SELF-CONSTITUTION AS RESISTANCE TO NORMALIZATION:
Educator Agency in the Era of Accountability

by

Andrea Marie Hyde

BA Humanities, California University of PA, 1992

MA Social Sciences, California University of PA, 1996

MEd Secondary Social Studies Education, Duquesne University, 2000

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

The School of Education in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2007

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

School of Education

This dissertation was presented

by

Andrea Marie Hyde

It was defended on

April 5, 2007

and approved by

Dr. Noreen Garman, Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

Dr. Jo Victoria Goodman, Assistant Professor, Pennsylvania State University

Dr. John P. Myers, Assistant Professor, Instruction and Learning

Dissertation Advisor: Dr. Michael G. Gunzenhauser, Visiting Associate Professor,

Administrative and Policy Studies

SELF-CONSTITUTION AS RESISTANCE TO NORMALIZATION:

Educator Agency in the Era of Accountability

Andrea M. Hyde, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2007

In this work, I explore the many ways in which public school educators interpret their charge to prepare future citizens. My purpose is to acknowledge and name a potent form of resistance to the requirements and limitations of state accountability policies. At the same time, I am constructing a theoretical frame that makes use of these discourses in a way that includes self constitution as an enactment of civic pedagogy, where pedagogy represents philosophies of education and teacher identities more than curricular content and instructional methods.

To accomplish these tasks I make use of a series of models of resistance to name and discus various subject positions (self-constitutions) that operate as forms of resistance. This includes Michael Foucault's work which articulates the effects of power in education: knowledge/power and surveillance, along with Foucauldian scholarship relevant to education. Primarily, I make use of Foucauldian self-constitution, or creating and presenting a self that is different from, if not in direct opposition to, the normalized version of the self created by dominant political discourses.

This study utilizes an open-ended interview protocol to engage with a purposeful sample of teacher-participants in South Western Pennsylvania. I portray a major portion of my analysis and discussion as a culling of themes, concepts or composites written as speculative essays.

On one level, this study is about twelve local educators' thoughts on education for U.S. citizenship (civic pedagogies), their individualized notions of citizenship and their own self-constitutions as citizens. Then again, the study is about the way that these specific educators

constitute themselves and about how these self-constitutions are a form of resistance to normalized notions of teaching and education. Still, the study is about my own journey of ad hoc theorizing toward a critical social theory of citizenship education. I have come to understand that it is not that educators cannot or do not offer resistance in this era of intensified educational accountability but that, for the most part, educational researchers and teacher educators do a poor job of recognizing and naming their resistance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I did not walk this road alone. This work is the product of collaboration and negotiation between me and the twelve educators whose thoughts and stories were so generously given. Following the concept of teaching as reciprocal gifting, I receive their contributions gratefully and return to them and others this document which is only a representation of the dissertation experience. In the future, I will do my best to continue to give my own teaching to others.

I thank my friends and family who have supported me and encouraged me over the long and sometimes seemingly fruitless journey toward the completion of a PhD. My husband, Howard, has had to endure the logistical and financial "adjustments" necessary for me to complete this program. He has also been my primary resource for literary references, word usage and grammatical arrangements. There is no way to measure the advantage of having direct access to a literature and humanities scholar while slogging through the original works of Michel Foucault. Howard, I thank you; I love you. I am further blessed with an almost embarrassing amount of love and encouragement from friends and colleagues who nourish me and sustain me, but I owe my original self confidence and assertiveness to my dad, who told me from the time that I was a little girl that I was smart enough to do anything. I love you, Dad.

Finally, I thank my committee for the contributions of their time and talents but especially for challenging me to say what I mean coherently; and even more importantly to distinguish what it is that I do NOT mean to say at all. I must acknowledge the significant contributions to this work from my dissertation advisor, mentor and friend, Michael Gunzenhauser. Mike came to

the University of Pittsburgh at just the time that I was free falling into an abyss of too many great ideas. I have benefited greatly from his facility with both policy and philosophy; his commitment to student research; and his deep appreciation of the ludic nature of academia. I am just one of the many graduate students who have benefited from Mike's attention to strong teacher-student relationships. He is my role model for the responsibility that we as educators have toward the life-projects of others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1.0   SECTION I-INTRODUCTION

1.1   BACKGROUND

I would like to explore more deeply the many ways in which public school educators interpret their charge to prepare future citizens. My purpose in describing the reception of this charge and the enactment of this charge in teachers' pedagogies is to acknowledge and name a potent form of resistance to the requirements and limitations of state accountability policies. Michel Foucault (and others) gives us this idea of self-constitution, or creating and presenting a self that is different from, if not in direct opposition to, the normalized version of the self, created by dominant political discourses. The agency in this form of resistance lives in the imagination and creation of something different.

As I discovered the potential for self-constitution as resistance in the writing of Foucault (1972, 1979/1995, 1985, 1986, 1990; Foucault et al., 1988) and witnessed the same in my classrooms - recognizing imagination, hoping, talking, and caring as action, I wanted to share this awareness with other teachers. I frequently hear from active teachers that the higher education community really should be "doing something" about the ever more encroaching state requirements for teacher training, classroom instruction, content standards, testing, data collection and reporting. As an education scholar and soon to be PhD, I have received repeated personal requests for assistance in amplifying voices of opposition to standardized tests and accountability systems that seem to blame teachers for achievement failures, while at the same time constricting their flexibility and discretion in adjusting instruction. More than anything, I hear

teachers wondering about what they, themselves, can do about conditions that they abhor. Too often the conclusion is that, like other reforms before it, teachers will have to put up with the requirements of NCLB or leave public school teaching. Some have chosen this latter solution (Hill & Barth, 2004; Kohn, 2004; Kumashiro, 2003; Sunderman et al., 2005; Thomas, 2004). As I don't see the immediate possibility for external political action arising from teachers, beyond the laudable efforts of the National Education Association (NEA, 2006), I want to illuminate an alternative path to resistance thorough self-constitution.

1.1.1 The Pilot Study

For the past two years, I have been involved in research and writing around high stakes accountability and the implications that this movement – specifically the requirements of NCLB – has had for teachers: From the de-professionalizing and patronizing policy language to the public's perception of teachers' responsibilities and "failures" and most especially to the multiple ways that teachers themselves respond to both requirements and discourses about teacher value. I scrutinized the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (107th-Congress, 2002) and the ways that states had been interpreting them and school districts implementing them (Gunzenhauser & Hyde, 2005; Gunzenhauser, & Hyde, 2006b; Hyde, Johnson & Carowick, 2005a). I have been especially struck with the overt anti-democratic nature of the legislation (For example, see Hyde, 2005b).

Preparation for the study began with mass consumption of stories of NCLB and the larger accountability movement. When Michael Gunzenhauser and I began collecting responses from active teachers, we were wondering how high stakes testing affected teachers' philosophies of education (Gunzenhauser & Hyde, 2005). I was impressed with how the language of preparing citizens was somehow included in each of the teachers' pedagogies. The most interesting data (for me) came in response to the prompts: What is the relationship

2

between education and democracy? And What are your views about the role of education for democracy? Most of the participants in our study did not identify themselves as social studies teachers , however, the elementary teachers sometimes did refer to social studies content in their conversations about democracy and/or citizenship. For the secondary teachers and administrators there seemed to be something in the process rather than the content of education that contributed to the preparation of future citizens. For all of the teachers, there seemed to be some element of their teacher identities (teacher selves) or personal philosophies that figured into their understanding of the relationship between education and democracy. My experience of the initial interviews indicated to me that there was a desire to resist externally defined and imposed conceptions of "good teaching". For more veteran teachers, NCLB was initially received as just the latest school reform that they would have to put up with or find a way to "teach around", but NCLB was then quickly identified as ever more restrictive and threatening to their sense of personal and professional success. In her own words, one teacher said that implementing the requirements of NCLB "feels like something bad"…"like we're harming students"…"like I'm compromising my professional ethics" (Katherine Reynolds, follow-up conversation, February 25, 2007).

1.1.2 Foucault and Education

Foucault's genealogical study of discipline, surveillance, and normalization, Discipline and Punish (1979/1995), has been particularly useful for studying the effects of power in education and is relevant for its articulation of domination and resistance. Foucault provides a lengthy analysis of how constant surveillance effects disciplinary power over inmates of an asylum, prisoners in a penal colony and students in a school. In each of these systems, observation by an evaluative and judgmental authority, invested with the power to reward or punish, creates a sense of self-consciousness that objectifies the self as something lacking;

3

something in need of control. Here, Foucault is explaining the Panopticon, a model prison proposed by Jeremy Bentham (1787/1995), a utilitarian philosopher and theorist of British legal reform.

> Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers… In view of this, Bentham laid down the principle that power should be visible and unverifiable. Visible: the inmate will constantly have before his eyes the tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied upon. Unverifiable: the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at any one moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so. (p. 195)

From a functionalist perspective, "panopticism" (the system of omnipresent gaze) leads to structural efficiency and order, but for the individual, this system promotes a pathological egocentricity in the individual under surveillance, which robs that person of the ability to make critical assessments of their own relative situation. An individual under surveillance acts as if he/she is always being watched, not because that is the case, but because it may be true at any one time. Most importantly, when one is concerned with behaving in accordance with expectations -now internalized -of the observers, one is not able to, or tends not to, recognize one's subjugation.

Educational researchers have explored Foucault's sense of knowledge/power in this context and theorized accountability as an example of surveillance (Gunzenhauser, 2005b,

2005d; Vinson & Ross, 2003). When schools, administrators, students, teachers and (to some extent) communities are rated hierarchically according to the distribution of test scores, and when this information (knowledge) is published for all to see, it serves as a mechanism of control (power). This as an example of Foucault in action. Conversely, those who determine what curricular components (knowledge) are important for students to know, or what knowledge is test-worthy, privilege the form and content of that knowledge (power) by making it testable. This is accomplished by the overuse of test questions that elicit specific (forced, closed set) answers.

High-stakes accountability [is] a problem of a particular kind: the foreclosure on possibilities for our aims for what it means to be an educated subject (Greene 1988, Pignatelli 1993, Siegel 2004). Using the technology of the examination, educators are encouraged to remake the individual as a set of attributes, each assessed by its deviation from the normal. The individual becomes a case, a normalized educated subject. (Gunzenhauser, 2005d, p.3)

For Vinson and Ross, the most devastating consequence of this surveillance is its threat to democracy. As they contend, surveillance runs contrary to the aims of democracy (as articulated by Dewey, 1966) because its disciplinary power is wielded by a few to the neglect or even detriment of the interests of the many. Further, the points of contact between groups are closed, scripted, standardized and mediated by images, not free and varied as Dewey's democratic ideal requires.

1.1.3 Agency and Resistance in the Era of Accountability

The conventional notion of agency is the ability to act effectively and the willingness or inclination to do so (Sloan, 2006) or the capacity for choice and self-determination, which assume the possibility of wholly self-generated and intentional actions (Applebaum, 2004). Noting that agency is influenced by social contexts, Foucauldian scholars theorized agency as

productive power which involves resistance (Butler, 1999/1990). The discourse of critical theory recognizes both resistance to change, which is a strategy of the oppressor, and resistance to authority which is a tactic of the oppressed (Arnove & Torres, 2003; deCerteau, 1984; Morrow, 1995; Young, 1990). Resistance is an expression of agency that may be reactive or proactive in relation to domination, "a constraint on self-determination" and oppression, "a constraint on self-development" (Young, 1990, p. 147). Resistance to domination might be more easily conceived of as an overt or covert, but external action, such as strikes, boycotts, sit/teach ins, marches and other forms of protest.

Foucauldian self-(re)constitution provides a potent form of resistance to normalization, which requires imagination and creativity, or a "pedagogy of possibility" (Giroux, 2005). In the current context of accountability, resistance to normalization of the self is the only form of resistance that makes any sense to me. State requirements for compliance to standardized objectives, methods, lesson planning, time management, content and assessment leave teachers with little room and even less time to exercise their professional judgment in what and how to teach; to respond to students' interests or even to make practical accommodations for the sporadic needs of individual students. High-stakes accountability schemes add an element of (self) surveillance to this project. Prior research has suggested that it has become professionally dangerous to oppose state requirements (Hill & Barth, 2004; Kohn, 2004; Kumashiro, 2003; Sunderman et al., 2005; Thomas, 2004). Verbal or written objections or outright refusals to comply with state requirements could result in teachers and administrators losing their jobs. Such educators may be tagged as "lazy" or accused of trying to cover up bad teaching or of not being interested in helping all children to succeed. This hegemony of "no excuses" (Carter, 2000) relieves politicians of the duty to provide reasons for abandoning the reforms of the most deeply entrenched policies of inequality (Valencia et al., 2001). According to Foucault, self (re)constitution as resistance to the norm of teacher-as-obedient-technician is immediately available to all teachers, and indeed it is a prerequisite for building communities of

6

agency and enacting other, more tangible forms of resistance. Through Foucault, we have an alternative way to think about teacher agency: Teachers can find "alternative ways of knowing the truth about themselves" (Pignatelli, 1993), where truth does not belong to the order of that which is, but that which happens-an event produced through struggle. We might recognize this as experiential knowledge as it emerges from practice-based research/reflection on practice. This is important fieldwork by which teachers have an opportunity to critically interrogate their existing roles, status and identity, which is "part of the larger project of democratic culture building" (Pignatelli, 1993).

1.1.4 Civic Pedagogies and Citizenship Education

In this study, I use the language of "civics" and "citizenship education" to engage the contemporary and historical discourses of the public and the political dimensions of education within the context of public schooling. I understand the scope of citizenship education to include all pedagogical approaches to the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to prepare citizens for participation in a democratic society. Such efforts may be represented by philosophies, programs or movements called civic education; character education; education for democracy; education for democratic citizenship; democratic education; democratic classrooms; and others. Citizenship education in a public school system may be class specific, part of the social studies curriculum, cross-curricular, or part of the mission or focus of the entire school. Private schools often do include some form of citizenship education in their curricula. However, because I am interested in examining the particular connection between public school educators and the preparation of democratic citizens, when I mention education, schools or schooling, I mean to confine my discussion to public schools.

The term "citizenship education" is often used interchangeably with "civic education" (AYPF-ASCD, 2005; Boston, 2005; Boyte, 2003; CIRCLE, 2003; Macedo, 2004; NCSS, 2005;

Soder, 2004), while for some there is a semantic problem with confusing the two. The National Center for Learning and Citizenship provides a useful distinction (Miller, 2004).

> In our view, citizenship education means the values, knowledge, skills and sense of commitment that define an active and principled citizen. State civics or government standards generally place a greater emphasis on knowledge of democratic concepts, institutions and rights than on the practical application of such knowledge to everyday public policy issues. (p. 1)

In this study, I use the term civic to mean public and political and I will refrain from using the term citizenship education in the sense of a particular range of curricular programs or a subfield of social studies education to keep my discussion of pedagogies outside of the social studies curriculum. This is virtually a reversal of the NCLC distinction presented above. To me civic pedagogies suggest ways of being in the classroom that have to do with democratic citizenship as distinct from academic skills or employment training.

Much of the conversation about civics education is limited to program content, skills and dispositions that students should be taught or should learn. I am constructing a theoretical frame that makes use of these discourses in a way that includes self constitution as an enactment of civic pedagogy, where pedagogy represents philosophies of education and teacher identities more than curricular content and instructional methods.

I would like to make use of Westheimer and Kahne's typology to portray more nuanced imaginations and enactments of pedagogies of democratic citizenship. In studying citizenship education programs, Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne (2004) have arrived at three conceptions of the "good citizen": 1) the personally responsible citizen; 2) the participatory citizen; and 3) the justice oriented citizen. Each type embodies significantly differing beliefs about the requirements for and definitions of a flourishing democracy. Each has implications for pedagogy, curriculum, evaluation and policy. Because some citizenship programs may privilege some perspectives on the way that problems are framed over others, these conceptual

8

distinctions underscore the political implications of education for democracy. Yet, in actual practice, teachers and to some degree administrators have less "choice" in which programs their schools can use, and subtle and overt relationships of power factor into the official versus the enacted curriculum. Further, there are multiple pedagogies and enactments embedded in the practice of each of the three particular program types Enacting civic pedagogies involves constituting the self-as-citizen; and the prevailing model of the "good citizen" has been cast in terms of an individual economic relationship with the state, which requires only passive obedience and provides "choice" in buying and selling as the "meaning and substance of individual and social agency" (Giroux, 2005, xxii). The personally responsible citizen represents well the normalized version of the "good citizen" and the "product" of the dominant interpretation of the charge for U.S. public schools to prepare future citizens. For this reason, I recognize citizenship education as a technology of normalization, where current official discourses serve to reify the "good citizen" as loyal consumer and the "good teacher" as obedient technician. Locating citizenship education within a very specific and limited frame will hopefully provide richer answers to my questions about the manner in which teachers constitute themselves.

Therefore, I am imagining a critical social theory of citizenship that is centered in projects of the self (civic pedagogies), yet might expand the scope of citizenship education to all segments of the school curriculum; to the school's organizational and policy structure; to the very culture of the school itself.

1.2   RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The specific questions that I will use to elaborate this investigation are as follows:

I.   Using a Foucauldian lens of "self-constitution" to re-examine a set of teacher interviews, what insights can I gain into stances of teacher resistance within a culture of compliance?

II.   How might these self-constitutions provide an immediate and potent form of resistance to the normalizing tendencies of state accountability requirements?

III.   How do some Pennsylvania (PA) educators interpret the charge of public schools to prepare future citizens?

To accomplish this task I make use of a series of models of resistance to name and discus various subject positions (self-constitutions) that operate as forms of resistance. This includes Foucault's work (1979/1995) which articulates the effects of power in education: knowledge/power and surveillance, along with Foucauldian scholarship relevant to education such as teacher agency (Pignatelli, 1993), technologies of normalization (Gunzenhauser, 2005d), (care of) the Foucauldian self (Gunzenhauser, 2005a; Marshall, 2001), and critique as resistance (Hoy, 2004); as these hang together with projects of freedom (Freire, 1973/2000; Giroux, 1988; Greene, 1988) and the discourse of emancipation (Brocklesby & Cummings, 1996; Habermas, 1987) . I pair Foucauldian "surveillance" with Mary Lee Smith's use of Murray Edelman's Political Spectacle Theory (Edelman, 1988; Smith, 2004) to introduce the particular use I make of Vinson and Ross' "new disciplinarity" (2003; 2001) as the context of power within which teachers in the era of accountability enact agency.

