, served as co-authors and co-researchers of this project. What they will take from it and what new possibilities they will create as a result will unfold as they continue to teach and learn. This work will include the growth of their craft as literacy teachers. It is my hope that this project has demonstrated for them how, as Deborah Britzman (2003) writes, "practice makes practice"—that as teachers they are unfinished, in progress, always becoming. I also hope that in their future work, especially in the classroom, they will see themselves as the critical embodied theorizers that we were when we sat around the table together analyzing our memories. Teachers today are often treated as the opposite—expected to stick to the script, lock-and-step with a corporate curriculum, or as test-preppers and

proctors—and so in those moments when their agency and creativity is squashed, I hope that they will remember how they theorized in deep and meaningful ways about the normalizing narratives that shape teachers and students in schools and worked to disrupt and challenge those stories. I hope that they will continue to view their lived experiences as legitimate knowledge and push back against the hyper data-driven culture of public schools. Most importantly, I hope that their future work will cultivate love and radical vulnerability with their students, and that they will find ways to honor, embrace, and learn from the bodies in their classrooms, especially their own.

Afterward: Our Collective

Kelsey

Figure 2: Kelsey

I have identified as a teacher my entire life; I even come from a family of English teachers. I have the unique experience of having both of my parents as my high school teachers/coaches on multiple occasions. I truly grew up in the Minnesota public school system. Due to this, I am incredibly passionate about keeping our youth in MN public schools and encouraging legislatures to continue to make public education a priority.

I am a lifelong Minnesotan and truly bleed maroon and gold (go Gophers!). I grew up in a town of less than 1,000 people in rural, central Minnesota. When I moved to Minneapolis for college, I realized the shortcomings and benefits of growing up in a small community. Teaching in an urban setting has made me realize how truly alike we all are, despite racial and ethnic differences. I teach my students the basic principles that I grew up learning: everyone has the right to kindness.

Much of my job is teaching social skills in tandem with English/Language Arts content. Making strong, positive connections with my "at-risk" students is the most rewarding aspect of my job. Working through personal issues with my students and helping them make mature, well-reasoned decisions is one of the most meaningful choices I have ever made. Without my small town upbringing, I would not be as empathetic as my students have come to expect me to be.

Sara

On the outside I am a polite, privileged, white twenty-something female. I am nice enough to gain the respect of most people around me. I sometimes have fun colors in my hair. I have tattoos and piercings that beg the world not to take me seriously. I wear t-shirts with political statements, and my new car already has political bumper stickers on it. I appear to be a loveable, approachable, kind white American female.

Figure 3: Sara

I am engaged to marry a kind and approachable Christian white male, though I do not identify as Christian. People with power like me best when I don't speak. People without much power sometimes don't trust me.

On the inside, I am someone who has always believed in equity (fairness). I am a feminist. When I was 10 years old, I played on the flag football team as the only girl, because there wasn't a girl's team. I always thought it was good to be independent and strong, until later in life when that didn't seem like the kind of qualities that a straight man might be interested in, in a female. Though there have been many times in my life when I have felt oppressed because of my gender, I continue my march towards equality with patience and understanding. I allow myself to be independent and strong.

When I moved to Minneapolis from the suburbs at 15, I realized that the world is full of inequity, and that I benefit from some of that inequity. That is when I started thinking about being a teacher. I had teachers in high school that acknowledged my greatness, and cared about me as a human being. They inspired me to share my greatness

with the world. I want to do that for my students. Today, I do whatever I can to speak up for all of the silences that I recognize. I am fully committed to disrupting the systems that continue to oppress and stifle people. I believe that the best starting point for this kind of work is elevating our language, and focusing on our commonalities. Unity is power.

Erin

For a long time I resisted the idea of becoming a teacher: it was too close, too familiar, too easy, too on the beaten-path. As a kid I loved school—the smell of books and the grinding sound of the manual pencil sharpener, the order, the schedule, the routines. I played the school game to see how rigidly and precisely I could control it— grades, the neat margins of my notebook paper, spelling quizzes, the perfect construction of each letter I wrote in D'Nealian cursive.

Figure 4: Erin

Teaching, I would learn, is actually quite the opposite of that. Control is an illusion, and the plans and routines and practices you enact in one moment with one class can never be replicated. When I was a kid I thought that I would ultimately find freedom in and through control, but as I grew up I began to see freedom in spontaneity, in multiplicity, in cultivating something new. This uncertainty and the vulnerability it exposed deeply frightened me, but it also made teaching no longer close, familiar, easy, or on the beaten-path. And thus a career in teaching became my path.

In college, I learned to be a teacher whose aim was social justice; then, as a high school English teacher in Denver, Colorado, I cultivated my classroom activism through

critical literacy pedagogies. Everywhere I turned there were more systems to disrupt and more rad adolescents who wanted to resist and challenge the status quo with me. But learning to be a critical, equity-minded teacher is a life-long pursuit. I am always learning more about what it means to be white, to be middle class, and to be genderqueer, and how, from these social and political positions, I might develop more loving and compassionate relationships with my students who are different from and similar to me.

Every day I miss teaching high school students, but I also come to love and care more deeply for my students in the university classroom and I find the greatest joy in learning alongside them about this incredible and uncertain path of teaching. It is profoundly impossible work filled with unimaginable possibility, this work of being a teacher.