This effort responds to the call for hope (Giroux, 1997) and a reawakening of imagination (Greene, 1988) and attends to the discourse on development of the will (Atman, 1991; Huitt, 1999) and the power of intention in transformational change emerging from various communities of science (Tiller et al., 2001) as well as the new interdisciplinary field of contemplative studies (Roth, 2006). For teachers who are not seeking resistance, or perhaps not even positioned in opposition to state requirements, this work might be a vehicle for presenting opportunities to critically examine teachers' locations within multiple and fluctuating relations of power.

Lastly, I am proposing this work as a contribution to the discourses of field of social foundations of education as an important component of teacher education. But there is no reason to think that this work cannot be expanded into the discourses of social studies education or even more specifically, citizenship education.

1.3   OVERVIEW OF SECTIONS

The rest of the dissertation proceeds as follows. In the first half of **Section II**, I provide a brief review of literature that delimits my use of specific discourses from the fields of civics/citizenship education. Working from Westheimer and Kahne's citizen typology (2004), I match each type of citizenship education program to a corresponding civic pedagogy and suggest challenges for enacting each type of pedagogy. I provide a rationale for my interest in citizenship education in "The Civic Mission of Schools" drawing on the historic charge for public schools to prepare future citizens and the contemporary discourse of crisis in citizenship education. I also appropriate JoVictoria Goodman's term "civic courage" (2003) to name teacher resistance to federal policies as an element of critical civic pedagogies. The section also includes a partial review of the discourses on education for democratic citizenship, sufficient to demonstrate points of intersections with social justice.

In the second half of this section, I present my understanding of resistance as I continue to examine Foucault's essential texts and lectures, along with Foucauldian scholarship. Rather than identifying resistance as any specific type of fixed action, adopting the concept of self-constitution in theorizing resistance troubles a more common understanding of resistance as reactive and oppositional. In "A Foucauldian Path: Resistance via Self Constitution", I distinguish the theoretical threads of human versus self emancipation in critical thought to ground transformative education in the critical-emancipatory tradition. I then briefly consider the

11

connections between self-constitution as resistance and transformative education (intentionality and self-transformation). To establish the context of educator resistance, I make of Vinson and Ross' "new disciplinarity" (2003; 2001) as the context of power within which teachers in the era of accountability enact agency. From here I move into a brief discussion of the Foucauldian self: self-reconstitution, or creating and presenting a self that is different from, if not in direct opposition to, the normalized version of the self, created by dominant political discourses. To more thoroughly consider the possibilities for individual agency, I end this section with a consideration of the role of intention in projects of change.

In Section III, I wrestle with the postcritical tensions among theories of critique and hope to create a frame that addresses the limitations of theoretical frames. I begin with Gary Thomas' critique of theory (1997), noting the appropriateness of taking an ad hoc stance with regard to my own theoretical frame within a study informed so heavily by Foucault and Foucauldian scholarship and which adopts a Foucauldian lens to construct a personal understanding of resistance. I briefly note the necessity of going beyond critical theory, in theorizing agency, to access the discourses of postcritical theory which I portray as a hybrid language of critique and transcendence. I finally settle on the field of discourse called "critical social theory" (Calhoun, 1995) as a tentative place to locate my own frame. In this section, I also present and defend my methods of data collection and analysis. I describe my study sample, my relationship to the data and the interview methodology and explain and defend my choice of the essay genre to portray the bulk of my analysis. Table 3.1 (p. 41) introduces the twelve participants and provides an at-a-glance list of the demographic area of their work environments; their certification level and area; their years of service as an educator; and their highest level of education. To bring a check on the rigors of my analysis, I turn to Patti Lather's (1986) concept of catalytic validity and consider researcher bias. In this piece I disclose my own interpretation of the charge of public schools to prepare future citizens and consider the ways that this affected my analysis of teacher interviews and other data.

With theoretical tools assembled, I move into my three analytical sections. In **Sections IV-VI**, I apply critical social theory in my analysis of the discourses surrounding accountability, teacher agency and civic pedagogies from policy documents, academic journals, public media items and interview transcripts. I use speculative essays (Schubert, 1991) to analyze and synthesize meanings from all data sources and revisit the major concepts introduced in Section II. This collection of essays generates concepts that hang together with major social and ethical theories. I make use of the speculative essay's blended language (Logsdon, 2000, p. 14-16) to conceptualize what I make of the data.

Spectacle and Surveillance (Section IV) names particular technologies of power that challenge teacher agency in the era of accountability. This includes the spectacle of teacher involvement or what Popkewitz (1991) calls the "rhetoric of participation" ; shaming and blaming teachers through publication of student test scores and the teacher-as-cause ideology; the reductionist response to mandates to increase standardized test scores called "educational triage"; and concerns about the hidden intentions behind the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) to privatize education. Instances of surveillance include the silencing of NCLB-related dissent as federal policy; technological surveillance of teachers via state-wide accountability databases; and the use of ambiguous language to rhetorically turn the gaze on teachers. I finish by recognizing how imagination and creativity make self-constitution possible as a way to resist the normalizing technologies of "the new disciplinarity" (Vinson & Ross, 2001).

Repertoire of Resistance (Section V) portrays examples of some emergent concepts of the role and identity of educators as change agents that I gleaned from conversations with my participants. This is not to equate change with a challenge to dominant ideologies or structural arrangements but simply to acknowledge a pervasive recognition of the power and responsibility that educators claim for themselves to "make new" - to mark problems, generate solutions and implement new strategies for the good of their students. These educators make "tools" of the following aspects of their own self-constitutions: post-certification graduate (especially doctoral)

13

study; an internally defined sense of professionalism; a reliance on their own pedagogies born of and/or nurtured in practice (field theories); a mastery of their content and the confidence and resources associated with such knowledge; consideration of their positionality with regard to power and authority; and their degree of political savvy.

For my final essay, **Enacting Self Constitution as Resistance (Section VI**), I interpret responses to the following specific questions: *What responsibility does the public school system have for preparing future citizens? What is your responsibility? How do you enact this responsibility? How well does it work for you in this era of accountability?* The most common response could be represented by the following dictum: Public schools should ensure that students are successful after graduation. In most cases, participants readily acknowledged and some even volunteered that success in this sense was defined by societal values, which they variously described as maintaining financial stability, taking care of one's self and one's family and interacting socially (Westheimer and Kahne's personally responsible citizen). In some cases this was made problematic and at other times not. Some participants saw their own definitions of success as aligned with "society's" but most had additional components such as subjective well being or happiness (Noddings, 2003). In the first part of this section, I distinguish some interpretations of elementary and secondary level instructors as an understanding of what might be named collectively a "developmental" civic pedagogy. In Part II of the section, I note the different work involved in emancipation versus transformation in the discourse of critical theory and consider the fit between self-constitution and the field of transformative education. At the end of the section, I speculate as to whether externally imposed accountability practices such as high-stakes testing (and especially NCLB) might ever help educators to accomplish transformative agendas and consider the desire to "make the world a better place" as a pedagogy of hope.

Section VII, Conclusions and Anticipation, portrays a post-study understanding of teacher resistance within a culture of compliance; of the ways in which some teachers constitute

14

themselves; and of how these self-constitutions might support a critical social theory of citizenship education. I consider what a more contextualized understanding of self-constitution as resistance offers to my own practice as I connect my learning to the social foundations curricula within a teacher-education program. I reflect on learning as a result of inquiry into my own theorizing and attempt to disclose and address problems and disconnections within this work as a postcritical project. And, finally, I anticipate the direction of my future scholarship as I reflect on the lessons of this dissertation and as a whole.

2.0   SECTION II –REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1   FROM THE DISCOURSES OF CIVICS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

2.1.1 What Kind of Citizen?

What kind of citizen do we need to support an effective democratic society? From their investigation of prominent theoretical perspectives, educators' conceptions of education for democracy and citizenship education programs in action, Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne (2004) have arrived at three conceptions of the "good" citizen: 1) the personally responsible citizen; 2) the participatory citizen; and 3) the justice oriented citizen. I see an ontological "fit" between Westheimer and Kahne's citizen typology and the responses of the teachers that I have spoken with - both informally and as part of an interview scenario - about the charge to prepare future citizens. However, this claim may be a bit misleading since educators' interpretations civic pedagogies do not "match" any contrived categories. But I am getting ahead of myself.

Borrowing from Westheimer and Kahne, then, the *personally responsible citizen* is aware of her responsibility toward others in her community. She is a law-abiding citizen; she is aware of civic rules and follows them. Citizenship programs aimed at creating the personally responsible citizen involve didactically teaching the rules and responsibilities of civil society and reinforcement of desired behaviors. This kind of program may be called character education in the sense that it aims to instill predetermined personality traits (Lickona, 2003). From my initial

16

inquiry into this area, I have found that when teachers accept the charge to prepare citizens, and enact a pedagogy that might prepare personally responsible citizens, there seems to be little conflict with the current accountability environment.

Similarly, when teachers interpret this charge as pertaining only to social studies educators or service learning/community service programs, they may enact or espouse a pedagogy that might likely prepare what Westheimer and Kahne call *the participatory citizen*. The participatory citizen is aware of the structure and function of civic society and is politically "active" especially at the local level. Educating the participatory citizen involves teaching bureaucratic organizational theory and the techniques for engaging in local civic action. But there may be an absence of critical thinking or problem-posing involved in this type of citizenship education. Although time, faculty support and school funds may in some cases and to varying degrees be diverted away from such supplementary programs in favor of test preparation efforts and remediation; it is still possible for teachers to facilitate participatory citizenship education programs in the current policy environment.

The *justice-oriented citizen*, the third prong of Westheimer and Kahne's typology, may act in unpredictable ways and say disturbing things or ask prying questions, because this type of citizen is concerned with uncovering the reasons for social problems, injustices and inequalities. Education for justice-oriented citizenship involves questioning the structural organization of local and more far reaching communities. This type of education asks students to investigate relationships of power and may involve student protests. When teachers interpret citizenship education as a responsibility of each teacher to prepare students who will critically examine status quo arrangements or to investigate historical developments of injustices and inequalities, or to pose challenging questions to public policies, there are fewer possibilities of enacting such a (critical or problem-posing) pedagogy in the current "era of accountability".

The narrow and often ideologically conservative conception of citizenship as an individualized and internalized set of behaviors regards civic participation as a financial

17

obligation (paying taxes and donating to local charities) and reduces civic action to voting. That said, I am deeply troubled by the evidence that state accountability requirements and a general policy atmosphere of standardization and compliance (Sirotnik, 2004) seem to be problematic for justice-oriented citizenship education programs, and, more generally, that such requirements limit teachers' imagination and capacity for Enacting Self Constitution as Resistance. Later, I will specifically extend the concept of the *justice-oriented citizen* from citizenship education programs within public schools to the field of social foundations of education as an aspect of teacher education.

2.1.2 The Civic Mission of Schools

The most telling sign of "the return of the citizen in American public and policy discourse" (Scobey, 2001, p. 5) is the proliferation of citizen education initiatives. (For example CEP, 2007; NASBE, 2006). According to the National Standards for Civics and Government (CCE, 1994), and affirmed in the Educate America Act of 1994 (103rd-Congress, 1994), "it has been recognized since the founding of the nation that education has a civic mission: to prepare informed, rational, humane, and participating citizens committed to the values and principles of American constitutional democracy". (p. 1) The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) recently published the Civics Framework (2006), which draws heavily on the National Standards for Civics and Government to devise a civics assessment. The NAEP civics exam was administered to students in grades 4, 8, and 12 throughout the U.S. from January to March 2006, the results of which will be reported in early 2007 (NCES, 2006). Anticipation of the 2006 test revived a discourse of "crisis" in civics knowledge from the results of the 1998 test, where "a third of all students did not reach a 'basic' level of achievement in their knowledge of civics" (ECS, 2004). Test anxiety, concerns for the place of citizenship education within the scope of the 2001 federal No Child Left Behind Act (107th-Congress, 2002; Boston, 2005) and the post

18

September 11, 2001 (9/11) foreign and domestic policy atmosphere in the United States, have all contributed to a revival of interest in the civic mission of schools (AYPF-ASCD, 2005; Ben-Porath, 2006; Boyte, 2003; CCE, 2004; CIRCLE, 2003; Goodman, 2003; Howard, 2004; NCSS, 2005; Soder, 2004; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004; Williams & Humphrys, 2003; Zaman, 2006).

From the beginning, the main purpose for establishing public schools in the United States was to prepare future generations for democratic citizenship. Citizenship under non-democratic rule would not require education beyond what parents and community could instruct children about their place in society and their relationship to the ruling authority. As it is, in theory, citizens of a democracy are the ruling authorities and must therefore be given the knowledge (reading and writing and some classical history) and attitudes (vigilance against those who would seek political office for corrupt purposes) of leadership. This was Thomas Jefferson's dream of a "natural aristocracy" who would govern on the basis of virtue and talent rather than birth and wealth (Letter to John Adams, in Jefferson & Washington, 1853). Influenced by Plato's utopian proposal for education, as well as other ideas central to classical liberalism (Tozer et al., 2002), Jefferson recognized that to prevent the political ascendancy of a hereditary aristocracy, more than just the wealthy had to be educated. At the same time, all citizens - meaning all free, White, male landowners - should be able to exercise their responsibilities for electing leaders and approving legislation through access to the free marketplace of ideas where men could discuss and rationally consider the best course of action. He proposed a meritocratic form of promotion into higher education and preparation for political office. However, as Joel Spring (2005) observes, "the details of Jefferson's plan are not as important as the idea, which has become ingrained in American social thought, that [public] schooling is the best means of identifying democratic leadership" (Spring, 2005).

Horace Mann, father of the "common school," had a vision of public education as a unifier of moral differences and a palliative to the social upheaval brought into sharp awareness

19

by the rapid increase of immigration, urbanization and industrialization during the mid to late -
19th century in the U.S.

> The religious struggles between the Calvinists and more liberal sects, the
> economic strife between the rich and the poor, the riots pitting Irish immigrants
> against native workers – all were evidence to Mann of a dangerous social
> disharmony which threatened the stability of society. The common school was to
> become the central institution to ameliorate this situation. It was necessary for all
> children to develop a commitment to a common core of values. (Tozer et al.,
> 2006, p. 66)

Mann's ideas were based, in part, on the Prussian model of the mid 19th century, a
compulsory school system established to develop patriotic citizens and unite the German states
for world leadership. Although philosophically democratic rather than totalitarian-minded, the
common school movement was "essentially a movement that reflected the values of
republicanism, Protestantism and capitalism" which created "what many consider to be the
indispensable institution for American democracy" (Urban & Wagoner, 2004).

Perhaps no one expressed the civic mission of schools better than educator,
psychologist and philosopher, John Dewey. In *Democracy and Education* (1966/1916), John
Dewey stated his view of schooling as a microcosm of a democratic community.

> [T]he realization of a form of social life in which interests are mutually
> interpenetrating, and where progress, or readjustment, is an important
> consideration, makes a democratic community more interested than other
> communities have cause to be in deliberate and systematic education. The
> devotion of democracy to education is a familiar fact. The superficial explanation
> is that a government resting upon popular suffrage cannot be successful unless
> those who elect and who obey their governors are educated. Since a democratic

society repudiates the principle of external authority, it must find a substitute in voluntary disposition and interest; these can be created only by education. (p.87)

Dewey's contribution to the "democratic imagination" in education is considerable and varies in importance according to one's individual philosophical or pedagogical affiliation. Though he rejected the dichotomy, those who favor a child-centered curriculum can more easily trace their philosophical lineage to Dewey than those who adhere to the curriculum-centered pedagogy. By democratic imagination, I refer to the capacity to see a connection between school-based educational activity and citizenship participation in a democratic society. Images of the "democratic classroom" range from elementary classrooms through whole-school structural and curricular arrangements to national movements for school organization and leadership. This imagination can extend to teacher education courses: content, activities, philosophies and pedagogies (Hyde, 2005b). The democratic nature of the classroom, activity, movement or pedagogy is reflected in the recognized purpose of organized educational activity in reproducing participatory democratic citizenship outside of the classroom.

For advocates of Deweyan democratic education, the collective imagination is set into action, through democratic participation (Beane & Apple, 1995; Beyer, 1996; Cunat, 1996; Garman, 1989; Gutmann, 1987; Mayo, 2004; McGinn, 1996; Meier, 2002; Noddings, 1992; O'Sullivan, 2001; Salamone, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1994; Slattery & Rapp, 2003; Wood, 1992). This begins with deliberative discourse in the classroom. Facilitating democratic deliberation may be one avenue of teacher agency that is open to public school teachers in this era of surveillance and accountability (Parker, 2006).

2.1.3 Civic Courage

What should children learn in public schools about patriotism? What are teachers' responsibilities in wartime? A special issue of *Phi Delta Kappan* brought together educators and

interested others to reflect on "Patriotism and Education" (Westheimer, 2006). To educate around the events of 9/11 and the continuing wartime climate, my Social Foundations of Education students and I read and discussed the articles in this collection. Students presented their own personal ideas of patriotism which could be broken down into a short list of requisite attitudes and actions, or citizen responsibilities. As these students are very new to education as a field of study and have not been inside a public school classroom since they graduated from high school, though for most this was only a few years ago, their reflections on teachers' responsibilities with regard to educating around issues of patriotism fell into some uncomplicated "support the President" or "say nothing" varieties. They either could not or would not imagine teachers taking a position on the meaning of patriotism or the "war on terrorism" that were critical or contradictory from those directly emerging from the White House. This was for me an instance of reaffirmation of the pervasive hegemony of public schools as a "state entity" and a force of reproduction of the status quo (Apple, 2000; Morrow, 1995; Willis, 1981). If, in this instance, we choose to adopt a critical teacher stance, as Kincheloe has suggested (Kincheloe, 2005), we might "embrace civic courage as a central purpose of schooling in a democratic society, to face accusations of disloyalty and to challenge dominant ideological efforts to manipulate public consciousness". (p 65)

Civic courage is certainly a pertinent and timely quality worth contemplating as it appears among all groups and individuals living in the United States. "Domestic tragedies have served to refocus Americans on their notions of citizenship and to place debates about American culture and globalization in a fresh and challenging context" (Marsden, 2003). JoVictoria Goodman (2003) maps the civic debate in the context of the post-September 11th 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centers in New York City and the Pentagon. Goodman ascribes *civic courage*, "the ability and willingness to confront one's own difference in civic matters" (p. 9), to those who questioned the prevailing rhetoric of the causes, meanings and actions required on the part of the U.S. in response to the terrorist attacks. Dissent,

22

especially in the months immediately following 9/11 was dangerous, as any position that differed from that originating in the oval office was equated with disloyalty to the nation (Goodman, 2003). A previously complicated and variously defined notion of American patriotism was at that historical moment and context solidified as nationalistic loyalty, which Goodman calls *coercive nationalism* (p. 9). I am interested, then, in the concept of civic courage and how it may relate to teachers who have different beliefs about curriculum and teaching, those who criticize totalizing and externally imposed educational policy, and especially those who talk of themselves in language different from that used in the dominant political discourses to talk about teachers.