Jaquinetta

I cannot recall a time where learning and education was not a part of my life. For many years, family and friends around me began to show characteristics about education that I did not know existed. There was a point in my life, when I was a young girl, where I would spend my summers with a woman who taught 3rd grade. I thought it was the most magical experience in the world. This left me with wanting more time with her, and wanting to know more about what she did as a teacher. However, when I went home, school was not at the forefront of what my family cared about. This is what made liking school and talking about it feel different to me. I

Figure 5: Jaquinetta

began to fall in love with the lost world of school as compared to the negative vibes of school from home. This is where teaching began for me.

Becoming a teacher was not an easy task. It was a combination of being a young mother, working multiple jobs, and attempting to complete my pre-service teaching education that made it tough. Over the past fourteen years of school, I have come to learn patience, hard work, dedication, politics, protocol, community, family and the love of teaching; all skills that I was not only taught in school but learned through my work with students and families alike. This was hard to balance as I moved from the learning process of teaching to the teaching process.

When I became a teacher two years ago, I walked in the door happy and ready to teach students through my pedagogy. It was later that I realized it took more than pedagogy to teach. Teaching is not as simple as what television and movies make it out to be. Teaching consists of a person's entire being to be used in many different ways. Ways that you do not always prepare for. It was not until recently, that I realized the number of times I put my entire body in between students and learning in order to ensure that learning is taking place. However, I will always put myself in that position, if it means learning is happening. I cannot imagine spending my life doing anything different than what I am currently doing. Teaching is an art; teaching is my art.

Justine

Figure 6: Justine

Teacher is still a name that I'm getting used to. It was only quite recently that I got used to answering to Ms. ----------- without looking around the room for my mum! Teacher, however, is also a name that comes with an enormous amount of historical and social baggage. The mélange of pop-culture depictions, literary tropes, and the plethora of personal and professional conceptions of teaching weigh on my insecurities in more ways than I could have predicted. I feel the pressure of what it means to be a teacher in as many concrete notions as I do ambiguities and nuances. Only recently have I let myself latch on not to the concrete, but to the nuance. I try every day to conceptualize my own version of teacher that can encompass all that previously exists while simultaneously leaving it behind.

Despite all of this mess that jumps around in my head all day every day, I am so proud to call myself a teacher. In my classroom, reading and learning in front of the most unique, challenging, and perfectly unperfect 7th graders around has, in some strange way, become my safe place; my happy place. I love the community that I fight to maintain, the learning I strive to create, and the chaos that ensues when all sense of purpose falls to the wayside.

Kristen

Muriel Rukeyser once said, "The universe is made of stories, not atoms." Our first knowledge of the world comes in the form of stories and songs sung to us by our families and the world around us. Through stories, I have come to believe in the power of imagination. In a story, we can know and experience perspectives that would otherwise have been invisible to

Figure 7: Kristen

us. This understanding lives at the core of my teaching practice. Through sharing and interpreting stories together we learn to see and hear one another and ourselves. When we do this, we become more peaceful, compassionate and understanding.

Tali

For my entire life, school has always been a very comfortable place. I've always been curious and have loved to learn. Not to mention, our present education system caters to my exact demographic: upper-middle class, white, quiet, female. I underachieved in high school, only putting my full effort into subjects that I was genuinely interested in. If I ever did dread going, it was only due to my incompetence with numbers and the French language. I've had a book in my hands ever since I can remember. I still get nostalgic when I think about my elementary school library. When given the choice, I would (and still do) choose the adventure of a book over human interaction. I am intensely and unabashedly an unforgiving introvert. I guess what I am saying is that I never seriously

imagined myself willingly entering into a profession in which I would have to converse with upwards of 150 people everyday.

I've never enjoyed kids. Relatives and neighbors would always go to my sisters when they needed a babysitter, knowing that I would only begrudgingly take the job in desperate situations. I will wholeheartedly admit that I entered this profession with selfish motives. What better way for a bookworm to spend time than speaking about books all day? However, I quickly discovered that my favorite part of the classroom was the relationships I was able to form with students. This became one of the most important aspects of my teaching. I suspect this has something to do with the fact that for the vast bulk of my educational experience, I never felt like more than a number, having gone to the largest high school and college in the state.

Needless to say, for an introvert like me, this is exhausting. It is even more exhausting when the teacher-student relationship I am able to form is slightly unconventional due to the small age gap between my students and myself. Some days I wish there was a bit more professional distance between my students and I. I am writing this introduction after what have felt like the longest two weeks of my teaching career. This past Friday ended with my class of "lower" level, boy-centric, disengaged juniors finally breaking my, what seemed to be up until now unbreakable, patience. After making my frustration transparent at the end of class and sitting down at my desk with five minutes until the bell, one of my students asked from the back of the class, "What's your favorite part of your job?" Even at the end of a Friday in mid-April, I didn't even hesitate when I answered, "The kids."

Kristin

Figure 8: Kristin

I recently spoke with a coworker turned friend *and* coworker about the beginning of my first school year. We talked about first impressions and who has come, gone, and gone nuts since the start of school. "You seemed pretty confident, actually," he said. Then we simultaneously said it was because I had no idea what was coming. I had no idea what was coming.

I spent most of my late teens and early twenties running away from my desire to be a teacher. I took for granted the education I was given as so many of my peers did, and did my dues as a potential-waster. Finally, feeling I had sowed enough oats and gained enough self worth to demand something of America's youths, I went back to school.

When I started my first year of teaching six-ish months ago, I probably *was* pretty confident. I had set ideas of what failed kids in education after being able to be a brat on the wall in so many hardworking teachers' classrooms observing and writing endless essays about those observations. Having been through a program that so explicitly addressed issues of race, class, and gender in education, urban education specifically, I knew it would be hard but felt I had a leg up. I was so, so comically unprepared for what lied ahead.

Currently I spend my days teaching trying not to obtain an arse whoopin'. I am lucky enough to have messy, complicated, painful, laughter-filled relationships with groups of kids and adults who I constantly find new differences and intersections with.

With thicker skin and better shoes I continue to work through my first year, and try to find some time to dance my into the next.

Kathryn

Originally from New Mexico, I moved to Minnesota almost 12 years ago for college. At the time it was not my intention to become a teacher. I didn't know what I wanted to study or do for a career, but my whole life I had been cautioned against becoming a teacher. Growing up I loved working with children. When I was twelve years-old, I was excited to get my first "job" as a pre-school assistant making $2.35 an hour at a local Montessori school owned by a family friend. It wasn't until years later I found out that my dad actually paid the owner to pay me. However, when I told my dad I wanted to become a teacher, he replied, "You are great with kids, but if you like kids so much, you should be a pediatrician."

This dismissal of the teaching profession was something that I wrestled with for a long time. I was privileged enough to explore different majors in college and I even spent a couple of years as a flight attendant for a small regional airline. During this time, reading and writing became a prominent activity in my life. So much so that I went back to school in 2011 to complete my bachelor's degree in English Literature with the end goal of becoming an English Language Arts teacher. Through all of these experiences, I have arrived at the end of my second-year teaching with a deep respect and love for not only the content I get to teach, but also the students, my colleagues, and the profession.

References

Adichie, C. N. (2009). Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie: The danger of a single story. Retrieved from:https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story?language=en. Site accessed March 8, 2016.

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. New York: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *Dialogic imagination* (Trans. M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Ed. M. Holquist) In P. Morris (Ed.) *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev,Voloshinov* (pp. 74-80). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *28(3),* 801-831.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Beals, F., Braddock, C., Dye, A., McDonald, J., Milligan, A. & Strafford, E. (2013). The embodied experiences of emerging teachers: Exploring the potential of collective biographical memory work. *Critical Studies ←→ Critical Methodologies, 13(5),* 419-426.

Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Berg, A. (2008). Silence and articulation: Whiteness, racialization and feminist memory work. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, *16(4),* 213-227.

Bordo, S. (1993). *Unbearable weight: Feminism, Western culture, and the body*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bresler, L., ed. (2004). *Knowing bodies, moving minds: Towards embodied teaching and learning*. Massachusetts: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Butler, J. (1989). "Foucault and the Paradox of Bodily Inscriptions." *The Journal of Philosophy.* Eighty-Sixth Annual Meeting American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division. *86(11),* 601-607.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.

Connor, D., Newton, R., Pennisi, A. & Quarshie, A. (2004). Tales of body/space invasions in school. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10*, 495-508.

Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Onyx, J. Gault, U. & Benton, P. (1992). *Emotion and gender: Constructing meaning from memory*. Sage Publications: London.

Dalzell, A., Bonsmann, C., Erskine, D., Kefalogiani, M., Keogh, K. & Maniorou, K. (2010). Gliding across liminal space between counsellor and counseling researcher: Using collective biography practices in the teaching of counselling research methodologies. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, *10(2),* 126-138.

Davies, B. (2000). *(In)scribing body/landscape relations*. California: AltaMira Press.

Davies, B. (2004). Introduction: poststructuralist lines of flight in Australia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *17(1),* 1-9.

Davies, B. (2005). *A body of writing, 1990-1999*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Davies, B. (2006). Subjectification: The relevance of Butler's analysis for education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *27(4),* 425-438.

Davies, B., Dormer, S. Gannon, S., Laws, C., Rocco, S., Lenz Taguchi, H. & McCann, H. (2001). Becoming schoolgirls: The ambivalent project of subjectification. *Gender and Education, 13*, 167–82.

Davies, B., Flemmen, A., Gannon, S., Laws, C. & Watson, B. (2002). Working on the ground. A collective biography of feminine subjectivities: Mapping the traces of power and knowledge. *Social Semiotics, (12)3,* 291-313.

Davies, B., & Gannon, S., eds. (2006). *Doing collective biography*. England: Open University Press.

Davies, B., & Gannon, S. (2013). Collective biography and the entangled enlivening of being. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, *5*, 357–376.

Davies, B., De Schauwer, E., Claes, L., De Munck, K., Van De Putte, I. & Verstichele, M. (2013). Recognition and difference: A collective biography, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *26(6),* 680-691.

Deliovsky, K. (2010). *White femininity: Race, gender & power*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Fernwood Publishing.

Deleuze, & Guattari (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dillabough, J. (1999). Gender politics and conceptions of the modern teacher: Women, identity and professionalism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 20(3),* 373-394.