2.1.4   Education for Democratic Citizenship and Social Justice

From at least as early as the progressive era in education, philosophers and school reformers, most notably John Dewey, have argued that the public school in a democratic society should be a microcosm of democracy (Beane & Apple, 1995; Beyer, 1996; Cunat, 1996; Garman, 1989; Gutmann, 1987; Mayo, 2004; McGinn, 1996; Meier, 2002; Noddings, 1992; O'Sullivan, 2001; Salamone, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1994; Slattery, 2003; Wood, 1992). As a principle of social organization, the democratic ideal aims to structure the arrangements of society so as to rest them ultimately upon the freely given consent of its members (Scheffler, 1981). A democratic society holds its own current practices open to future revision and so education for democracy must be critical. As Amy Gutmann (1987) has observed, since living in a democratic society implies the responsibility of consciously reproducing future citizens of that society, the moral primacy of political education in a democracy requires that we favor participatory over disciplinary instruction. Education is a prerequisite of such an arrangement and education for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a democratic ideal cannot be used as an instrument for enforcing rules, shaping students for their future roles as workers or reproducing the status quo.

23

Former Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) president Noel McGinn (1996) has noted the decline in active participation in associations of all kinds that permit learning how to disagree without mutual destruction and how to cooperate with solidarity in social structures of cooperation. McGinn laments the fact that time in school – when devoted to citizenship at all - is spent on teaching about democracy rather than allowing for genuine democratic participation by students, a circumstance which has been directly correlated to adult democratic participation or even more importantly to practice in challenging the claims of authority.

I take my concept of education for democratic citizenship from John Dewey's (1966/1916) requirements for a democratic society and from Amy Gutmann's (1987) vision of democratic education. According to Dewey, a democratic society has two requirements: (1) it is composed of groups with many and varied interests that are consciously communicated; and (2) there are varied and free points of contact with other groups; open relationships, where what is healthy are those relationships that foster more future interactions, not fewer (John Dewey, 1966). And, as Amy Gutmann has observed, since living in a democratic society implies the responsibility of consciously reproducing future citizens of that society, the moral primacy of political education in a democracy requires that we favor participatory over disciplinary instruction (1987).

I take my working definition of social justice from past president of the American Sociological Association, Joe Feagin (2001). I recognize three distinct components of Feagin's requirements for social justice: (1) a legislative or policy component: resource equity, fairness, respect for diversity, eradication of social oppression; (2) an economic component: redistribution of resources from those who have unjustly gained them to those that justly deserve them; and (3) an education component: a system to create and ensure the processes of truly democratic participation in decision making. I am meanwhile mindful of a basic criticism of this social

democratic interpretation. Friedrich Hayek criticized the term for its connection to the command economy. According to Hayek:

> Social justice rightly understood is a specific habit of justice that is 'social' in two senses: First, the skills it requires are those of inspiring, working with, and organizing others to accomplish together a work of justice. These are the elementary skills of civil society, through which free citizens exercise self government by doing for themselves (that is, without turning to government) what needs to be done. Second, it aims at the good of the city, not the good of one agent only. Its object, as well as its form, primarily involves the good of others. (Novak, 2000, p. 11-13)

From my understanding, then, education for democratic citizenship is social justice work when it (1) promotes the value of free and equal association of diverse groups, (2) encourages cooperation to accomplish social goals and (3) teaches the skills and responsibility for shared decision-making.

A social justice perspective goes beyond education for democratic citizenship to view the purpose of education as social transformation. Following from the thoughts of Paulo Freire (2000), the primary job of education is liberation. This has been variously interpreted as freedom from oppressive social, economic and/or political conditions; freedom of educational access and outcomes; and freedom of thought and expression (Giroux, 1997). The social element of a justice-oriented belief system holds that relieving the suffering and oppression of some members of a society is the only way to ensure the overall wellbeing or happiness for all members. This line of thinking sees freedom as a collective right; that no one can be considered free as long as some are oppressed (Garrison, 2004). Education for social justice follows the vision of a better society and strives to achieve it. As in the economic or market model, the benefits of education might be indicated by lower poverty rates and industrial growth but the emphasis is on correcting inequalities of opportunities and outcomes for traditionally

marginalized groups (or individuals in those groups) along with liberation from oppressive beliefs and actions in traditionally dominant groups. Imagination, interpretation, compassion and cooperation are modes of engagement favored by social justice advocates working in education. These are the desired qualities of relationships between teachers and students, teachers and teachers, students and students, administrator and teachers and schools and community.

2.2   A FOUCAULDIAN PATH: RESISTANCE VIA SELF CONSTITUTION

2.2.1   Human vs. Self Emancipation

In contemplating a theory of citizenship that can live with the tension between critique and hope, it is helpful to consider the nature of educational change. In the broadest and most basic sense, critical theories criticize functionalist explanations of systems and relationships and usually involve some observations of domination and oppression. Change is usually reproductive of the status quo and freedom from this cycle of reproduction is called *emancipation*. Postcritical theories make use of the critical lens but go further; they also call out the limitations of critical theories, recognize fluctuations in relations of power, and most importantly, they also acknowledge agency. Change could be both/either reproductive and emancipatory but in situations where there may be no extraction from relations of power (for Foucault, this is every situation), postcritical scholars may speak of freedom as *transformation* rather than emancipation.

Foucault and other postmodernists/poststructuralists have been accused of repressing the self-critical aspects of modern philosophy which recognize the limitations of emancipatory projects. Modernism in critical theory has produced two lines of emancipatory thought that can

26

be traced from Kant, via Habermas and Foucault respectively. The difference is *human* emancipation versus *self* emancipation (Brocklesby & Cummings, 1996). While Foucault's genealogical work is emancipatory in that it attempts to free people by shedding light on the various ways that power subjects them and in recounting the rules of the system so that individuals might develop strategies of resistance, for Habermas (1987), the emancipatory promise of modernism is an unfinished project, but a worthy project nonetheless. He looks for theories, such as "communicative rationality" (Habermas, 1984), that can be applied to "emancipate others from a 'worse' to a 'better' state" (Brocklesby & Cummings, 1996, p. 741).

Giroux (1988) makes use of a modern notion of (human) emancipation as an act for the benefit of others in his definition of *transformative intellectuals* as teachers and administrators

> who develop counterhegemonic pedagogies that not only empower students by giving them the knowledge and social skills they will need to be able to function in the larger society as critical agents, but also educate then for transformative action. That means educating them to take risks, to struggle for institutional change, and to fight both *against* oppression and *for* democracy outside of schools in other oppositional public spheres and the wider social arena. (p. xxxiii, italics original)

So by the above distinction, Giroux's intellectuals might be called emancipatory rather than transformative. Later, Giroux (1991) argues for a reconsideration of the discourse of modernism among critical pedagogues, who in adopting postmodern sensibilities (e.g. by locating the site of action/change on the self) stray too far from the ideal of *human* emancipation, and therefore lose hope in creating social change. He proposes a "border pedagogy of postmodern resistance" which attempts to link "an emancipatory notion of modernism" with postmodern critiques (p.72).

Considering the problems of deskilling and deprofessionalization via curriculum restrictions, assessment requirements and the current accountability environment

27

(Gunzenhauser, 2006a; Schultz, 2005; Sirotnik, 2004;Ingersoll, 2003), I offer a critique of Giroux's idea of teachers as public intellectuals. (See Section VI, **Enacting Self Constitution as Resistance**). In *Teachers as Intellectuals* (1988), Giroux describes his dream teachers; not real teachers at all. (Although in some works, his notion of teacher is admittedly utopian or ideal). I understand Giroux's positioning of teachers as public citizens and I see the way in which teachers are figured this way in critical discourses. I am more concerned with teachers as model citizens, that is: teachers as citizens who model the responsibilities of democratic citizenship.

2.2.2 The Context of Resistance: Surveillance and Spectacle

In Kevin D. Vinson and E. Wayne Ross's *Image and Education: Teaching in the Face of the New Disciplinarity* (2003), the authors make use of a notion of surveillance that is directly descendent from Foucault's panopticism, paired with a DeBordian understanding of spectacle as "a social relationship between people that is mediated by images" (page 48). As previously discussed, Foucault provides a lengthy analysis of how constant surveillance effects disciplinary power, but Vinson and Ross helped me to connect the gaze-orientedness of our culture with knowledge-power, image-knowledge, and finally image-power. Their work contributed significantly to my postcritical theorizing of teachers' experiences under "the new disciplinarity", as NCLB is the quintessential surveillance-spectacle of our time, at least with regard to education.

My understanding of spectacle has developed from sociological theory (Goffman, 1959) rather than "situationism" (Debord, 1995) . From the critical perspective of Murray Edelman's Political Spectacle Theory (Edelman, 1988), educational policy making, which should be and is often purported to be a series of democratic and participatory political actions, degenerates into spectacle. That is, individuals and groups with the most cultural and political capital are using

their power and influence to achieve selfish interests; that this action goes on out of sight of the American public; and that these interests further separate, segregate and differentiate opportunities for students, parents and communities to the advantage of affluent groups and the detriment of students of color and/or lower socio-economic status.

In *Political Spectacle* (Smith, et al., 2004), Mary Lee Smith uses Edelman's theory as a framework by which to explore the phenomena of a few particularly illustrative case histories of education policy making including the Reading First initiative and the successive legislation that led to NCLB. Surveillance, the other leg of Vinson and Ross' new disciplinarity, is not directly addressed in *Political Spectacle*, but surveillance is the current social and political milieu within which spectacles are displayed. Moreover, constant surveillance by those in power – whether the power of legislative authority or of financial reward or censure (consumer power) or of ego satisfaction/self legitimation – is arguably the reason that spectacles exist.

According to Smith, political spectacle produces symbolic benefits, often represented by ambiguous language, while the resultant policies produce real effects, usually different from those stated. The symbolic benefits of high stakes testing are increasing accountability; removing "waste", in the form of low quality teachers and ineffective or weak curricula; measuring achievement and failure on the part of schools and individual students. The supposed purpose, of course, is to raise test scores for all students and to close the achievement gap between white students and students of color by penalizing schools that do not show adequate yearly progress towards these ends. As Smith points out, "independent research has never shown that high-stakes testing leads to better achievement…but [such tests do] serve the purpose of enhancing the political and professional careers of those who champion them" (p. 233).

The real or backstage results of high-stakes testing are an increase in the dropout rate, which correlates negatively with socioeconomic status and minority status. These tests measure the wealth of the people whose children attend the schools; "they measure selection, not

29

treatment" (Smith, 2004; p.232). Another undisputed result of assessment policy is the windfall that it creates for the testing and education-for-profit industry. Following the view of technology and private industry corporations which invest in schools as beneficent social philanthropists, the image that is presented to the public is that of selflessness, charity and public service. Though Smith admits that she cannot substantiate the claim, she identifies the ultimate goal of corporate interests in public education to be the privatization of schools (Smith, 2004; p. 234) - the complete commodification of educational goods and services.

A secondary aim of *Image and Education* (Vinson & Ross, 2003) is to provide a primer on the "means by which teachers, students, and other interested stakeholders might resist…various confirmative, anti-democratic, anti-collective, and oppressive potentialities" (back cover). A central place is given to critical (image-resistant) pedagogy and the absolute dependence of this, albeit uncontested, educational good on some willingness to resist current conditions. My response to the methods of resistance suggested in this work (deCerteau's "la perruque" and Debord's "derive" and "detournement") is that they serve to perpetuate the idea that teachers are responsible for correcting/resisting the oppressive conditions of public schooling. Some of the examples, such as purposely throwing the tests, disrupting test-taking, or hacking into testing databases, are dangerously subversive, though the authors mention this only once (on page 160). Casually suggesting these "examples" of resistance is somewhat irresponsible. In moving from theory to practice, a far saner, safer and more effective set of tactics should include an invitation to collaborate with unions, lobby groups and any other concerned groups that could share a vision and a mission. Or, perhaps, as Foucault repeatedly suggested in his research methodologies (archeology and genealogy) and the topics he found important to analyze (knowledge/power, discipline, normalization, examinations and the reflexivity of the Self), *thought* and *critique* are the best means of transforming systems of knowledge and power (Foucault, 1990):

Thought is not what inhabits a certain conduct and gives it meaning; rather, it is what allows one to step back from this way of acting or reacting, to present it to oneself as an object of thought and question it as to its meaning, its conditions, and its goals. Thought is freedom in relation to what one does. (p.154)

and

A critique is not a matter of saying that things are not right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out on what kinds of assumptions, what kinds of familiar unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest. (p. 155).

2.2.3 The Foucauldian Self

In exploring the concept of teacher agency, I have repeatedly encountered conceptions of "the Foucauldian self" – most accessibly described in Gunzenhauser's "Normalizing the Educated Subject" (2005d). On page 24, Gunzenhauser lists some individual tasks that educators might take up "to counter the process of normalization through high-stakes accountability[1] I see my dissertation work attending to one or more of these tasks. What seems to me the most basic and universal possibility for teacher agency is to engage the self and others in counter-discourses about the meaning and value of education. In other words, "dialoguing across difference" (Boler, 2004) is a project of social justice intended for the liberation of the self. Alternatively, to impose meaning from outside of these dialogic interactions would be an exercise of oppression.

---

[1] Exposing the philosophical basis for the misuse of the technology of the examination; articulating alternative philosophies of education (e.g. ones rooted in relational ethics/care theory); developing rationales for how certain practices have been illegitimately foreclosed; providing theoretical support for colleagues whose research into innovative practices has been foreclosed by the ascendancy of the standardized test; and analyzing rhetoric surrounding accountability.

2.3   TRANSFORMATIVE EDUCATION

The nature of change in transformative education is small, discreet, personal, internal, and possibly invisible to others. In this sense, Foucauldian self constitution certainly qualifies as a technology of the self that could be called transformative. The field of transformative education employs four broad categories of technologies of the self: knowing oneself, controlling oneself, caring for oneself and recreating oneself.

> Transformative education is aimed at promoting awareness and fundamental change at the personal, relational, institutional, and global levels. In doing so, it deploys a range of techniques, processes and practices aimed at assisting learners to 'work on themselves' (Tennant, 2005) (p. 102).

Foucault has spoken and written at length on "the care of the self" (Foucault, 1985, 1986; Foucault, 1988; Foucault *et al.*, 2005; Foucault *et al.*, 1988). Most interesting for a discussion of transformative education is that Foucault has built a connection among all four of the above technologies, incorporating them all into a fuller understanding of the Hellenistic "care of the self" (*epimeleia heautou*). In *The Hermeneutics of the Subject* (Foucault *et al.*, 2005), care of the self is explained as "a number of actions exercised on the self by the self…by which one takes responsibility for oneself and by which one changes, purifies, transforms and transfigures oneself." (p. 10-11). Recreating oneself is just one of these actions, a technology of catharsis and self-confession that requires a specific type of "conversion". This conversion is a "return to the self", a "turning around toward oneself" (p. 208), which involves taking stock of oneself, and even more fundamentally knowing oneself "in the form of recollection." (p. 210). It is a philosophical conversion (as Foucault suggests, like that of a master freeing his slave, p. 213) rather than a religious conversion, that requires "being reborn in a different self which has nothing to do with the earlier self." (p. 211). However, this conversion does involve a break "with what surrounds the self so that it is no longer enslaved, dependent, and constrained" (p. 212).

With regard to pedagogy, the care of the self goes beyond something that adults teach to students, although the student-teacher relationship has always been in the classical sense an important site of conversion from childhood to adulthood. Care of the self is the very practice of self constitution that offers resistance to normalization of teacher selves and compliance to externally defined notions of accountability.

3.0   SECTION III-METHODOLOGY

3.1   THEORETICAL TOOLS AND FRAMEWORK

Theory in education is antagonistic to pluralism in ideas. With commitment to it, fertility is sacrificed to orderliness – Gary Thomas (1997, p.36)

I am wrestling with the postcritical tensions among theories of critique and hope. A postcritical project of theory construction seeks to create a frame that addresses the limitations of theoretical frames. In reading "What's the Use of Theory?" (Thomas, 1997), I am reminded of my inescapably postmodern worldview. Gary Thomas argues for "anarchy of thought" and "ad hocery" as alternatives to claiming or building theory in educational research. As multiple understandings and uses of the term "theory" are laid out, Thomas demonstrates how without a tacit agreement or an explicit definition, the meaning and intentions of the word "theory" must be guessed by its use in context. If "theory" represents only individually contextualized intellectual endeavors, there is good reason to question why the term might be used at all. Further, echoing the sentiments of Paul Feyerabend (1978), Thomas suggests that theory is harmful, "actively destructive of thought and progress" (1997, p. 22). Making use of the works of Michel Foucault and Foucauldian scholarship is appropriate for this task, since Foucault was vigilant against the codification of discourse and adherence to the "archive" – the store of legitimate knowledge, including rules and procedures for thinking (Jardine, 2005).

Although I intend to make generous use of Foucault and Foucauldian scholarship, I see no reason that I should not proceed with the mindful construction of my own framework, as long

34

as I acknowledge the arbitrariness of my "choice" of theoretical discourses and remind myself to critically interrogate my own motives. I approach this research as both thinking and writing to come to know (Richardson, 2001). Staying with Foucault's work against foreclosing the possibilities for what he and his readers might ultimately make of his writing, I have planned for, if this is possible, a messy and unfinished product. The dissertation document as a record of such an investigation is structured generously enough to hold multiple and divergent stories. I wrote the study document in this way so that I could listen to and learn what was happening on two levels: I wanted to hear and understand both my participants' responses and my own (postcritical) theoretical ad hocery as I engaged in naming self-constitution as a form of resistance. The central topic of investigation is how individuals constitute themselves through their actions (cognitive, emotional, and physical) and in response to their environments (both inner and outer) to create "experiences" which I am recognizing as acts of resistance.

I am thinking of this dissertation as a conceptual, postcritical project that makes use of interview texts as empirical data; one that will use the language of critical theory while offering a critique of critical theory's reliance on rationality, its under-emphasis on agency; under-complication of relations of power and an absence of hope. And since the language used in Thomas' "critique of theory" makes use of the notion of hegemony – a neomarxist, critical construct paired by Gramsci with a call for teacher resistance – there is no compromise of postmodern multiplicity and ambiguity in recognizing and naming instances of oppression and agency.

Coming from a perspective of critical social theory (Calhoun, 1995), I recognize that teachers are positioned to be forces of change or vehicles for the reproduction of the status quo. I will therefore utilize both a language of critique and a language of transcendence, what Giroux and Freire before him have called a language of "hope" or of "possibility" (Freire, 1973/2000; Giroux, 1988). Critique and hope represent what Maxine Greene has called the "dialectic of freedom" (1988), a decidedly social construction of selves engaged in the imagination of

35

alternative ways of being, in an effort to appreciate the power of human beings to affect their own destinies, to exercise human agency and to change social conditions. "It is actually in the process of effecting transformation that the human self is created and re-created" (p. 21).

I make use of Foucault's *Hermeneutics of the Subject* (2005), to connect care of the self, intentionality and citizenship. I examine this collection of some of Foucault's lectures to inform my understanding of the tension between critique and hope, especially in the discourses on (self) transformation and transformative education. In such discourses, intentionality or focused, willful thought is treated and developed as a necessary component of civic action and self constitution, which is action taken upon the self. A more complicated understanding of intentionality-action locates thinking, talking and feeling as actions in themselves. Recognizing the subtleties of this fluctuating relationship as it informs the process of self constitution is necessary for working through a Foucauldian concept of resistance.

Adopting a Foucauldian lens to construct a personal understanding of resistance places one in an existential position: If there is no release from the operations of power, no way to extract the self from relations of power, then resistance does not translate into a neat or final emancipation. Rather than expelling the oppressor within, as Freirean endeavors attempt, Foucault asks that we acknowledge the oppressor within and then to be ever vigilant about foreclosing future possibility for more and more freedom. This understanding can be liberating in itself; pessimism about achievement of perfect results or ultimate results becomes meaningless and betrays itself as the only excuse for postponing one's project of emancipation.

The hybrid language of critique and transcendence has variously been referred to as post-structural (Peters, 2004) postmodern transformative (Howe, 1998) postcritical (Noblit, 2004) and post-critique (Hoy, 2004). The critical framework that Joe Kincheloe describes in *Critical Constructivism* (2005) "pursues epistemologies and ontologies that provide us more power to construct and reconstruct our 'selves' in the ways we want them to be" (p. 87). Recognizing constructivist ontology, critical constructivists understand that just as the self has

been shaped by social action, the self can be rethought and reshaped by social action. The model of the self as a finished, autonomous, free agent collapses in the face of poststructural analysis, which locates one's view of the world and one's view of the self within language (discursive practice), within the stories that we tell ourselves about our selves. The "notion of a new self or a critical ontology is grounded in the human ability to use new social contexts [such as external accountability and compliance] and experiences [narrowed and/or scripted curriculum and teaching to the test or competing to make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP)] to reformulate subjectivity". (p. 93). At the same time, critical social theorists recognize that human beings are never completely independent of these structuring forces; that no one can "operate outside of society or be free of cultural, linguistic or ideological influences" (p.101).

Understanding how teachers resist the labeling and internalization of themselves as "obedient technicians", which I see as an act of democratic citizenship and Kincheloe calls "a reconceptualization of the civic self" (p. 68), is so important because "thinking in a new way always necessitates personal transformation" and "if enough people think in new ways, social transformation is inevitable" (p. 49). Perhaps it is at the moment when teachers are critically aware of the way that power shapes them, that they develop their own teacher persona. For, as Hoy observes, if it were not for the potential for resistance, there would be no need for the exercise of power (Hoy, 2004).

I will retain the language of critical ontology to make a study of selfhood in light of the sociological, cultural studies, cultural psychological and critical analytical work of the last few decades. It was the language analysis of the 1980's (like Foucault) which made it possible to notice that "the socio-historical dimensions of self production are often manifested on the terrain of language" (Kincheloe, 2005, p. 51). I will also use the term critical social theory (Calhoun, 1995) to include "a broader category of theoretical production than critical theory" (Leonardo, 2004, p. 11) including general sociological theory (labeling, symbolic Interactionism), feminist theories, and standpoint epistemologies such as those found in cultural studies. Also critical

37

social theory is more appropriate when specifically referencing the work of Michel Foucault, who claimed to be a social critic (1988). Ultimately, I want to emphasize the ambiguity of self construction. That is, the self is neither the product of individual autonomous agency nor the exclusive result of the coalescence of historical social forces. Nor is the self an essentialized, bounded product at all, but a series of selves, each in relation to the particular historical and environmental moment.

3.2   METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

3.2.1 Cultural Intuition

The pull to recognize and acknowledge self constitution as resistance comes from a place of empathy for active teachers. I identify as a champion for teachers, for their professional dignity, for their value as educational resources and important role models for students and for their significance as public citizens. Delores Delgado Bernal (1998) uses the term cultural intuition to refer to the unique viewpoint that scholars, who share a culture with their research participants, bring to the research process. This personal quality of the researcher is similar to "theoretical sensitivity" in grounded theory and other qualitative methodologies (Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).   Theoretical sensitivity indicates an awareness of the subtleties of meaning of data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). "[It] refers to the attribute of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand, and capability to separate the pertinent from that which isn't" (p. 42). Delgado-Bernal uses Strauss and Corbin's four major sources of theoretical sensitivity - personal experiences, existing literature, professional experiences, and the analytical research process itself (p. 93) - to establish her own cultural intuition as a Chicana feminist researcher. Though I borrow this language to highlight the personal nature of my inquiry

I do not wish to bring the history or scope of grounded theory to this study. But I am willing to claim that since teachers share a culture composed of the intersections of class, vocation, training, labor, experience and professional language, teacher-researchers have unique viewpoints (theoretical sensitivity) that can provide them with cultural intuition when inquiry is located within teacher culture and/or the teaching field. I acknowledge that my own cultural intuition has guided this research project and has colored all stages of analysis and meaning making.

3.2.2 My Relationship to the Data

The nature of my relationship with my data is dialectical, serving to center the theory as the focus of analysis. The claims that I will make should be thought of as constructions; they will represents my efforts to make sense out of my experiences of a negotiation between data and theory. According to Lincoln and Guba, "the major task of the constructivist investigator is to tease out the constructions that the various actors in a setting hold and, so far as possible, to bring them into conjunction - a joining-with one another and with whatever information can be brought to bear on the issues involved." (1985, p142).

As an adherent of the caring ethic (Noddings, 1984, 1992, 1995b, 2002), I find it most appropriate for educational researchers as "ones caring" to adopt and promote the projects of the subjects or "ones cared for" in the researcher-subject relationship. I include my interview participants' responses to my preliminary interpretations as a way of declaring my focus and as a means of inviting clarification of the interview experience as a co-creation and as an intermediary interpretation of the research data. This is what Patti Lather (1986) calls "praxis-oriented" research:

> 'Praxis oriented' clarifies the critical and empowering roots of a research
> paradigm openly committed to critiquing the status quo and building a more just

society. I use the term to mean the dialectical tension, the interactive, reciprocal shaping of theory and practice that I see at the center of emancipatory social science. (p. 55)

In this study, dialectical tension exists between my own experiences, beliefs and biases that I hold in the background of my understanding and a portrayal of my participants' responses that I attempt to bring to the foreground. The process of my theory building is reciprocal in the sense that I invite participants, in conversation, to contribute to and guide the development of themes and sub-themes that later emerged (rather organically), as essays (Sections IV-VI).

3.2.3 Interviews and Follow-up Conversations

The interview data was taken from a current collaborative inquiry, in which I am the co-investigator (IRB Number: 0506172; M. Gunzenhauser P.I.). This study utilizes an open-ended interview protocol to engage with a purposeful sample of teacher-participants in South Western Pennsylvania. This sample was ideal for my investigation since preliminary analysis suggests that the population can provide a ready example of the context of normalization of the self. Table 3.1 below, lists the names of all twelve participants (pseudonyms); the demographic area of their work environments (as they described them); their certification level and area; their years of service as an educator (presented as a range to further protect their anonymity); and their highest level of education.

Name	Demo. Area	Level	Area	Years Service	Education
Brad Lawrence	suburban	secondary	English	15-20	PhD student
Cid Davidson	suburban	elementary	principal	7-10	PhD student
David Quigley	rural	elementary	1st/4th/Math	30-35	BS
George Griffin	urban	secondary	English	5-7	MA Literature, MSEd
Irene Brennan	rural	secondary	Science	5-7	PhD student
Jean Gray	rural	middle/secondary	principal	15-20	PhD student
Jill Bartoni	rural	secondary	English	30-35	PhD
Joice Umbridge	suburban	elementary	3rd	20-25	MSEd
Katherine Reynolds	semi-rural	elementary	2nd/LearningSupport	30-35	PhD
Kathryn Queen	urban	secondary	Science	7-10	MS Genetics, MSEd
Sam Galloway	semi-rural	elementary/middle	principal	20-25	EdD student
Vicky Lewis	suburban	elementary	Art	10-15	PhD

Table 3.1. Participants

The selected sample provided enough variation in responses to do rich conceptual analysis. While not achieving maximum variation, this method of purposeful sampling provides a reasonable amount of texture to allow me to accomplish my interpretive task. All interviews have been recorded and transcribed. Five of the twelve (12) interviews that I used have been transcribed by a hired transcriptionist. The others I transcribed myself. The transcripts were read to identify significant themes, which emerged from memo-writing, and dialogue with interview participants via informal follow-up conversations, a form of recursive data collection.

This method of analysis is based upon the work of Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) and Coffey and Atkinson (1996), anthropologists and sociologists influenced by grounded theory, but who advocate conducting qualitative analysis without the assumptions from traditional grounded theory about underlying order and causality. This framework allows for multiple possible avenues of meaning to be captured, encouraging the researcher not to foreclose too quickly possible

meanings that may be embedded in text (Gunzenhauser & Hyde, 2005c see Apex. A, p. 39).

Data selected from the interview transcripts are partially a product of participants responding to a predetermined interview protocol (see Apex. B), while data arising from follow-up conversations were in most cases participant-instigated reflections on the interview experience. At the beginning of each of the follow-up conversations, I asked participants to read a copy of their interview transcript with the suggestion that they might make corrections if and where their responses were not represented accurately and make comments if and when the transcribed responses did not represent their responses conceptually. As participants read through their own transcripts, they offered comments and posed question to me about the study project as a whole. I showed participants various outlines for this document and asked for their suggestions and approval on my choice of speculative essay topics from almost forty original essay themes.

There was just one exception to this rather open-ended approach: in each of the follow-up conversations, I asked participants to respond to the following set of questions in order to get at my central research questions: *What responsibility does the public school system have for preparing future citizens? What is your responsibility? How do you enact this responsibility? How well does it work for you in this era of accountability?* Responses to these questions are largely reflected in **Section VI.**

3.2.4 The Essay as Method and Expression of Praxis

Each single interview provides varied and sometimes contradictory elements that are interesting to a study of the subtle and fluctuating relations of power involved in self constitution as resistance. For this reason, I portrayed a major portion of my analysis and discussion as a culling of themes, concepts or composites written as speculative essays (Schubert, 1991).

Essay invites creative talent and requires something personal of the writer. It is geared toward a more public view and deliberately more accessible to a non scholarly audience. The speculative essay "blends qualities of a personal essay and theoretical writing to show the process of an author thinking on a subject" and "displays the reflective and recursive nature of writing" (Logsdon, 2000, p. 14-16). Education has been a prominent theme for essay dialogue (Dewey, Montaigne, Locke, Thoreau, Emerson and Rousseau) and the modern and contemporary incarnation of the essay in the public realm has always been socially conscious. Traced back to the classical period, the essay is a form a criticism; it was not mean to answer a thing (Bloom, 1985/2005).

I approach my writing with an understanding of essay as both an initial attempt to understand something and the result of that attempt (OED, 1989, n. II5, II5b). While an understanding of the speculative essay as philosophical inquiry informed my writing, I have produced a different kind of essay, one that is an expression of my praxis, a "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1970/2000, p. 36).

> Freire's theory was based on an ontological argument that posited praxis as a
> central defining feature of human life and a necessary condition of freedom.
> Freire contended that human nature is expressed through intentional, reflective,
> meaningful activity situated within dynamic historical and cultural contexts that
> shape and set limits on that activity. (Glass, 2001)

The essay as "intentional, reflective, meaningful activity" is something like a dialogue that takes place between two mutually interested parties that share an intellectual foundation as far as the subject matter upon which they are reflecting. Using the essay format to represent my analysis and discussion seemed appropriate since I am attempting a creative educational commentary, using an accessible style, which delivers a critique of a predominant social institution.

3.3   ISSUES OF "VALIDITY" AND RESEARCHER BIAS

To bring a check on the rigors of my analysis, I return to Patti Lather (1986) for "a reconceptualization of validity appropriate for research that is openly committed to a more just social order" (p. 53-54). Most appropriate for my study is Lather's concept of catalytic validity – the degree to which the research process reorients, focuses and energizes participants toward self-understanding and self-determination through research participation.

To approach any degree of catalytic validity, I must first disclose my own interpretation of the civic mission of schools, historically constructed as a charge to the public school to prepare future citizens. I must be vigilant so as not to "reinscribe oppression" (Foucault, 1980) by reading my own self-constitution (as teacher) into the responses of my participants. At the same time, I acknowledge that despite my intentions, there is no way to keep my own bias from influencing my analysis. Coming from a view of the U.S. public school as just one of the educative and "miseducative" (Martin, 2002) institutions of society and considering the historical imaginary of the role of the public schools teacher - much informed by ideologies of the nature of women's work and thus as nurturance, a non-rational disposition towards children but one amenable to guidance by expert (male) authority - I take a decidedly critical stance with regard to the charge, per se.

But in order to answer the postcritical call for hope that is perhaps at the heart of this study, I must use my own teacher identity, constituted in part by the structural-critical and spiritual-intuitive lenses of my philosophical imaginary to create a personal methodology. And if I wish to bring integrity or wholeness (Palmer, 1998) to my own project of self-constitution, then I must recognize what is true for me about the possibilities for resistance to normalization and compliance. Then, in trying to clarify the stance for my understanding of resistance, I would like to invite teachers (and teacher education students) to imagine that thinking is action; that our practice is rhetorical, persuasive, and not technical. Our words are our actions and our

conversations with students about the social, historical and philosophical foundations of education are the very seeds of change. These self re-imaginings and co-created imaginings of difference are social justice work. Borrowing from Foucault (1988), my project is to "show people that they are much freer than they feel" (p. 10).

4.0   SECTION IV: SPECTACLE AND SURVEILLANCE (THE NEW DISCIPLINARITY)

4.1   INTRODUCTION

In this essay I discuss the ways in which state accountability requirements affect teachers' practices. I name particular technologies of power that challenge teacher agency in the era of accountability. This includes the spectacle of teacher involvement, including "educational triage" (Booher-Jennings, 2005); shaming and blaming teachers through publication of student test scores and the teacher-as-cause ideology; and perhaps what lies behind the quintessential surveillance-spectacle, the No Child Left Behind Act - efforts to privatize education. Instances of surveillance include the silencing of NCLB-related dissent by federal policy; technological surveillance of teachers via state-wide accountability databases; and the influence of the ideology of teacher causality which uses ambiguous language to rhetorically turn the gaze on teachers.

I borrowed the title of this essay from Vinson and Ross (2001), but take my own understanding of surveillance from Foucault's concept of panopticism in explaining the technologies of the examination (Foucault, 1979/1995) and my understanding of spectacle from Smith's application of Edelman's political spectacle theory (Edelman, 1988) to standards-base test reform and high stakes accountability (Smith, et al., 2004). Vinson and Ross explain "the new disciplinarity", the context within which educators offer resistance.

[E]ducation today must be understood according to a setting in which spectacle

and surveillance come together, a state of affairs in which discipline is

established and maintained as individuals and groups are monitored

simultaneously by both larger and smaller entities.(2001, p.3)

Each participant offered a critique of some aspect of public education. These were overwhelmingly delivered at federal accountability legislation and state mandates to districts in response to such legislation. Throughout the transcripts and continuing conversations, there is much by the way of criticism of NCLB, especially the ever increasing and more "disciplinary" policies and procedures surrounding Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) testing. In the next essay, **Repertoire of Resistance**, I present examples of some emergent concepts of agency that I gleaned from conversations with my participants. These examples illustrate for me the notion that with every instance of domination, there is an opportunity for resistance (Foucault, 1988; Hoy, 2004). Here are just a few of the themes that educators talked passionately about.

4.2   THE SPECTACLE OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT

Schools have been responding to the mandates to increase standardized test scores with a strategy called educational triage. "That is, teachers divide students into three groups- safe cases, suitable cases for treatment and hopeless cases – and ration resources to those students most likely to improve the school's scores" (Booher-Jennings, 2005, p. 232-233). Scores are what is most important and this idea becomes reified as educators as well as policy- makers "forget" that this notion of proficient/not proficient was an arbitrary decision. For example a child who scores 78 might be labeled "proficient" but one who scores a 77 is considered "basic". Further, states determine the cutoff between "proficient" and "basic" and set them at different scores. Referring to PSSA Vocabulary Awareness, a daily quiz that teacher were told to give each day to every class, one teacher reported, with some satisfaction for having made a

note of it, his principals statements during an after school staff meeting: "I don't care about instruction; I want you to do these things every single day." (George Griffin, follow-up conversation December 29, 2006). These quizzes were instituted at the two month warning mark; two months before PSSA tests were scheduled for the district. Another teacher had a similar story that obviously upset her deeply.