Ellis, C. (1994). *The autoethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Freedman, D. & Holmes, M., Eds. (2003). *The teacher's body: Embodiment, authority, and identity in the academy*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Foucault, M. (1972). The discourse on language. *Truth: Engagements Across Philosophical Traditions*, 315-335.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, volume 1: An introduction*. New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* Second Edition. New York: Random House.

Gallagher, K. (2015). Forward. In M. Perry & C. Medina (Eds.) *Methodologies of embodiment: inscribing bodies in qualitative research.* New York: Routledge.

Gannon, S. (2001). (Re)presenting the collective girl: A poetic approach to a methodological dilemma. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *7*, 787-800.

Gannon, S., Walsh, S., Byers, M., & Rajiva, M. (2012). Deterritorializing collective biography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *27(2),* 181-195.

Gillies, V., Harden, A., Johnson, K. Reavey, P., Strange, V. Willig, C. (2004). Women's collective constructions of embodied practices through memory work: Cartesian dualism in memories of sweating and pain. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *43*, 99-112.

Gonick, M. & Gannon, S., Eds. (2014). *Becoming girl: Collective biography and the production of girlhood*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Women's Press.

Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.

Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press.

Halberstam, J., Bordo, S., Miller, T., Marcus, S., & Mulvey, L. (2015). The male gaze in retrospect. *The Chronicle of High Education, 62(16),* B8.

Haug, F., et al. (1987). *Female sexualization: A collective work of memory*. Verso: New York.

Haug, F. (1999). Memory-work as a method of social science research: A detailed rendering of memory-work method. http://www.friggahaug.inkrit.de/documents/memorywork-researchguidei7.pdf. Site accessed on July 8, 2014.

Haug, F. (2008). Memory work. *Australian Feminist Studies*, *23(58)*, 537-541.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Hughes-Decatur, H. (2011). Embodied literacies: Learning to first acknowledge and then read the body in education. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 10(3),* 72–89.

Jackson, A. (2013). Posthumanist data analysis of mangling practices. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26(6)*, 741-748.

Jackson, A. & Mazzei, L. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Jansson, M., Wendt, M., & Ase, C. (2008). Memory work reconsidered. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 16(4),* 228-240.

Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity, and design: A synthesis model for critical literacy education. *Educational Review*, *52(2),* 175-186.

Janks, H. (2002). Critical literacy: Beyond reason. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *29(1),* 7-26.

Johnson, E. & Kontovourki, S. (2016). Introduction: Assembling research on literacies and the body. In Enriquez, G., Johnson, E., Kontovourki, S., and Mallozzi, C. (Eds.) *Literacies, learning, and the body: Putting theory and research into pedagogical practice*. New York: Routledge.

Johnson, C., Richmond, L., & Kivel, B. (2008). What a man ought to be, he is far from: Collective meanings of masculinity and race in media. *Leisure/Loisir*, 32(2), 303-330.

Johnson, C., Singh, A. & Gonzalez, M. (2014). "It's complicated": Collective memories of transgender, queer, and questioning youth in high school. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *61(3),* 419-434.

Johnson, E. & Vasudevan, L. (2012). Seeing and hearing students lived and embodied critical literacy practices. *Theory into Practice, 51(1)*, 34-41.

Jones, S. (2013). Literacies in the body. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *56(7),* 525-529.

Jones, S. & Hughes-Decatur, H. (2012). Speaking of bodies in justice-oriented, feminist teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *63(1),* 51-61.

Kamler, B. (2006). Text as body, body as text. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, *18(3),* 369-387.

Kaufman, J., Ewing, M., Hyle, A., Montgomery, D. & Self, P. (2001). Women and nature: Using memory-work to rethink our relationship to the natural world. *Environmental Education Research*, *7(4),* 359-377.

Kidd, L., Brown, N., & Fitzallen, N. (2015). Beginning Teachers' Perception of Their Induction into the Teaching Profession. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education,* 40*(3)* 154-173.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern.* Routledge: New York.

Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press

Lather, P. & St. Pierre, E. (2013). Post-qualitative research, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *26(6),* 629-633.

Latta, M.M. & Buck, G. (2013). Enfleshing embodiment: 'Falling into trust' with the body's role in teaching and learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *40(2),* 315-329.

Lesko, N., Simmons, J., Quarshie, A., & Newton, N. (2008). The pedagogy of monsters: Scary disturbances in a doctoral preparation course. *Teachers College Record*, 110(8), 1541-1573.

Lewis, C. & Crampton, A. (2016). Literacy, emotion, and the teaching/learning body. In Enriquez, G., Johnson, E., Kontovourki, S., and Mallozzi, C. (Eds.) *Literacies, learning, and the body: Putting theory and research into pedagogical practice*. New York: Routledge.

Lewis, C., Pyscher, T. & Stutelberg, E. (2014). A critical sociocultural approach to English education. In J. Brass & A. Webb (Eds.) *Reclaiming English language arts methods courses: Critical issues and challenges for teacher educators in top-down times*. Routledge: New York.

Luke, A. (2012). Critical literacy: Foundational notes. *Theory into Practice, 51(1)*, 4-11.

McWilliam, E. (1996). Admitting impediments: Or things to do with bodies in the classroom. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 26(3)*, 367-378.

McWilliam, E. & Taylor, P., Eds. (1996). *Pedagogy, Technology, and the Body*. New York: Peter Lang.

Mallozzi, C. (2016). Disciplined within a discipline: English teachers are bound to be human bodies. In Enriquez, G., Johnson, E., Kontovourki, S., and Mallozzi, C. (Eds.) *Literacies, learning, and the body: Putting theory and research into pedagogical practice*. New York: Routledge.

Meiners, E. (2007). *Right to be hostile: Schools, prisons, and the making of public enemies*. New York: Routledge.

Minh-ha, T. (1989). *Woman native other*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. *Film theory and criticism: Introductory readings*. Eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 833-44.

Mulvey, A., Terenzio, M., Hill, J., Bond, M., Huygens, I., Hamerton, H., & Cahill, S. (2000). Stories of relative privilege: Power and social change in feminist community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *28(6),* 883-911.

Nagar, R. (2014). *Muddying the waters: Coauthoring feminisms across scholarship and activism*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Norquay, N. (1999). Who rebels? Gender and class in stories of irreverence and resistance. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *12(4),* 417-431.

Palmer, A. (2009). 'I'm not a "maths-person"!' Reconstituting mathematical subjectivities in aesthetic teaching practices. *Gender and Education*, 21(4), 387-404.

Perry, M. & Medina, C. (Eds.) (2015). *Methodologies of embodiment: Inscribing bodies in qualitative research.* New York: Routledge.

Purohit, K., & Walsh, C. (2003). Interrupting discourses around gender through collective memory work and collaborative curriculum research in middle school. *Sex Education*, 3(2), 171-183.

Rankine, C. (2014). *Citizen: An American lyric*. Minnesota: Graywolf Press.

Rogers, R. & Wetzel, M.M. (2014). *Designing critical literacy education through critical discourse analysis: Pedagogical and research tools for teacher researchers*. New York: Routledge.

St. Pierre, E. (2015, December 3). *Post qualitative inquiry*. Speech presented at Literacy Research Association annual meeting in CA, Carlsbad.

St. Pierre, E. (2015). Afterward. In M. Perry & C. Medina (Eds.) *Methodologies of embodiment: inscribing bodies in qualitative research*. New York: Routledge.

Shor, I. & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Tate, (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and education. *Review of Research in Education, 22*, 195-247.

Uitto, M. & Estola, E. (2009). Gender and emotions in relationships: a group of teachers recalling their own teachers. *Gender and Education*, *21(5),* 517-530.

Young, I. (2005). *On female body experience: "Throwing like a girl" and other essays*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zembylas, M. (2007). Emotional capital and education: Theoretical insights from Bourdieu. *British Journal of Educational Studies 55(4),* 443–463.

Zembylas, M. (2007). The power and politics of emotion in teaching. In Schutz, P. A., & Pekrun, R., Eds. *Emotion in education*, 293-309, Amsterdam: Academic Press.

Appendix A: Full Text of the Memories

Prompt: Write about a time when you felt your teacher body being perceived in a very particular way (by students, parents, administrators, colleagues, or yourself).

Kristen's Memory:

During work time, Ms. Olsen notices that a group of students are calling her over to discuss a seemingly critical issue. She makes her way over to that table and finds a group of five students on the edge of their seats all leaning toward Chloe.

Chloe, a bilingual Latina student, while a positive presence in the classroom, is also very talkative. She is the sort of student who collaborates well with others, provided that they can manage to stay on task. In the weeks since school has started, Ms. Olsen has found herself redirecting Chloe's chattiness more often than she finds ways to have more positive interactions with her. She is worried that Chloe will never see her as a true ally.

"Ms. Olsen," Chloe says, annoyed, "Will you please tell Carlos that you're not my mom?"

Goodness. This again? This is not the first time Chloe has been jokingly teased for looking like she could be my daughter. Lately, students have been asking Ms. Olsen if both her parents were white. Could it be connected?

"No, Chloe is not my daughter." The students relaxed, somewhat disappointed. "But she does look like my sister (pause) who is a model."

"Really?" Chloe and her friends are taken aback by this response. "That is so weird. It reminds me of a time I met this girl and I found out her favorite number was 23, which is also my favorite number because my birthday is October 23rd."

Interestingly, Ms. Olsen's sister also has a favorite number. It is 23 because her birthday is on June 23rd! She informs Chloe and her friends of this coincidence.

The bell rings. As students begin to filter out the door someone pauses to clarify the homework with Ms. Olsen. Chloe hangs back to continue chatting.

"Ms. Olsen," She says confidentially, "Was all that stuff about your sister true?"

"Of course!" says Ms. Olsen.

As she leaves the room in a rush, Chloe gushes to one of her friends about the crazy coincidence.

Kelsey's Memory:

Kelsey was sitting at the front of the room on an uncomfortable metal stool. This is the signal to students that Kelsey needs their attention. Sitting teacher = attention. One student who was not a member of Kelsey's class was in the room because she was feeling more anxious than usual. The student, Karen, often shared problems at home and at school with Kelsey. She and the student had an arrangement: if Karen needed somewhere to go, she was always welcome in Kelsey's classroom as long as she was not a distraction to the learning. Since Karen was extroverted and chatty by nature, sometimes she needed a little reminding.