I will tell you this for a fact and I would hope that this would make this somewhere into your study. I was told this directly from my principal: "do not worry about the students who are below basic. I'm not concerned about them. I want you to work with the basic students to move them to proficiency because that's where we have the best shot of upping our scores". I sat there that day and I though, "how can I be a party to this?" And I'm sure that all of this plays into my decision to retire this year. (Jill Bartoni, interview transcript, lines 222-228).

A less frequently argued point among progressive-educators is that "sometimes the [higher scoring] kids are left behind because we have to concentrate on the kids with the lower scores." (David Quigley, follow-up conversation, January 21, 2007). Not to mention that concentrating on just the middle third amounts to stereotyping both the top and bottom third (Booher-Jennings, 2005).

Many of the participants, teachers and principals, mentioned grade-level or department-level teams organized for strategic coordination of test preparation efforts. What these teams had in common was the reactive nature of their planning based on standardized test data. Perhaps the teams are engaged in "educational triage" or perhaps they are making plans for the coordination of instruction. Often, the teams have been organized to receive instructions from their district offices, sometimes delivered via the curriculum specialist or the principal. In addition to these specific teams/meetings, it was common for participants to talk about after-school and in-service meetings where they were asked to give input in the form of verbal suggestions or written team reports. This request for teacher in-put was often times explicitly not a solicitation

of criticisms or complaints. For example, one educator described his principal as declaring at the start of an in-service meeting: "By the end of the day I want your collective action report for how you are going to implement these daily action words into your classes" (George Griffin, follow-up conversation, December 29, 2007). Long time English teacher, Jill Bartoni, reported on the feeling that she and the other teachers at her school have about "teacher involvement".

> Many of us, when we go to these meetings, feel like, 'what's the point? We're not listened to'. Even when we suggest ways to help students…at least in my school…we're told that they want us to come up with ideas…for the last three years we've had these meetings and not one of the teachers' suggestions have been put into place (Jill Bartoni, interview transcript, lines 160-164).

Popkewitz (1991) calls such involvement "the symbolic rituals of democracy" (p.214). Following political interest group theory, participation ensures political representation, without regard to the persons or interests who form the rules for or determine the purposes of participation. This "rhetoric of participation" has been tied historically to the discourses of educational reform, where reform is assumed to be a new technology, instruction design, program or policy which is introduced into the school or classroom and which represents a change for the better. This conforms to the American value of progress (Williams, 1970) and is "a way to connect administrative values with larger social beliefs" (Popkewitz, 1991, p. 213)

Jill also told me about her school's new program of library intensives which represented for me a spectacle of remediation.

> So we're going through these motions of trying to remediate students. Right now the principal put into place a plan where every so many days students who fail a content course go into the library and two people from the guidance department come in and just supervise them in a 20 minute study period and all of us say 'what good is that? That's not helping the student.' But we have on record that

49

we're trying to remediate even though every teacher knows that it's a joke. It's

doing nothing (Jill Bartoni, interview transcript, lines 164-169).

I have heard similar stories from friends and students who are math teachers and math

tutors. They described math remediation scenarios where students are taken away from regular

instruction and placed in front of computers to drill with Math skills software. Students page

through the program as many times as necessary in order to select the right answers. Such

remediation allows improved test-taking skills to be mistaken for math achievement growth

(Bickel & Cadle, 2004).

4.3   SHAMING AND BLAMING

The performance of spectacle as a disciplinary technology requires a public audience,

while the employment of surveillance requires only the expectation of one. Perhaps the most

insidious technology of NCLB is "shaming" – from the Department of Education ascribing the

label of failure to schools that do not meet state goals for AYP right down to the individual

district and school policies of score reporting in public newspapers and in school and district

staff meetings (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Meier & Wood, 2004; Ohanian, 2007; Sirotnik, 2004;

Smith, 2004). There is no shortage of teacher stories about staff meetings where all attention is

focused on how well or poor their school did in comparison to other schools within the district

and as well as those in neighboring districts; or how this grade level compared to that; and even

how one classroom's scores ranked compared to another, within the same school (NEA, 2007).

As Palmer (2002) challenges, spend some time shadowing a public school teacher for just a

couple of days and "almost certainly, you will witness for yourself the challenges teachers face,

their lack of resources, and the deep demoralization they feel about serving as scapegoats for

our nation's ills."(p.2).

One of the science teachers described the climate of competition building at her "high performing" school.

So [school district] is meeting AYP so its mentioned occasionally that yes we are still doing well we are doing better than other districts in our areas so I think that brings on some sentiment of competition or at least our administrators are trying to light the fires of competition for some of the teachers in testing subjects, that 'hey we gotta compete with this school district next to us and they're re doing a little better than us', so that's a little disturbing, so I feel like those teacher are a little bit pressured, but I think that as long as those teachers are performing, as long as we are still making AYP, its not as bad as it could be. It's not as bad as it could be. (Irene Brennan, interview transcript, lines 186-192)

Another teacher related a more straightforward instance of shaming. This time, the emphasis is on the results of shaming/blaming:

We lost so many teachers…so many good teachers because of the test…another teacher threatened to leave 3rd grade last year because of the test. And the pressure is on the teacher as much as the pressure on the child or more so…because you feel responsible…for everyone …if they are not performing to their best…so the pressure is not as much on the children as much on the teachers. (Joice Umbridge, interview transcript, lines 612-617)

Yet another teacher talked about the anger and demoralization that sometimes accompanies the shaming/blaming events.

Some of us have discussed this and we use the word impotent…we feel impotent. On the other hand, there is anger for us…and I feel that I can speak for them too. There is anger that can infect…it can find our way into our teaching and we try to find a way to keep it out of the classroom but it comes out in the meetings…the anger at the after school meetings is very explosive. We have these meetings at the end of the day when we've been…if you know

anything about the high school teaching schedule its 40 minute bells, boom, boom, boom…and so we drag ourselves into cafeteria to be talked to and to be shown slides of scales and charts and graphs; we're shown how we've flat lined and how the junior high across the street has made improvements and how we should be doing this and how are we going to do this…(Jill Bartoni, interview transcript, lines 143-151).

4.4   BEHIND THE SPECTACLE: PRIVATIZATION

The majority of participants in this study volunteered the observation that the "real" political agenda behind NCLB was aimed at destroying the public school system. This accusation has been leveled by many education scholars over the past five years of NCLB's reign (Burch, 2006; Cadiero-Kaplan, 2005; Kohn, 2004; Meier & Wood, 2004; Ohanian, 2007; Sirotnik, 2004; Smith, 2004; Spring, 2002). Although a few could imagine a time in the future where all K-12 education would be offered by a private service, some described what they saw as a slow conversion to government schools run by private contractors. Currently only 12% of the roughly 55 million school-aged students in the U.S. are currently serviced by private schools (CEP, 2006, p. 5). As has been suggested by numerous proponents of privatization, the remainder could be served by either by traditional private schools, made more affordable by mega corporations such as Edison, privately run state schools, independent but state supported charter (brick and mortar or online) or some other home schooling that aims to strip away what we think of as public education. The number of schools NOT making AYP is steadily increasing (NEA, 2006a) along with the number of vouchers distributed to parents of failing schools. I share my participants' worry about what this could mean for a system based on market competition, where parents purchase the best education that they can afford, when more than 1/3 of all public school students are from low-income families. (CEP, 2006, p.11).

The implications for me, and it's not only because I'm a teacher…the view that
there could be and may very well be a political agenda, the intent of which is to
strip of us of what has been the public school system, absolutely terrifies me…in
terms of what that means for a democracy. And I see the move to charter
schools and the move to take over schools and the move to diminish public
school as a way to keep the very wealthy, wealthy. And making those lines of
diversion of poverty so much greater (Jill Bartoni, interview transcript, lines 268-
274).

Jill refers to a common critique of NCLB, that it unfairly harms the very students that it
promises not to leave behind - poor and minority students (Berliner, 2005). George Griffin
expressed the same idea about high-stakes testing as being part and parcel of an overarching
political agenda to keep the ups up and the downs down. He is particularly angry about the way
his inner city, all African American students are reflected in the representation of test score data.
Following cultural deficit thinking (Valencia, 1997), the tests just reinforce the racist and classist
belief that certain students are stupid and lazy. The test scores also strengthen the argument
that we should stop spending money on some schools – stop rewarding them and start
punishing them.

I think there is no secret now that most standardized assessments are in most
ways racially biased, economically biased, geographically biased, culturally
biased. So, I think accountability has in its possession through standardized
assessments the perfect tool to either disenfranchise or enfranchise. (interview
transcript, lines 412-417)

It has been part of the public discourse for more than a decade that because of their reliance on
property tax revenues, public schools are disproportionately financed to the advantage of
students from wealthier communities (Kozol, 1991; 2005) and the racial segregation of
communities brought into public consciousness by the devastating images of the aftermath of

53

Hurricane Katrina (Henslin, 2005) are magnified by the striking racial segregation of White and non-white students in our public schools (Berliner, 2005; Burch, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2004; Kozol, 2005). Schools that serve minority and poor students have to spend a much larger portion of their budgets on testing and because of the penalties that schools face for poor test performance, school systems have little choice but to spend even more money for services that are supposed to improve test results. (Perelman, 2006). It is not surprising, then, that so many of the teachers in my study were suspicious of the motives behind NCLB.

4.5   FEDERAL POLICY AND THE POWER TO SILENCE

Early in 2002, U.S. foreign policy and domestic education policy carried a rhetorical protection of association with support for an administration under attack by hostile enemies. Thus, criticism of the new NCLB Act was as unwelcome and professionally dangerous as dissent on issues of military action and security measures. It is therefore appropriate to refer to educator's expressions of domestic policy dissent as "civic courage" - Goodman's (2003) term for foreign policy dissent - and to figure even private dissent as resistance. Civic courage may be a powerful residual of self-constitution in Enacting Self Constitution as Resistance especially in the face of totalizing discourses or nationalism and patriotism (Westheimer, 2006). One interview participant in particular helped me to see the similarities in these two examples of power operating to silence dissent: In general, it is not safe for teachers to speak out against the war or about NCLB. However, as with most things in public education, there are different experiences of oppression/agency and different possibilities for exercising resistance depending on the political environment of the school community, which my participants and educational researchers have observed, tends to varies by economic class (Anyon, 1982; Bowles & Gintis,

54

1976; Fordham, 1999; Meier & Wood, 2004; Paige, 2004; Smith, 2004; Sullivan, 2001). One teacher described what it was like to represent what was, in the context of her community, a minority opinion with regard to both NCLB and the War in Iraq.

> [I]t's almost like those of us who feel this way have a little group where we know what we know but we better not say it loudly or let out the truth as we see it because its almost scandalous…its like talking about the war…you talk about the war in my district. You can't ask questions about…"well the war was announced to be over but in the paper today, four more soldiers died in Iraq". I don't teach in a context that lends itself…the kind of context where I might be able to rally some parents…at least that's not how I envision it…to be partners with me to construct or speak to some of the issues that are negative about this accountability movement. (Jill Bartoni, interview transcript, lines 128-134)

Whether a school or district has an official stance on "the war on terror", some educators feel that foreign policy, like domestic educational policy constricts their speech. Depending on the political culture of the community, some teachers do not feel free to voice opposition to any federal policy; they cannot offer political resistance. This is, in effect, a silencing of their public thoughts with colleagues, parents and students. However, as long as educators can hold fast to their dissenting private thoughts (self-constitution via enactments of private thoughts) they can still maintain their integrity (Palmer, 1998) by offering "ethical resistance" (Gunzenhauser, 2006a; Hoy, 2004; Levinas, 1969).

4.6 THE TECHNOLOGY OF SURVEILLANCE

In 2002, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) passed a resolution to purchase and implement a software tool that would use "value-added analysis" to track student

achievement data from year to year. Specifically, value-added analysis is "a statistical method used to measure the influence of a district and school on the academic progress rates of individual students and groups of students from year-to-year"(PDE, 2006b). From talking to the principals among my participants, it seems that the Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System (PVAAS) is not consistently emphasized from district to district. During the 2006 school year, districts received only limited reports with more comprehensive reports scheduled for delivery in the fall of 2007. One principal who had attended a professional development presentation from SAS, the software designer contracted to provide the PVAAS data to all 501 districts in Pennsylvania, has very strong feelings about the possibilities of using the system to "get rid of teachers". Speaking of the presenters, Cid Davidson told me the following story:

> It was initially developed to get rid of bad teachers. That's what it's for…its to rate teachers performance…they come right out and say that…when I was at [previous school district] we were sent to [nearby school district] to listen to a presentation on this…you know how on the first day of school your have these assemblies that are supposed to inspire people… and the presenter from [North Carolina] told all the teachers that they were going to implement this system and it was to make sure that they were doing their jobs. She told a story about how to prove who your worst teachers are and how to get rid of them. You can use the system to predict how well the students are supposed to do on the standardized tests based on their previous performance and if they don't make those scores then this would be one more piece of evidence to get [the bad teachers]. (interview transcript, lines 358-367)

Cid was aware of PDE statement about using PVAAS data for teacher accountability. The Website for state-wide implementation of PVAAS states quite plainly that

> These data will be available for all school districts to use for local decision-making as seen appropriate by the school district. PVAAS is not a tool for

56

teacher accountability. Teacher-level data are not required as part of the Pennsylvania Department of Education's implementation of PVAAS. Pennsylvania has not collected teacher linkages to student achievement data; therefore, it is not possible to provide teacher level analyses (PDE, 2006b).

Cid strongly distrusts this position, making the point that no matter what official position the state may take, principals will be looking at the data with a eye for variations by instruction; in his own words, "it's a way to rate teachers and we're not saying that but that's what we are going to use it that way" (interview transcript, lines 373-374). However, other principals were equally as confident that they and their fellow administrators would not use such data for teacher accountability. Another principal, Sam Galloway, was supportive of the PVAAS noting that the "scores allow teachers to know down to the very student, where the students are and where they should go" (follow-up conversation, February 7, 2007). He added that this was kind of system was useful, that it would only render meaningful and predictive data, when state assessments are given and scores are reported for each year. 2006 was the first school year in which the PSSA test was given in each year from grade 3 to grade 8 and again in grade 11. Even so, none of the principals thought that the PVAAS could ever be a realistic or fair system for evaluating teaching. Two explanations for this surfaced: First, an evaluator would have to know something about the teacher as a person before she could blame or credit a teacher for students' scores; and secondly, an evaluator would have to know something about the life-worlds of students before building an argument for teacher causality. Here is an example of the working through of resistance into in the ideology of "data-driven decision making" (MINDS, 2004).

Constant and ever more sophisticated and comprehensive surveillance of teachers make it hard for anyone to protest the disincentive (on the part of teachers) to welcome low-scoring students into their classrooms. After a few years, the rhetoric of teacher causality makes

it probable that the public - and teachers themselves - will equate low scoring students with poor teachers. This system produces "a team of one" mentality as teachers are intimidated by their colleagues' success. As some of the more critical teachers in this study accused, NCLB makes an easier job of removing veterans who resist the changes to their teaching that the law requires. Newer teachers, some more veteran teachers foresee, will be completely disciplined to follow instructions and will lack the capacity for even self constitution as resistance.

> And who knows, maybe that's part of this big plan to get rid of us who are the resisters, because the newer teachers come in with this [accountability mentality] in place…and so they're obedient little newbies who do what they're told because so much is at stake for them…their tenure, their job (Jill Bartoni, interview transcript, lines 245-248)

A discussion of the two most prominent and polarized rationales for the importance of the teacher is included in the next section.

4.7   TURNING THE GAZE ON THE TEACHER

Consider the phrase "all children can learn". Uttered as a type of mantra, there is little accompanying discussion of what this might mean let alone an interrogation of its underlying assumption. When used as a placeholder for a notion of essential human dignity, this meaningless phrase cheapens the conversation by omitting context and contingencies. All children can learn what? Learn how? All children can learn provide x. As it turns out this phrase belongs to the discourse of "no excuses" and a partial defense of the status quo apportionment of financial resources based on property taxes (Carter, 2000; Valencia *et al.*, 2001). It is ambiguous language that serves to rhetorically turn the gaze on the teacher and support the

ideology of teacher causality. Further, it indicts teachers who cannot get a student to achieve a certain test score.

The study participants exclaimed surprise at my suggestion that this language was particularly problematic for me, though few were shocked to hear that this was a possible rationale for sanctioning teachers whose students scored below basic on standardized tests. In reference to this statement, Kathryn said

> I believe that's the truth with a capital T, but there are certainly qualifications. This relates to responsibility as well; students and parents as well as teachers must be responsible enough to know when a student needs to be able to learn as well as when a student simply cannot succeed in a certain class. There is a limit to what teachers can do to change the instruction when assessments are in a particular format…one that does not measure all the different ways of learning. (follow-up conversation, Jan 19, 2007)

Another teacher, David Quigley, agreed that all children can learn but "not the same thing at the same rate. This is where I disagree with NCLB. Every child learns at a different rate. Each child is an individual." (David Quigley, follow-up conversation, January 21, 2007).

When it was time for my follow-up conversation with principal Sam Galloway, I selected a different but similarly ambiguous phrase that also supports the ideology of teacher causality: "The most important variable in the classroom is the teacher". On the one hand, those educational theorists and researchers who are more considerate of the social context of teaching and learning (and assessment and evaluation) use this ambiguous phrase as a rationale for devoting more resources to supporting teachers. Such support has been figured as increases in salary and reduction in student loan burdens; sufficient resources, equipment, time; and the most favorable teaching environments, including optimal student-teacher ratios (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Kumashiro, 2003; Sirotnik, 2004; Valencia et al., 2001). However, like "all children can learn", this truism provides a rationale for teacher-centered school reforms, for

59

centering and keeping the gaze on the teacher. In terms of accountability, the object of measurement is student outcomes, chiefly standardized test scores. To find the cause for student scores, instruction –both content and delivery- is examined. When content is thought to be held constant (standardized), the significant variable is logically reasoned to be delivery. This is why teachers are both lauded and blamed for a change in student scores.

Sam Galloway thinks that teachers are "absolutely" the most important variable in the classroom; because [as a teacher] you can turn [students] on or turn them off". Sam talked about the influence that teachers have over how a student feels about a particular subject, sport or activity. He further thought that teachers who are able to make students love math, for example, are those who make the subject applicable to the real world. He also held the converse to be true: that teachers who could not make students love their subject, were not making relevant connections. This response certainly provides supports for the teacher-as-cause ideology behind teacher-centered reforms. However, on further reflection, I found a way to complicate the discourse. For what we sometimes think of as hegemony, or ideological oppression, may contain the seeds of agency.

4.8   THE POWER OF THREE: REDIRECTING THE GAZE

Here I turn to the work of Greg Seals (2006), who struck upon a means by which teachers and students could use dialogue about curriculum to mediate the world. By using Georg Simmel's original idea that qualitative change in any social interaction begins with the move from dyads to triads (Wolff, 1950), Seals redirects the gaze from the teacher and back to the triadic relationship among teacher, student and curriculum.

According to Freire (1973/2000), in order to disrupt traditional banking education, where the teacher deposits knowledge into the heads of the students, the unidirectional teacher-

student relationship in which the teacher has all of the authority (power) and the student has none, must be exchanged for a more equitable bidirectional relationship between teacher/students and student/teachers. In an effort to fill in the gap in critical scholarship concerning the informed hope of realizing democratic interaction that fits a Freirean conception of student participation, Seals (2006) observed that

> a reconciliation of the poles of the student-teacher contradiction requires changing the dyadic classroom into a nonpartisan triad of curriculum, students and teachers. Education of this sort does not pit students against teachers, but puts teachers and students into dialogue with one another. Dialogue treats the curriculum, whether real world of the student or ethereal school subject, as something the students and teachers negotiate, navigate and innovate together (p. 290).

It may not require a teacher to make a complete switch over to a "dialogic classroom", where the classroom is recognized as "a space of contestation" (Garman, 2007, p.2) for the value of intermittent side dialogues (i.e. making connections between math and the real world) to be realized and in order to achieve a dramatic shift in the teacher-student relationship.

Freire says that the foundation of dialogue is love; that it "cannot exist in the absence of a profound love for the world and men" (1973/2000, p. 77). In the next essay, I explore how this belief about love might a create small opening out toward resistance to the normalization of students as numerical deviations as I liken some of the participants' field theories to Freire's pedagogy of love.

4.9   THE CASUALTIES OF THE NEW DISCIPLINARITY: CREATIVITY AND IMAGINATION

Several teachers in this study expressed a concern for the loss of creativity under high-stakes accountability and many other teachers have echoed this in their personal stories and criticisms about NCLB (AFT, 2004; edweek.org, 2007; NEA, 2002).

In the extreme case, teachers are completely separated from the conception, design, and planning of their work, and these steps are carried out by highly skilled outside experts, often college and university professors. In this kind of division of labor, teachers are treated as interchangeable, low-skill technicians, and teaching is reduced to the role implementation of prefabricated packages designed by the experts. (Ingersoll, 2003, p. 157)

George Griffin, a high school English teacher, passionately remarked that if public schools continue to follow the administration's plan for complete standardization, "we will end up with a nation of automatons. Our creativity will go into the toilet. It will be like having a nation of deltas with politicians feeding them the soma of propaganda. Consume, Consume!" (a reference to *Brave New World*, follow-up conversation, December 29, 2006). Third grade teacher Joice Umbridge described the cumulative effect on her practice of having to tie instruction to the standards and preparing students to be tested on specific standards as stifling to her creativity: "[T]the creativity is gone. So…I'm more conscientious and less creative." (interview transcript, lines 687-388).

Educational researchers have indeed confirmed that as self-consciousness increases, creativity decreases (Amabile, 1996; DeBord, 1997; Fusarelli, 2004). Child development specialist, Karen DeBord, lists surveillance as one of the barriers to creativity. She explains that "[o]ften people are not able to perform at their best because of outside influences that make them feel pressured or insecure. (DeBord, 1997).

62

With regard to the possibilities for Enacting Self Constitution as Resistance, creativity and imagination are of utmost importance for one to participate in the "dialectic of freedom" (Greene, 1988), a decidedly social construction of selves engaged in the imagination of alternative ways of being, in an effort to appreciate the power of human beings to affect their own destinies, to exercise human agency and to change social conditions. In the era of accountability, educators can still imagine possibilities and create openings in the construction of teacher as obedient technician as well as teacher as victim. The next essay, **Repertoire of Resistance**, explores some of the tools that teachers might use in constituting themselves to resist normalizing technologies of the new disciplinarity.

5.0   SECTION V: REPERTOIRE OF RESISTANCE

5.1   AGENCY AND RESISTANCE

In this essay I present examples of some emergent concepts of agency that I gleaned from conversations with my participants. Each participant offered a critique of some aspect of public education. These were overwhelmingly delivered at federal accountability legislation and state mandates to districts in response to such legislation. But even in the rare cases where such legislation was seen as beneficial or progressive, there seemed to emerge some concept of the role and identity of educators as change agents. This is not to equate change with a challenge to dominant ideologies or structural arrangements but simply to acknowledge a pervasive recognition of the power and responsibility that educators claim for themselves to "make new" - to mark problems, generate solutions and implement new strategies for the good of their students.

Resistance is usually thought of as a reaction and/or rejection of something undesirable; a stance of direct and willful opposition. In the case of self-constitution as resistance to normalized conceptions of teachers, resistance is a proactive stance of difference. Teachers sometimes balk at the term resistance because it is associated with being uncooperative or going against rather than working with authority (administration). Yet they often prize the capacity and willingness to make decisions for themselves. Teachers might not want their students to resist working through challenging material. Yet the teachers in this study do seem

to want students to engage in critical thinking, to resist taken for granted assumptions. These educators also want students to take responsibility for their own learning, which could be seen as resistance to constraints on self-development (oppression).

The educators in my study make "tools" of the following aspects of their own self-constitutions: post-certification graduate (especially doctoral) study; an internally defined sense of professionalism; a reliance on their own pedagogies born of and/or nurtured in practice (field theories); a mastery of their content and the confidence and resources associated with such knowledge; consideration of their positionality with regard to power and authority and their degree of political savvy. These tools, that collectively I am calling a "repertoire of resistance", might be some of the elements that go into a self-constitution of teacher as intellectual, an update to Giroux's 1988 ideal.

5.2   GRADUATE STUDY

All but one of my interview study participants were previous or current graduate students and in fact eight had or were in the process of completing doctoral degrees. Because of how often so many of them made reference to their post-certification graduate education courses, I asked them all what they thought about the possibilities of post-credential graduate study in education that might contribute to developing the awareness of alternative policy discourses, critical emancipatory or transformational theories and concepts and enactments of resistant pedagogies. Educator practice and teacher preparation does not necessarily include policy as "content" let alone provide for critical discussions and analysis. But for at least the last 30 years, graduate study in education has included at least a minimum of social theory and philosophy, including at least a cursory mention of the impact of the new sociology of education (Apple, 1979; Bernstein, 1975; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Young, 1971) on educational theory and

research. This provides students, who are often practicing teachers, with an awareness of radical pedagogy, "a critical response to what can be loosely termed the ideology of traditional educational practice"(Giroux, 1988, p. xxix). Nearly 20 years ago, Giroux and McLaren called for a reconception of teacher education, so that schools might be seen as democratic public spheres and where pre-service teachers could be educated as transformative intellectuals (1988, p. 159). I hear from educators and have read from the literature and course descriptions that graduate study in education, for in-service and post-service teachers as well as non-practitioner education scholars, provides such reconceptions within the content, inquiry and practice of the social foundations of education. Although programs or departments of social foundations are not unusual within schools and colleges of education, they are most often conceived of as supportive of other departments that serve teacher and administrator preparation and certification programs (Butin, 2005). So even though a minimum of some foundational courses (basic education courses) such as the history, philosophy or sociology of education or less frequently these days, multicultural education, are required of almost all teacher education programs leading to initial certification, the possibilities for engagement with the implications of the content as well as opportunities for research and field study which offers a critical response to the certification program's content, usually exist only in post-certification, graduate study. These thoughts were exemplified for me when I heard one participant, Sam Galloway, talk of two specific advantages that were made available to him via doctoral studies: *peer networking* and *expansion of worldview*

> The principalship is an isolated position; you can only develop so much of a relationship with teachers since you are their supervisor and you are not on the same level as your superintendent or that level of administration. So you are basically by yourself. When you have class with other principals, you get to hear about what is going on in their building and share your strategies with people who understand you.

66

Then in describing the power of collaborative doctoral study in particular, this educator said,

I was raised a conservative person and through college I didn't change. [The

Doctoral] Core [a two-term required experience at the University of Pittsburgh]

forced me to think outside of my box. I even wrote about being released from my

little box. I still have my core values and beliefs but I was able to open my mind.

Others have noticed this about me (follow-up conversation, February 7, 2007).

Responses such as these seem to indicate that post-certification graduate study in education encourages deeper reflectivity about policy and practice. Graduate (especially doctoral) study opened an avenue to policy conversations for these educators, which they might not otherwise have had.

5.3   EDUCATOR PROFESSIONALISM AND AUTHENTIC ACCOUNTABILITY

Participants in this study expressed an internally defined sense of professionalism by which they assessed their own practices. Many teachers can imagine a strong link between teacher accountability and professionalism and have here and elsewhere (Schultz, 2005) suggested that teacher accountability should be based on a professional code of ethics, not by student assessments.

According to my teacher participants, professionalism goes beyond professional development but is connected to a commitment to learning and improving professional knowledge that may be a result of professional development activities. Professionalism in this sense is described as a responsibility to know content, care for students, communicate effectively with parents and share lesson plans and materials with immediate teacher colleagues. It has very little to do with a level of formal education, career development or

certification. As one teacher put it, "you can't rely on professional development – classes and training. You learn 80% or more in the classroom. Teaching itself comes from the experience in your own classroom". (David Quigley, follow-up conversation, January 21, 2007).

Professionalism could also be conceptualized as a disposition, similar to Parker Palmer's (1998) *integrity*, one of the twin requisite components of good teaching. As George Griffin says, "I just do what feels right, even if it means losing my job; it is my professional duty." (follow-up conversation, December 29, 2006). When asked about some of the lessons that he had been planning to teach his high school students- every one of whom carries the "academically at-risk" label, every one from an economically disadvantaged, urban environment - just one week before teachers were instructed to prepare for PSSA testing, George proudly admitted

> Almost nothing I teach them is part of the 'official curriculum' (sic). None of that
> stuff will do them any good. What they need most is to be introduced to the true
> nature of the human condition; to be able to value the aesthetics of the most
> valuable human experiences. Do you honestly think anyone else would bother to
> teach them about art, philosophy, music? They need to become good human
> beings before they can become good or productive citizens (follow-up
> conversation, December 29, 2006).

The content that George was describing (art, philosophy, music) is referred to as "enrichment" in his district, designating it as something extra that might be attempted after the official curriculum material was covered and never during PSSA prep time, which for this school meant the two months prior to the administering of each test. His way of being with his students might be considered moral education (Giroux & Purpel, 1989; Noddings, 2002; Slattery & Rapp, 2003), as it depends on this teacher's own ethical awareness of the business of schooling. *Identity* is the other component to good teaching, according to Palmer (1998), who builds upon this premise in *The Courage to Teach*.

Face to face with my students, only one resource is at my immediate command:

my identity, my selfhood, my sense of this 'I' who teaches – without which I have

no sense of the 'Thou' who learns…Good teaching cannot be reduced to

technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher. (p.

10)

Thus in negotiating the curriculum, George is accountable to his professional integrity,

drawing from his own aesthetic sense and identity as a humanities scholar and a maverick

philosopher.

Like the other educators in this study, Vicky Lewis and Joice Umbridge accepted

accountability; that is, they expressed a strong belief that they were, and indeed should be,

accountable for their work. For the most part, "we [teachers] can check ourselves to make sure

that are doing well". But, they also stated quite plainly that some teachers just "put in the bare

minimum" and they admitted frustration with other teachers who were not "doing their jobs"

(follow-up conversations, February 17, 2007). This demonstrates for me how teachers are also

engaging in the discourse of authentic accountability (Valencia *et al.*, 2001). Advocates of high-

standards and those whose research impacts their implementation have advanced the concept

of "internal accountability" as a way to distinguish processes in schools that encourage

educators' accountability to student learning from processes of mere compliance, arising from

"external accountability" and mandated by NCLB (Gunzenhauser, 2003). A group of education

and civil rights organizations from The National Center for Fair and Open Testing has proposed

a set of principles for reconstructing of accountability systems to make them more "authentic"

(FairTest.org, 2004). These include critical inquiry into meaning of accountability (accountable

for what? accountable to whom? and accountable by what means and to what ends?).

Viable forms of internal assessments might include teacher evaluation, portfolio

conferencing, project completion, self-reflection, class grades or a composite of all these

(Darling-Hammond, 2004). Internal assessments are historical and contextual. They can

69

accommodate extenuating circumstances and bad test days. Most importantly, measures of internal accountability are made by the most qualified evaluators, students and teachers themselves who are the people most closely involved in the learning that they attempt to portray. Rejecting externally constructed definitions of teacher accountability in favor of individually and authentically defined accountability is an act of resistance via self constitution.

5.4   PEDAGOGIES OF LOVE

During the interviews and throughout the transcription process, I heard three interpretations of "philosophy" of education: a) meaning, b) value/use or purpose, and c) pedagogy (or as they were expressed, theories of classroom teaching, learning or environment and teacher-student relationships). I distinctly heard descriptions of what could be called field theories – pedagogies born of and/or nurtured in practice. Garman (Garman, n.d.) calls these "embedded theories", those we use without noticing. I introduced and then with their approval used the term field theories with my participants in our conversations.

Some educators seem to have developed a field theory that can be likened to Freire's "pedagogy of love" (Darder, 2002; Freire, 1973/2000). This should not be confused with what Freire calls "coddling". This language is "disempowering to teachers and therefore disadvantaging to students because it precludes the possibility of teachers taking political action, such as strikes, to improve educational conditions" (Ninnes, 1998). Freire says that

> the task of the teacher, who is also a learner, is both joyful and rigorous. It demands seriousness and scientific, physical, emotional, and affective preparation. It is a task that requires that those who commit themselves to teaching develop a certain love not only of others but also of the very process implied in teaching (Freire, 1998, p. 3).

70

Three interview participants (all work with elementary-level students) provided strong examples of pedagogies of love. The basic tenet was this: Love is the key to great/effective instruction. Teachers who love their jobs and are excited about what they are doing (no matter what age) will use variated instruction and have more democratic classrooms: more love, critical thinking, group work, student talk. Comfort and positive reinforcement, friendliness, patience, individual attention and fun are the elements of this pedagogy.

The primacy which Sam Garrison places on the adult-child relationship in schools is interesting to me as I begin to recognize how some educators build field theories that, as reflected in their daily decision-making, rely on a higher moral authority, outside of established policy. As Sam explained, "policies are for people who are afraid to make decisions" to describe his rationale for modeling discretion (reasoning) to students. While one student (a willful repeat offender) may get suspended for using foul language, another (the victim of persistent harassment who reached a breaking point) may not. Though admittedly a risky stance because of allegations of favoritism, this educator surmised that "students understand what is fair", which is often different from total equity in treatment. As a principal and long time educator, this participant recognized that he had more liberty to express his field theories than any of the teachers in his building; that operating outside of official policy was "risky" since the personality of one's direct supervisor was pivotal in such exercises of flexibility. According to my understanding of critical resistance, it seemed that such extra-policy operations might exemplify such a notion of agency. But in light of the above considerations, this agency-power is only to some principals and even fewer teachers.

A possible blind spot in such field theories of love, is the potential for mythologizing teachers as self-sacrificing public servants. This has long been the assumption about teachers and is quite possibly a carry over from the days when teaching (especially elementary school children) was women's work (Apple, 1985; Clifford, 1989; Spring, 2005; Tozer *et al.*, 2006).

Scholars are beginning to raise the possibility that much of the low status of

teaching is attributable not only to the relative weakness of children, but also to

the diminished stature of women. Like nursing and social work, teaching has

been burdened with an image of 'social housekeeping.' Such 'women's work'

becomes both identified as an extension of the domestic sphere and vulnerable

to loss of discretion, autonomy, and status... And it is not surprising that

historians and labor economists have begun to explore connections between

feminization and explicit initiatives (like installing 'teacher-proof' curricula and

Individually Guided Education) to 'deskill' teaching by limiting occasions for

teachers to use their professional judgment and skills (Sedlak, 1992, p. 1371).

I have heard from many of the teachers who express a pedagogy of love that good

teaching requires that you love what you do and "if you don't like it, you should get out" (David

Quigley, follow-up conversation, January 21, 2007). This "love it or leave it" discourse

represents a potentially harmful belief that often serves as an axiom of career advice for the

self-directed individual. This makes retreat rather than resistance the logical move in response

to dissatisfaction and forecloses on any consideration to seek a change in the circumstances of

the work environment. I feel strongly that this hidden assumption lies behind the intolerance that

the public has for teacher complaints. It is also one further consideration in the theorizing of

resistance to observe that this mythology impedes the imagination of alternatives. It operates as

a mechanism of self-silencing and works through peer pressure to "suck it up", since everyone

else is enduring the same conditions.

5.5   SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION

Subject specialization, field of study and/or academic background seems to color the awareness and means of resistance/compliance to technologies of normalization. For example, the English teachers in my study all made references to literature that helped them make sense of educational "big pictures". They tended to have much more sophisticated (though more cynical) criticisms about standards based educational reforms and high stakes testing. The English teachers knew more about the history of education, the history of resistance (social) movements and could evaluate school reforms within international and multicultural contexts. Preparation for English education usually includes a solid foundation in the humanities (NCTE, 2003), which provides opportunity for critical and imaginative thinking about the issues that confront us as citizens and as human beings. Further, teaching contemporary literary theory (postructuralism, new historicism, Marxism, deconstructionism, feminism) in high school provides students with an interpretive repertoire which enlarges their view of the world. This approach empowers students to think "beyond the boundaries of their own comfortable world" so that students can "read and interpret not only literary texts but their lives – both in and out of school." (Appleman, 2000, p. 63; 2).