This particular day Karen needed more support than usual. Similar to many people who suffer from some sort of mental illness, Karen had a few strategies that she employed to help her remain calm. Her favorite: playing with hair. During one-on-one conversations with Kelsey, Karen would often stand behind Kelsey and talk about her problems and things that were bothering her. While doing this, Karen often played with Kelsey's hair. Both parties were fine with this arrangement.

While Kelsey was sitting on the stool this day, Karen walked into the classroom and immediately made her way to the front of the class where Kelsey was sitting on the stool. As Kelsey was giving her lecture and instructions, Karen stood behind her and played with her hair as had happened so often previously. This time, however, Kelsey was very uncomfortable. Now, there was a class of 36 students staring at her while another student played with her hair. After a few minutes, one student in the classroom raised his hand.

"Miss, why is Karen playing with your hair?"

While thinking of how to answer the question, Kelsey heard other students in the background murmuring and muttering many of the same questions.

Karen answered, "It makes me feel better. I'm very anxious today."

"Anxious about what?" another student asked.

"Well, my mom is being a b--"

"Karen," Kelsey cut her off, "you know what the deal is. You want to be in here, you can't be a distraction."

Karen giggled and apologized in a very un-apologetic manner and went back to her usual safe seat. Kelsey continued the lecture and carried on as befitted the lesson.

Justine's Memory:

She dreaded passing time. A stranger to the battles of hallways past, Justine struggled to understand the pertinence of hallway teacher presence in the same way her veteran coworkers could. She stood, each day, with her clipboard signage on the straight blue line running a full clockwise scale around the school.

On this particular Tuesday, Justine stood in position on the blue line with little thought given to the cacophonous upheaval surrounding her position. She repeatedly pointed her finger towards the sign reading, "Be On-Time for Learning" and was repeatedly ignored by students of all genders, sizes, and colors. She stood still along the line with her feet planted with equally distributed weight in true ENVoY fashion. She did not approach students to redirect, engage, or partake. Rather, she pointed to her sign. Her sign to be quiet, to get to class on time, or, to walk. On this particular day, "WALK" was her sign of choice. In true student fashion, the sign was blatantly ignored.

As one student whizzed past her just brushing the end of her clipboard, Justine whirled around to remind the student – using her finger and clipboard, of course – to please walk through the hallways. As she turned, Justine felt her stomach lurch forward into her throat and her knees buckle beneath her. Justine was hit from behind by the clipboard brusher's pursuer and the two of them went tumbling to the floor. The male student landed on top of Justin's ankles and knees. Justine's dress was drawn up and the wind knocked out of her throat. The student's shock and annoyance manifested into a low guttural growl. Though unsure, Justine is almost certain the noise had little to do with her, and more to do with having failed to catch his target. As the student got up, brushed away the dust and ran off, Justine brushed away a quick tear and returned to her spot on the blue line; frozen.

Tali's Memory:

It's 6th period at the end of the first week of school. Tali is starting to think that maybe she can get a handle on this teaching thing after all. Students even seem to be adjusting to the fact that their teacher looks as old as some of their peers. While Tali still

does not know most of her students, it is clear that 6th hour is more outspoken and outgoing than all of her other hours put together. They always have a new question or comment to state, regardless of whether their question in actually related to the class or not.

Near the end of the hour, Tali asked students to start free writing about an object of significance in their life. After much prompting and many redirects, students finally settled down into writing in their journals. After circling the room, Tali grabbed the stuffed Pumbaa that sits on her podium and sat back down in her desk. She held Pumbaa as she watched the students free write. About three minutes after everybody had quietly been working on their free write, a student commented, "You look so cute with your Pumbaa!" Her voice carried and the entire class was aware of her comment. The boy next to her, whispered, "She *always* looks cute." Tali's head immediately jerked up, as she made eye contact with Jadon and blurted out an exclamatory, "Jadon!" In his eyes, Tali could see the shock she was sure was mirrored on her own face. He quickly looked down, and mumbled, "I didn't think anybody would hear that." Although Jadon said the words quietly, they were easily heard by at least half of the class.

Tali was painfully aware of both the heat that had risen in her cheeks and the 30 pairs of eyes that were now turned towards her. There was a quick moment of indecision as she weighed her options. Jadon did not say his comment with malicious intent and it was not outwardly derogatory. Would it do anybody good to embarrass him in front of the class? What would she even say? She didn't know these students well enough to address the situation with any sort of certainty and the thought of confronting Jadon in front of the rest of the class seemed like it would be equally mortifying for both parties

involved. Steeped in uncertainty and deciding to retreat rather than make a stand, Tali pushed Pumba away from her and told students they must keep writing for 7 more minutes.

Sara's Memory:

The only vivid recall I have of my first week teaching at my first real teaching job is the time when Bernie pointed out my pit stains to the entire class.

Bernie was "that one student." He had two voices; the one he used when he wanted something that reeked of innocence and ulterior motives, and the voice that he used when he had something VERY smart to say.

The school was located in East Saint Paul. It was a K-8 Charter School with tiny class sizes, cliquey administration, and the middle school portion was the afterthought hidden away by the cafeteria in the basement. I would often sweep around the room with air freshener after one class left and the next one entered. There were no windows, and the air quality in that room was poor. Returning to that classroom after a long break smelled a lot like dead mice and crushed dreams. And the dark windowless room combined with the body heat of 25 middle schoolers was simply oppressive.