It seems that discussions, whether as a method of instruction or a curricular goal, are more frequently employed by teachers of English or other humanities (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999). Parker (2006) notes that "whereas teacher authority has been diminished by centralized planning and student learning is fixed to a fervent testing regime, purposeful discussions offer occasions for something more like education". (p. 16) Parker refers to two types of discourse structure which support purposeful discussion: seminar and deliberation (p. 12). The purpose of seminar is to "reach an enlarged understanding of a powerful text" (such as the Pledge of Allegiance), while the purpose of deliberation is "to reach a decision on what 'we' should do about a shared problem" (such as whether and under what circumstances the Pledge should be

73

required of every public school student) (p. 13, Table 1). Although discussions, as Parker defines them, are a rarity in most U.S. schools, they can play an important role in the formation of citizens, as they allow students to listen and learn about rich content along with diverse others. Parker and other have called this practice "enlightened political decision making" (p. 13).

> Citizens who possess broad social and disciplinary knowledge plus the disposition to speak and open to one another, whether they like one another or not, are precisely what the democratic project cannot do without". And so using discussion in public school classrooms, which may be the last public space of difference as students are not free to associate only with homogeneous peers, "there is some chance that educators might contribute to 're-forming' the democratic public. (p. 16)

> Parker's sentiments are echoed by English teacher, Jean Gray.

> Our lives have become so busy and so electronically monitored that between students 'IMing' and working on the computer and cell phones, face to face conversation is dying and face to face discussion is dying. And unless a teacher allows students to interact in group discussion…in a sense in study groups, but at much lower levels…um…I don't think they interact as citizens (interview transcript, 273-277).

Brad Lawrence would prefer to let his students' interests dictate the pace and direction of their study together. He would like to educate around more items of popular culture, such as TV shows, movies and music, but feels that if it was discovered that his classes were engaging with such content, then "there would be consequences because we have to account for why we didn't get in certain things that we were supposed to, things that the students have to know for next year." At the time of the interview, Brad was being "audited". He had to account for the day and time that he taught certain concepts and justify each component of his lessons according to how they addressed a particular standard. (Interview transcript, lines 552-561).

"As an intellectual tradition, cultural studies has sought to illuminate issues of power by understanding the role of culture in social and economic oppression while reconceptualizing culture [including youth culture/popular culture] as an important form of resistance" (Gaztambide-Fernandez *et al.*, 2004, p. 2). Scholars who write about popular culture as a tool of both reproduction and resistance see the relationship between popular culture and education as "central to the actual and potential role of youth in a democratic society" (p. 229).

English literature and language arts teachers might easily defend the inclusion of cultural studies and popular culture into their curricula by way of supplemental texts and discussions that address the state standards. George Griffin mentioned that the English teachers in his district were coached to use literature that was of "high interest" to their particular urban adolescent population and that "supposedly our textbooks are made that way" (follow-up conversation, December 29, 2006). Savvy English teachers, such as the ones in this study, might find ways to accomplish critical projects that address the vaguely worded Pennsylvania Academic Standards for Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening (PDE, 2006a). One could argue, although my participants would not agree that this was the intent, that the PA requires students to learn critical literacy, including critical media literacy. Standard 1.2, Reading Critically in All Content Areas, for example, includes "identifying the use of proper references or authorities and propaganda techniques where present" and the using "teacher and student established criteria for making decisions and drawing conclusions" (1.2.11A). Standard 1.11B requires students to "use and understand a variety of media and evaluate the quality of material produced", which requires that students be able to "explain how the techniques used in electronic media modify traditional forms of discourse for different purposes". Standard 1.6, Speaking and Listening, asks student to "evaluate the role of media in focusing attention and forming opinions" (1.6.11F).

It is important to note though that not all of the standards make it into the PSSA test, that is, the questions do not address every single standard, in any given year. The standards that

are expected to be included in the PSSA are called the anchors. Jill Bartoni reminded me that regardless of the affinity that any teacher might have for one of the more "critical" standards above, it is "the tests themselves make a certain kind of learning or knowledge legitimate…because…the tests have the authority. And the parents trust the tests and the test maker, who are not us" (interview transcript, lines 211-214). Schools receive a list of the anchors from their district offices (which receive them from the PDE) prior to the administration of the year's test. According to my participants, the schools received this list at no particular time but ideally at the start of the school year.

Many of the educators, no matter their area or level, wondered what happened to the emphasis on science that was born of late 1980 and disappeared at the arrival of NCLB. After the release of *A Nation at Risk* (NCEE, 1983), the U.S. federal government pledged a series of proposals to commit federal funds with the express intent of encouraging more students to pursue careers in math and science and to improve the quality of math and science education (103rd-Congress, 1994). Along with the emphasis on math and science was a call for greater critical thinking skills, also known as the "excellence movement" in education (Tozer et al., 2006, p.452). The movement called standards-based education reform (SBER) began in the late 80's and early 90's to create the same high quality education along with the same high-levels of support for all students, teachers and schools, was fundamentally concerned with equity. This movement, which Scott Thompson (2001) refers to as authentic standards-based reform in order to distinguish it from its "evil twin", test-based reform, is an approach that is designed to make schools accountable to the communities that they serve and to do so by focusing on high-quality teaching and learning, not on test scores" (p. 62).

National standards for science require educators to teach critical thinking skills though "the process of science" (NRC, 1996). To many progressive scholars, the critical in critical thinking refers not to a questioning of oppositional stance but simply to higher-order thinking. Alston observed with disappointment that "the success of the critical thinking movement has

76

come at a high cost to the notion of thinking as a rich field of inquiry and practice." (Alston, 2001, p. 29). However, the teachers in my study interpreted the mandate to teach the scientific method as part of the official science curriculum as a requirement that they teach students to be critical, meaning questioning, thinkers. The two high school science teachers in this study, Kathryn Queen and Irene Brennan, explained with specific example where the scientific method supports critical questioning, curiosity and constant review.

Educators, especially postsecondary instructors, often have the opportunity to introduce different "ways of knowing" (Luttrell, 1992). In the case of the scientific method, one might recognize a theoretical perspective that is critical of knowledge the way it is and therefore seeks constant revision. But there are different theoretical perspectives that are not critical of knowledge the way that it is; they rely on knowledge based on tradition or based on authority. I wondered if the science teachers saw a challenge from the scientific perspective to traditional or fundamentalist beliefs, or ways of knowing. Kathryn had this to say, "Well, there is only a conflict if you expect a one and true answer. If you can accept that different ways of knowing lead you to different answers, then there is no conflict. If you expect one answer then there is a conflict." (interview transcript, lines 344-346). Irene shared this story about critical thinking and the scientific method:

> I try to convince them that science is important to them, even if they are not going
>
> to be a biochemist or a biologist. And I tell them that science should be important
>
> to them because it can make them a critical thinker. So have to go through and
>
> find three different claims about the world and then they have to evaluate those
>
> claims based on questions that they come up with, as to whether they think that
>
> this is a good claim a bad claim or just a disastrous claim. And then that sets us
>
> up for the scientific method and why you should be curious about things and why
>
> you should be concerned. From there we move into our basic unit on ecology or
>
> environmental science and that's a great spring board because there are so

many controversial issues about it so we discuss a lot about population and population control and what their beliefs are about it and I tell them all the time when we have these discussions they can give me their opinions and back it up with something but they cannot say I don't know or I don't care because that is not a an option. So I really try to make them think about some of these controversial topics that exist in our world (interview transcript, lines 50-62).

Teaching critical thinking through the scientific method, asks students to address limitations and weaknesses of scientific investigations. This is somewhat new and contradictory endeavor for students, who have learned to produce the right answer and defend it. "They resist taking responsibility." They launch into blaming the learning environment, the teacher, the equipment, "anything but themselves" (Kathryn Queen, follow-up conversation, Jan 19, 2007). It is perhaps too easy for students to deliver criticisms of external elements – people, resources, environment – then to construct critiques of their own work of that of others (Alston, 2001). When scientists write findings, human error is always a factor. "It's not meant to be a blame or a threat to their expertise." (KQ, follow-up conversation, Jan 19, 2007).

Both of these science teachers expressed a constriction in their decisions to push critical thinking in discussions or writing assignments by a requirement that they cover the official curriculum.

Unfortunately, like I said, especially with my honors classes, I struggle a lot because then I feel like I have to get back to the curriculum to get all those other topics in that I know they are going to be exposed to in college. (Irene Brennan, interview transcript, lines 63-65).

5.6   THE POWER OF PRESTIGE: RESPECT OF THE COMMUNITY

Prestige, such as enjoying the respect of the community, better positions a teacher to engage in resistance. According to sociological theory, individuals with high amount of prestige often perceive themselves as more powerful and in social exchanges they typical can more effectively promote their own projects and influence others more easily (Weber, 2001/1904). Teachers who feel the respect of their communities, including that of supervisors, teachers, parents, and students might feel more powerful and thus be more likely to risk imagining different scenarios because they trust their own insights and judgments. Veteran teacher David Quigley reflected on his relationship with the community,

> I was involved a lot with the community. I was in the American Legion, the Vietnam Veterans Organization; I worked for the church a lot. In the community, I'm well respected a lot. I believe….If I ever get out of teaching; I can get to the school board. I hope to win. I enjoy being in the community, I enjoy being with the parents…I mean in church or social functions, whatever that might be. (interview transcript, lines 143-151).

David admitted that the support of the community greatly influenced his confidence in his own teaching and in his degree of liberty to speak out against practices and policies, such as NCLB. He further noted that a teacher's confidence comes from following factors: length of time in the classroom; public praise, especially from parents; mastery of subject areas; the freedom to make decisions in the classroom; and the degree of stress that a teacher experiences "especially with PSSA prep". (follow-up conversation, January 21, 2007).

79

5.7 RELATIONS OF POWER: POSITIONALITY WITH REGARD TO ACCOUNTABILITY

Foucauldian self constitution involves an inner critical engagement of self-constituting practices as well as an outer questioning of the conditions within which the self is constituted. As Pignatelli (1993) observes in theorizing teacher agency through a Foucauldian lens, "power is ubiquitous" (p. 427). It is therefore impossible to identify the source of oppression. So, the "project of becoming aware" (p. 421) involves recognizing one's place in the power structure. Positionality with regard to accountability affects teachers' capacity for awareness, use of power and acts of resistance. For example, a teacher's position with regard to responsibility for test scores, their longevity with the district, the respect they enjoy in the community and their degree of political savvy, are all factors in constituting the teacher self.

Whether educators are teaching classes that are considered PSSA core (math and language arts; grades 3-8 and 11), PSSA supportive (grades k-2; science; art) or non-involved (health and physical education, or private school affiliated) directly influences their capacity for deviating from the official curriculum. In Kathryn Queen's private school job, she is not concerned with PSSA testing, because the school's administration and parents do not recognize it as any valid measure of student's success. The faculty, students and parents aim for other markers, such as successful completion of the International Baccalaureate (IB) requirements. As far as her capacity to resist federal policy in her public school teaching, Kathryn said," well, I choose to ignore it." (follow-up conversation, Jan 19, 2007). Teachers have been asked to prepare students for the PSSA science exams scheduled for school year 2007-2008 by including PSSA type questions in their assignments. These questions, which Kathryn called short answer, were referred to as essay by the administration. In this situation, PSSA testing currently holds low stakes, and consequently produces very little stress for the teachers.

Veteran teachers can recall a time of greater freedom and flexibility before NCLB (Ohanian, 2007). Some of the teachers in my study have experienced decades of pre-NCLB

"success" in the classroom. These teachers also enjoy the respect of parents and colleagues and students may tend to perform for them more readily. More junior teachers seem to feel that principals tend to close their eyes (suspend surveillance) to the practices of veteran teachers and therefore give them more freedom. It made sense, therefore to speculate that longevity made resistance via self-constitution more likely. But many established teachers may have gotten a late start with NCLB because they defaulted to "ignore mode", a form of resistance that reliably saw them through previous school reforms. While some of the respondents in this study thought that longevity gave them more power to speak and to act against policies and practices, others felt that longevity just made teachers more likely to get burned out or even to get pushed out of the public school system.

When I first interviewed Kathryn, she had been hoping for years to get assigned to teach some of the IB biology classes. Her requests had so far been ignored by the principal. Then, in between the interview and our follow-up conversation, Kathryn wrote several specific requests and made repeated verbal defenses of her qualifications for the assignments. She went so far as to develop a schedule for the whole faculty to show the principal how assigning her two sections of IB Biology could provide coverage for all school periods and satisfy the preferences of the other faculty as well. Kathryn explained what had made her act more bold in her attempts. "I realized that I was an asset; and that I deserve what I want; and if I don't push for it I won't get it". Kathryn now expresses less fear of the principal (though she is adamant that this had nothing to do with any change for the better in the personal relationship she has with this woman) and has adopted the mantra, "what is she gonna do, fire me?" (follow-up conversation, Jan 19, 2007).

Principals do respect veteran teachers for their maturity and leadership. As David Quigley observed, veteran teachers "know how to mentor younger teachers; to handle emergencies" or otherwise "step up" when called upon for some service to the school. But this respect was not enough to override the privileges associated the seniority policy in David's

district. "I taught math all my life [in another district], so it made me mad that I got bumped [from my position] because of seniority. So my expertise did not count more than seniority." (David Quigley, follow-up conversation, January 21, 2007).

5.8   POLITICAL SAVVY: FROM COPING TO USING THE TOOLS OF THE OPPRESSOR

Some participants in this study found ways to harness the power of NCLB for their own projects of change. In seeing the advantages and possibilities inherent in new curricular and testing requirements, educators offer resistance to the normalizing image of educator as victim of external educational policy, and constitute themselves as "other than". More than one participant found usefulness in the results of the district and school-level policies associated with state-level mandates in response to the federal mandates of NCLB. For example, David Quigley lauded the amount, variety and accessibility of math and science curricular materials, especially the "manipulatives".

> We've been inundated with materials supplied by the district, where we are able to do more with the testing. You get a lot of materials from the district… to help the students learn. When I was in the private school, we never had so many materials. Here, we are given so many materials, that I am learning with the students too. When they use materials like the manipulatives that they have, with cubes and things, they teach me as much as I teach them. And, I know, when I walk into the classroom, I have to prepare myself to [show the students how to use the materials]. (interview transcript, lines 443-457)

David did not feel that the kinds of materials constrained his practice; or in any way limited the possibilities for what he might do in the classroom. "The more materials, the better" (lines 447-448).

Other educators described "DIBELS" (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills), one of the diagnostic tools for reading, part of the Reading First program that was initiated by NCLB, as being quite helpful (though others found the same tools to be dehumanizing to the students and of questionable value to the teachers). Teachers in more rural, less affluent, districts celebrated the arrival and more and newer personal computers for students. Though the intention of the computers may have been sent to the schools as part of pre-packaged, commercial software-based remedial math and reading programs, they were welcomed nonetheless.

The most sophisticated defense of mandatory score reporting and state-wide adoption and implementation of new standardized curriculum packages came from principal Sam Galloway, who saw the potential for NCLB to bring positive changes by way of improvement of instruction. That is, the new curricula were superior to some veteran teachers' "stale and yellowed lessons from 1983". But more than this, mandatory score reporting would allow teachers to make radical changes to their practice –content and delivery - without admitting fault or lack on their part and without having to ask their principals or peer teachers for help.

It's not safe for teachers to admit that they are doing something wrong or to ask anyone for help, especially their principal. And it is not safe for other teachers to make suggestions for changes to someone else's teaching or to tell administrators that so-and-so may need some updating (follow-up conversation, February 7, 2007).

5.9   PROBLEMATIZING UNIONISM AS THE SITE OF RESISTANCE

By the commonplace understanding (described above), teacher resistance is organized political activity, and the expected site of teacher resistance is the teachers' union. I want to complicate unionism as the site of teacher resistance, and while I do not propose the

dismantling of the seniority system, I would like to problematize seniority as a mechanism of labor protection.

5.9.1 Problematizing Longevity: Seniority vs. Merit

The seniority system is one contested element of unionism that is criticized for restricting public schools' hiring and transfer decisions (Holland, 2005). The history of union organizing around seniority systems, especially with regard to compensation, was intended to protect older workers from being replaced by younger, cheaper, employees (Tozer et al., 2006; Urban & Wagoner, 2004). Within the discourse on teacher accountability, the seniority system is an easy target. When likened to the private sector, compensation based on seniority seems to dodge accountability and rewards teachers for consistency, while creating a disincentive for innovation, creativity or hard work.

In David's case, the seniority system, which ranks teachers according to their length of employment with the district, was thoughtless. In keeping with the district's contract with the teachers union, all non-tenured teachers have their positions offered to senior teachers as "vacancies" for transfer. This system assumes that one teacher is as good as any other (certification area aside) and has the unfortunate result of sometimes placing teachers in schools that don't want them/need them and of pushing untenured but more specially prepared teachers (subject specialists, for example) from schools that want them/need them. In this case, a skilled and experienced math teacher, who had worked for two years to maintain his school's PSSA math scores, was bumped from his position over the expressed objection of his principal. David was replaced by a 12-year veteran of the district; who had been teaching upper elementary language arts and had no interest in math instruction but was attracted to the location of the school. This made David feel as though he was "being treated like a worker, not a professional".

This case further illustrates the complicated responses that principals have to the mandates of state accountability systems. It is understandable why principals would feel restricted in their abilities to make hiring and assignment decisions that best serve the school, the teachers and the students. But, as my principal informants have told me and as other educators and administrators have observed, merit pay is not the obvious counter to the dysfunctions of the compensatory system. Further, in the post-NCLB era of accountability, when merit pay is positioned as a check to union power, merit is not some quality of professional knowledge, passion for content, or relationship with students, colleagues or parents. Merit is not evaluated by a teacher's direct supervisor. A teacher's merit is assumed to be measurable by their students' test scores. Merit pay based on student achievement would work counter to the equity goals of NCLB – perhaps the most heartily defended rationale for perpetuating the law. For example, the Governor of California

> wants to reward teachers not by their educational level or years of service but by their ability to "impart knowledge" and turn out high-achieving students. But if the yardstick to measure merit is only students' test scores, inevitably merit pay would go primarily where it is least needed: to teachers with the easiest jobs in advantaged schools (Brown, 2005).