I don't remember what I was saying, but I remember the look on Bernie's face when his hand went up.

"Yes, Bernie" I stopped.

In his wreaky Eddie Haskell voice, the words slid out; "did you know that you have stains…" I don't remember how he referenced the sweat stains under my armpits. I don't remember if he pointed to my armpits or to his.

I do remember the collective gasp that the class made. And maybe is was sweet Laura who said something like "Bernie, that is so mean!" I don't remember what my paraprofessional Kara's face looked like, but I remember the collective pause.

"Yeah!" I retorted over-confidently. "It's hot!"

I know that I have told this story many times, usually to convey how brutal middle schoolers can be. How insensitive, how cruel.

I remember caring more about the observable reaction that I had to Bernie's comment than I did the embarrassment of having pit stains. I remember talking about the incident with Kara later, and her telling me how admirable it was that I didn't react to his comment with embarrassment. I would love to believe that that interaction didn't somehow influence all of the other interactions and perceptions of interactions that I had with Bernie from that point on, but I really think it did.

In a later memory, with the same wreaky voice, Bernie conspicuously offered me his banana at lunch. I will always wonder if Bernie learned anything that year.

Erin's Memory:

She drives them in one of those Jeeps with plastic for windows and tires that move like arms, grabbing the ground as the car rumbles down the street. It's the kind of car meant to be driven over dirt hills, through creeks, and across sand. But they stay mostly on urban streets, except when she jumps the car onto a curb, across a sidewalk, and parks it on someone's grassy front lawn. Erin is belted in tight in the passenger seat; sweat is trickling down her back in her too-hot black pants and crisp, long-sleeved, purple shirt. Her hair is brushed into a perfect bob. She is trying to look professional. With one

hand, Erin clutches the side of the door and with the other she holds a list of names and addresses. The sweat on her hand is turning the papers into a clammy damp mess.

She has given her trust to this woman, who is navigating streets Erin does not yet know and can speak a language that Erin cannot. She drives recklessly, with a confidence Erin lacks completely. Finally, she slams on the breaks and without a word, turns off the ignition and marches up the driveway of a duplex. No, her body doesn't march, it flows. Her colorful dress is layered, wrapped, and pinned around her. With high teased black curly hair, dark brown skin, and dramatic eye make-up, she is the Latina Goddess, and tripping behind her, Erin is the new, young, white woman teacher. It is the second week of school. They are making house calls.

She rings the doorbell, knocks hard, and then tries the door, which is unlocked. Inside, a television is blaring, shades drawn, lights off. "Hello?" she shouts inside. "Hola?" A man appears from behind the doorway. "We are looking for Jesus Archuleta," she says in Spanish. The man does not respond. "My name is Dr. Acevedo-Barron and I am the vice principal at North High School. Jesus has not attended school and we need to know where he is." Erin stands there thinking, "I don't belong here." In that moment she wishes she hadn't agreed to do this. The man studies them, than turns toward the inside of the house and yells, "JESUS!" After a few awkward minutes, Jesus emerges. Their list tells them that he is a 10th grader. His hair is spiked up and his clothes are far too big, but his face still looks round and soft like a child's. When he catches sight of them, his gaze drops to the floor.

She asks him why he isn't in school and he says, "I dunno."

They repeat this pattern: reckless driving, knocks on doors, lots of questions, hard conversations in Spanish and English. There are crying mothers, crying babies, eviction notices, empty apartments, lots of "I don't knows." They are rounding up bodies, counting them, checking them off the list. Erin stands there awkwardly and wonders, "Who am I to knock on their doors, to ask why they aren't in school, to put my white middle class body onto their threshold, to demand answers?" She lets Dr. Acevedo-Barron do the talking and she tells herself that it's because she speaks Spanish and Erin does not. But the truth is, Erin is deeply afraid and she cannot hide it.

Kathryn's Memory:

There is a collective sigh as the students enter the room and see the circular set-up. Although the PowerPoint projected on the screen up front reminds the students that today they will have their first Socratic Seminar, most students don't need to glance up to be reminded of today's learning objective. The circular desks confirm that today is Socratic Seminar day. The desks are arranged in two hasty haphazard circles. There is a smaller circle, which is closer to the center of the classroom, and a larger circle of desks surrounding the smaller one. And although most of the desks are used in this configuration, there are still a number of desks scattered on the outside. Some of the more eager students take their places in the inner circle, a few sit in the outer circle, and several try to sit in the desks that line the perimeter of the classroom and pretend they don't hear their teacher ask them to join the class. Kathryn looks around the classroom, feeling just as disorganized and chaotic as the classroom appears. Her voice, asking students to take out their materials and find a seat in one of the circles, is being drowned out by more and more students coming into the classroom. When the one-minute-warning song begins to

play over the speakers, Kathryn realizes she is stuck in the middle of the circles and to get out of the circles she has to squeeze through two layers of desks, backpacks, jackets, and students to get the things she needs for the day. It is clear that moving around the classroom is going to be really difficult.

Once the students find their seats and begin taking out their materials, Kathryn explains the day's agenda and the expectations of the Socratic Seminar. Although most students are listening and following along, there are still some students having their own conversations, students throwing things, and some students not doing anything. Kathryn passes out the pre-seminar reflection sheet hoping that if they are busy doing something, she can check their preparation materials. As the students do this, Kathryn squeezes back into the inner circle.

Kathryn begins looking over the students' notes, making sure they have answered enough questions to be able to contribute to the seminar. That is when someone throws a ball of paper across the room, or at least to the middle of the circle. Kathryn bends over to pick up the ball of paper and that is when she hears someone whistle. But it's not just a whistle, it was a wolf-whistle and boys behind her laugh as if someone just made a joke. Kathryn turns around to see four young teenage boys with quickly fading smirks on their face.

The look on Kathryn's face and the hushed silence that fell over the room signaled to the boys that whistling at a teacher is not an appropriate thing to do. Kathryn, unsure of how to talk to teenage boys about objectifying women and afraid of accusing the wrong student, was at a loss of words. "I don't know who whistled, and to be honest I

don't want to know," she begins. "But whistling at your teacher is not ok." Kathryn

stumbles out of the circle and tries to pretend that nothing happened.

Jaquinetta's Memory:

It was hard for her to imagine the next steps. She envisioned this moment

differently. One can't imagine what it feels like to see such an incident take place. She

hugged her student! No one could understand why she did this? One day prior to this

event, her student approached her with a problem. She walked toward that student,

placing her hand on the small of his back (pack) asking him to stop. The student refused.

She continued to walk along with him. The student refused. Next, no one could believe

what took place. The student violated his teacher with profound vulgar words.

You stupid _____, I hate you _____! That's why _____!

With a smile on this teachers face, high heels seeping into the grass, his teacher

walked behind him for a quarter of a mile back to school from the long bus lane. The

student continued his rants as the teacher began to feel as though she was no longer

human. She must remain calm, uninfluenced by his word. This teacher shocked all that

was watching, she had a smile pasted on her face, repeating the same comments, I'm

sorry you feel that way, when we speak to admin. The student continued with their rants,

and this teacher somehow remained calm.

My ex- fiancé was the last person who made me feel little. He made me feel

extremely small. I felt as though he was superior and I was inferior. This was mainly

because he reminded me of this all the time. What bothers me the most right now is not

the student calling me names, it is how I felt the last time a boy/man called me these

names. My blood is boiling; I can feel the vein popping in the middle of my forehead. If

my heart do not calm down, Lord Jesus, I am not responsible for the results of this child when we make inside of the building. Ooh, someone I know, "HELP!" I feel so unsafe right now. "HELP!" Is that bitch really ignoring the fact that her student is cursing me out yet she is always asking for help? Ok! Never again will I assist her when she asks. I swear if this tear fall, it will be the last. I will not let this little person see a tear fall. I refused to let him see this. I need to calm down; I cannot talk to his mother. She really just said he does not need to apologize. Oh, he will apologize, no student get away with this type of behavior without apologizing to me. He was asked several times to apologize and he refused. The next day, I was asked to be nice when I spoke to him. "I'm always nice," was my response. I took a deep breath and remembered that he was missing a core piece after speaking with his mother. He was missing reprimanding, love and embrace. That's it. I know what to say. He apologized on his own, thank god, but next, I took another deep breath walked toward him and said, "we need to hug it out." We walked toward each other, with open hearts and forgiveness. He hugged me. Something he admitted to not doing with his mother. For me, that was powerful. I am able to give him what he needs in this moment. In this moment, we need comfort. He needs love, and that I can give him.

Staff members nearby were amazed with the amount of control she had. This teacher, not once lost their composure. Not one time did this teacher's face show frustration. It appears she is blocking the sun out of her face as she walks to the building. If this happened to other staff, it is likely that teacher would react immediately to that student. Another teacher who is familiar with the student begins to submerge herself into the situation. The entire time this took place, the teacher never loses the smile on her

face, it just stays there. It appeared as she and the other teacher are close colleagues. The walked into an office, called the boy's mother who insisted his behavior was justified. The end result of this day was no consequences. The following day, the student approached this teacher for mediation. Words were exchanged between the two of them that resulted in a hug. No one understood why she did that. No one could figure out why after all that was said, did this teacher take time out to hug him.

Kristin's Memory:

I had asked the vice principal for help on numerous occasions. I had said that my 7th hour was giving me a lot of trouble. "Ok," he would say, "ok," until it wasn't ok and I came into his office in tears. I didn't know what to do. The level of disrespect and chaos was beyond anything I could handle. I didn't know how I could come back to the room and teach. "I can't do it," I cried, "I don't know how I can go back and teach a class." He apologized and admitted to ignoring my previous cries for help because he "thinks I can handle it." It's this same vice principal who is watching, sitting at an unassuming chair at the back of the room, as Ariel comes up to me and asks for a hug. She had been off task and I had verbally redirected her multiple times. I call it verbal ping-pong with the kids, where all I do is get three words in and then a name, a few more words and another name. After some back talk, she got out of her seat. "I'm sorry," she said, "Can I have a hug?" With arms outstretched she waited. "Ms. C., can I have a hug?" big, wet, brown eyes looked at me with an emphasized blink, then she leaned in and snuggled her head right in my bosom. My arms pushed down on her embrace, trying my best to exaggerate my lack of participation in the hug. Still squeezed, I told her to sit back down. When she was

satisfied, Ariel went back to her seat. "Shit," I thought, "That's gonna come up," as I continued on with the lesson.