Vicky Lewis and Joice Umbridge teach at the same suburban elementary school. They heartily but privately support merit pay for teachers. Each can remember a time before NCLB and for this reason; their ideas about how to evaluate a teacher's merit have nothing to do with student's PSSA test scores. They recalled a time when it was possible, yet still not popular to voice support for merit pay to recognize teachers who were contributing outstanding efforts and experiencing classroom success as measured by multiple indicators of student growth (excitement, interest, academic performance on classroom tasks, etc), supervisor observations, student feedback, parent satisfaction, peer recognition and outside review. Since merit pay had become some closely connected to students test scores –and in fact, in this district, parents had

been advocating for just such a compensatory system – supporting merit pay had become "a secret; something [they] can only talk about with a few people who also support it." (follow-up conversations, February 17, 2007).

5.9.2 Teachers as Collective Laborers

Merit pay is not widely popular with teachers, teachers unions and many liberal - progressive reform advocates because of its association with the competition and efficiency rhetoric of private business models and conservative education reform initiatives. The protections of the salary scale seniority system that has been a historical bulwark of unionized labor against the exploitations of management (Spring, 1988; Tozer et al., 2006; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Urban & Wagoner, 2004). This observation opens the way or points the way back to consideration of teachers as professionals, in contrast to the political and legal arrangements of teacher work as organized, unionized labor. Being a professional means that a person has normative claims on the world (Wilkins, 1995) "and some have argued rather forcefully that the profession of teaching lacks key characteristics attributable to professions, such as a code of ethics and autonomy" (Gunzenhauser, 2006a, p.1).Noting this, one of the educators in this study even brought up the contention that "teachers have never been professionals, but they never mention this in teacher education" (Jean Gray, follow-up conversation, December 28, 2006).

I have heard teachers criticize their local unions for being overly concerned about job benefits and insufficiently concerned about the daily conditions of teacher work: restrictions on practice, exclusion from curriculum decisions and most notably the imposition of the external assessment regimes and accountability systems. While the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers as well as their state-level affiliates have been lauded for concerted efforts to reduce class sizes, protect special programs and forcefully oppose the

unreasonable and unfunded mandates of NCLB (AFT, 2004; NEA, 2006b), teachers' perceptions of their local unions reveals a reliable dissatisfaction. Of the criticisms most interesting to my study, is the silencing force of coercive unanimity. Collective bargaining requires union members to waive individual rights to redress or appeal, although democratic action via ballot voting might provide some protection from the tyranny of the majority in such organizations. One of my participants told me about spying or eaves-dropping by building union representatives to find out which teachers opposed popular referenda. Another told me of an instances where the local union representatives called for a "verbal vote" on whether the teacher would negotiate with the local school board on such controversial issues (such as merit pay). This had an expected silencing effect on teachers with minority opinions.

5.10   CONCLUSION: RESISTANCE AND TRANSFORMATION

The preceding examples of resistance might contribute to a self-constitution of teacher as transformative intellectual, an update to Giroux's 1988 ideal. In talking with real teachers who operate within relations of power, most recently defined by test-based accountability systems, Giroux's positioning of teachers as political actors assumes choice and freedom to speak and act and privileges overt political resistance. Where I take up a utopian project is in recognizing and naming a repertoire of resistance that is transformative rather than emancipatory. As previously stated, Giroux made use of a modern notion of emancipation as an act for the benefit of others, but I am interested in the philosophical work of the self upon the self, not in the sociological work of the self upon society. Rather than identifying resistance as any specific type of fixed action, adopting the concept of self-constitution in theorizing resistance troubles a more common understanding of resistance as reactive and oppositional. It is a rhetorical move, an affirmative action that promotes contextualized, non-specified, non-defined concepts of

87

resistance as agency. In the next essay, I attempt to understand how the tools in this repertoire nuance the enactment of civic pedagogies and how self constitution relates to transformative education.

6.0   SECTION VI: ENACTING SELF-CONSTITUTION AS RESISTANCE

6.1   PART I: CIVIC PEDAGOGIES

Most of the themes and concepts in this essay arose from my understanding of participants' imaginations and enactments of critical civic pedagogies. As mentioned earlier, I use the term civic mean public. To me civic pedagogies suggest ways of being in the classroom that have to do with democratic citizenship as distinct from academic skills or employment training. Much was received from direct responses to the historical charge of public schools to prepare future citizens. In their responses, my participants described pedagogies (philosophies of education and teacher identities more than curricular content and instructional methods) that I recognize as civic, by my own understanding of the term - public and political.

For my participants, the most common interpretation of this charge could be represented by the following dictum: Public schools should ensure that students are "successful" after graduation. In most cases, participants readily acknowledged and some even volunteered that success in this sense was defined by societal values, which they variously described as maintaining financial stability, taking care of one's self and one's family and interacting socially (*Westheimer and Kahne's personally responsible citizen*). In some cases, this was made problematic and at other times, not. Some participants saw their own definitions of success as aligned with "society's" but most had additional components such as "subjective well being" or happiness (Noddings, 2003).

6.1.1 At the Elementary Level

There was clearly recognition of the responsibility to teach students how to be "good citizens" reflected by what could be called a developmental civic pedagogy. There was a general tendency for elementary educators to imagine good citizenship as getting along with other people, following rules, caring for the community and voting, while secondary educators discussed responsibilities of challenging students with coursework to prepare them for college or employment. Perhaps educators simply recognize an age-appropriate distinction, well supported by stage theories of cognitive (Piaget *et al.*, 1969) and/or moral development (Kohlberg, 1969; Paley, 1992). At the very least this nurture-challenge progression gives testament to the firm roots that stage theories of child development and learning still have in teacher education. I also see parallels in the tension between the desire to nurture younger children and challenge older ones between secondary and tertiary education. Educational theorists talk about making students uncomfortable as a necessary element of transformative education [see below] especially in teaching across difference (Boler, 2004b; Kumashiro, 2000; Kumashiro, 2002). However the students discussed in the literature of transformational education are generally adults, such as teacher education students.

Elementary level teacher David Quigley interpreted the scope of the public school's responsibility as extending to preparing the whole child. He felt that public schools should make sure that each child has a chance to get an education by "serving free breakfast and lunch and by providing them with a safe environment…that extends to their parents and rest of the community". Not surprisingly, he took his own responsibility towards the students to be "making them feel safe, making them feel comfortable"; and providing them with an enjoyable learning environment. His strategy for accomplishing these goals is to tell the students that "we are one big family", because, he assures me, "1st graders can understand this concept", if nothing else (follow-up conversation, January 21, 2007). Former kindergarten teacher and moral

90

philosopher, Margaret Paley (1992), observed the same from interactions with her own students as she made the connection between sharing pedagogical authority in the teacher-student relationship and education for democratic citizenship. In her practice, Paley used an "in between" strategy for democratic rule making in which she suggested a classroom rule of her own creation and submitted it for consideration to her young students. Paley took notice that her students were "just emerging from life's deep wells of private perspective: babyhood and family. Then along comes school. It is the first real exposure to a public arena." (p. 21).

David astutely observed that his success with building a caring classroom community was due primarily to the small class sizes (10-13 students in the early primary grades) that his district typically enjoys. His philosophy of citizen preparation might be summed up with the following aphorism, "If we [teachers] are good to them [students], they will be good to other people." This represents an enactment of the golden rule, trusting in the influence of adult-child relationships to shape character (Noddings, 2002). It also exemplifies the sometimes overlapping interpretations and enactments of both character education and education for democratic citizenship (Howard, Berkowitz, & Schaeffer, 2004; Hunter, 2001; Kaplan, 1998; Lickona, 1991; Matera, 2001; Nash, 1997; Noblit & Dempsey, 1996; Noddings, 2002; Ryan, 1999; Williams & Humphrys, 2003).

Kathrine Reynolds, an elementary school teacher makes, as she calls them, "small moves" in enacting a critical civic pedagogy with her young students. For example, she makes a conscious choice in selecting books for her second grade classroom that have mostly young girls as protagonists. This might be an application for elementary classrooms of Megan Boler's (2004a) "affirmative action pedagogy" that privileges previously marginalized voices while silencing more dominant ones. As far as teaching citizenship, Kathrine recalled the patriotic stories and songs that she taught her students. But rather than choosing to read stories from her school's social studies curriculum about "great Americans" who she tells me are "overwhelmingly white men", she draws attention to the women of history by bringing in her own

91

materials and designating a reading corner with a sign that announces books about "Her Story".

She further changes the lyrics of Yankee Doodle Dandy to sing "A real live neice of my Uncle

Sam". After telling me these things she reflected, "I guess I'm more subversive than I thought"

(follow-up conversation, February 25, 2007).

Only one of my participants, Vicky Lewis, was an Art teacher and her response to the

question of citizenship preparation was as unique as the rest of her contributions. "I take it as

my responsibility to educate the whole community about art." She suggested that her work

might generate such pertinent questions for democratic deliberation as "Should the arts receive

public (tax) support?" and "Is art a public good?" Such questions are appropriate for current and

future citizens to consider while at the same time, art-making cultivates an aesthetic awareness

that may be desirable for critical social engagement and the enjoyment of both public and

private life (Dewey, 1934). In *Cultivating Humanity*, Martha Nussbaum (1997) proposed the

inclusion of art instruction as one of three capacities, which are essential to the health of

democratic citizenship.

> [W]e need to cultivate our students' "inner eyes," and this means carefully crafted
>
> courses in the arts and humanities, which bring students into contact with issues
>
> of gender, race, ethnicity, and cross-cultural experience and understanding. This
>
> artistic instruction can and should be linked to the "citizen of the world"
>
> instruction, since works of art are frequently an invaluable way of beginning to
>
> understand the achievements and sufferings of a culture different from one's
>
> own. (p.5)

In *Lifelong Learning and the Democratic Imagination* (Willis & Carden, 2004), adult

community educators from Australia, New Zealand, England, Scotland, Canada, America and

South Africa argue that an inclusive social democracy is more than a political or legal

arrangement. It requires more than rights, privileges and rules of behavior. It requires a living

imagination that might be passed along to future generations not so much as rules of

engagement but as "dispositions". These include purposive attention, embodied awareness, ecological awareness, aesthetic delight, a constant feeling of connectedness, a generalized feeling of belonging and agency, compassion for living beings, a permanent desire for fairness and justice and taste for courtesy. This approach to education for democracy usually involves an arts infused curriculum. Advocates of embracing the emotional component of learning build on Dewey's notion of experiential learning. According to Dewey, the educative process can be identified with growth - or "growing" as he preferred, since it indicates action - when understood as developing, not only physically but intellectually and morally (Cahn,1997). Principal Sam Galloway represented for me an educator attempting to care for the whole child as an enactment of moral education. As he observed, "children are the products of their environments; their perspective on right and wrong is connected to that; as educators, we need to know that." (follow-up conversation, February 7, 2007).

6.1.2 At the Secondary Level

As for their particular responsibilities, many educators expressed a variation on the theme of "critical thinking". This was expressed in terms of such benign sounding goals as teaching students how to think for themselves, how to make independent decisions, and how to interpret public documents and advertisements, to more radical projects such as teaching then to question authority, to understand how dominant groups view minority groups and examining how structural arrangements work to "keep the ups up and the downs down" (*the justice-oriented citizen*). As a response to my question about the nature of the relationship between education and democracy [see the initial study protocol, Appendix], secondary principal Jean Gray reflected on the "danger" of teaching students to think for themselves while at the same time observing the almost crucial need to do just that.

We ask students to leave their first amendment rights at the door. And I'm torn about this… as a principal and as one that need to make sure that there is a safe school and…a well disciplined school, that has to be done to some extent. But as a citizen, we are not letting our students learn how to express themselves; be able to argue pro or con on a topic. Whether they agree with it or not they should be able to look, find facts, develop an argument one side vs. the other side and I don't think we push them enough to be part of the community. And that is part of a social issue…For some reason, we are raising a whole bunch of conservative students…and I am not sure whether it's because we put such strict rules on then, that when they get out, they think that that is how society should be run… You know they can't walk around in here with a T-shirt that is very disruptive, that maybe they are pro legalization of marijuana. They could do that on the streets; they cannot do that in the school building (interview transcript, lines 267-283).

Brad Lawrence, a veteran English teacher, observed that the public school's responsibility was to develop what sounded to me to be a critical work ethic. I say *critical* to distinguish this from the Protestant work ethic that is part of the inheritance of the dominant culture of the United States (Weber, 2001/1904). This ethic questions the ideology of "the one right way" to accomplish any task and involves reflection and collaboration. Brad was specific about the failure of any civic content being transmitted via the schools since most of what students learn in k-12 experiences, by way of the official curriculum, is at some point forgotten. Nor did he entertain the notion that teachers might have much influence on students' civic behaviors as teachers are certainly role models, but not the chief role models. "We are most often evaluators and, perhaps sometimes, motivators", he thought. We can provide guidance to students during their own individual growth. Brad summed up what he saw was his number one job as an educator with regard to preparing future citizens: "I don't care if you are only making a peanut butter and jelly sandwich; I want you to make the best peanut butter and jelly sandwich."

94

(follow-up conversation, December 27, 2006). To him, the responsibility for developing this critical work ethic involved providing feedback to students on their assignments and allowing students to question his evaluations while constantly reinforcing the "do your best" message. There was also a requisite element of self-reflection and peer critique involved in this practice. His students work in study groups to learn other students' strategies for writing as well as the principles of collaboration.

> The study group provides a social structure to maximize learning through deliberative discourse….Study groups are organized so that learners can engage in an educative experience by developing a keener sense of agency, in other words, becoming agents of their own learning (Garman, 2001, p. 2).

It seems likely that some part of Foucault's tactics for using thought and critique in transforming systems of knowledge and power may be the form of resistance that is in operation in such pedagogy. Students (like inmates in prisons and patients in hospitals) possess "subjugated knowledges". They are people "whose voices we refuse to listen to even though we want to understand them" (Jardine, 2005, p. 119). And if "thought is freedom in relation to what one does" (Foucault, 1990, p.330), then when teachers encourage students to make their own meanings especially in concert with multiple and differentiated voices, they engage "the local character of criticism" (Foucault, 1980, p. 81), rather than rely on critical metanarratives such as Marxism or Feminism, and they make space for student thought to operate as agency in relation to learning.

Kathryn Queen, connected her responsibility in preparing future citizens to the specific context of her content area and then to the world at large. For Kathryn, the responsibility of a public school is "to produce citizens who can think critically about world issues". This teacher feels personally responsible for "teaching [students] to use the scientific method in more than just science". She attempts this by "showing them how to use the scientific methods to get a date and [tries] to teach them really relevant, important biology…[she is] convinced that

95

understanding science can lead…to solutions to non-science problems". When asked what she meant by relevant and important, she described the ethical ambiguity of science. She told me several stories about how she communicates to her students that judgments about right or wrong ways to use science are decided by people other than scientists. This is the kind of critical pedagogy referred to in the conversation that Paulo Freire and Myles Horton had about the social context of science. (Freire & Horton, 1990). Kathryn thought about the means by which she could evaluate these critical thinking goals for her students. She settled in on two different kinds of measurements: one subjective/intuitive and one more objective/operational: "I can see them thinking; it's obvious; the physical signs…and also a teacher can tell. I could also collect a post-graduation assessment of opinions". I pointed out that she was looking for dispositions, not skills. She told me that she is certainly concerned with skills but wondered "how can you measure when someone has mastered a skill…has made it applicable to their lives?" (follow-up conversation, January 19, 2007).

I asked Jill Bartoni, another secondary English teacher, if she could relate her pedagogy (that she mentioned as being "counter" to the testing routine) to her understanding of the relationship between education and democracy. Jill self identifies as a critical theorist and admits to deep suspicions that NCLB is a means of getting rid of critical, veteran teachers and of a further movement toward privatization, echoed by many progressive educators (Anyon, 2005; Bloomfield, 2003; Burch, 2006; Cadiero-Kaplan, 2005; Meier & Wood, 2004).

It's getting harder and hard to teach students to think…to push against the grain…to probe...to ask questions…and to have a sense of wonder and to question texts…any texts. There is for me it seems a resistance and a lack of understanding for the need to do that…and it's not just 'tell me what I need to know to pass the test'…it's something deeper…something more fundamental. Maybe it's a lack of a sense of agency…to see education and learning as a means of owning one's life in the world. That to me that is where the

96

freedom…freedom is embedded in that, so that learning doesn't become something that's freeing and liberating and opening possibilities. It becomes that's functional and purposeful in the sense that it is something that you do to get to something else as opposed to something that is ongoing and organic…its not embodied. I am real concerned about the passivity I see. It's almost blankness; It's a blankness on their faces (interview transcript, lines 36-46)…. and I'm scared about the future of public education…about moves to privatize it…I'm scared about a generation of students coming out who don't know how to read between the lines …don't know how to question. It's a culture of fear. Everybody is fearful, fear grips people and so in the grip of that fear, you act. (lines111-115).

6.1.3 Democratic Classrooms

Democratic classrooms have been imagined as the sharing of pedagogical power at the classroom level (student developed rules or choose assignments); community established and governed schools; national movement for school restructuring; and pedagogical models centered on deliberation (Hyde, 2005b). As a check on this scholarship, I asked my educator-participants about their thoughts on democratic classrooms, what this term meant for them and about the possibilities for introducing such ideas into their own practice.

I found a rather sophisticated "post-critique" of the democratic classroom movement. Democratic classrooms, it was widely observed, are more likely with some groups of students then with others. The participants all thought this; it seemed a bit of practice-wisdom. Yet there is scant attention paid to the student dimension when considering opportunities and strategies of democratic "ways of being". There is a feeling that teachers choose what kinds of classrooms to have and that teacher training, skills and dispositions are the only elements worth

manipulating This concerns me as yet another insidious assumption about the degree to which teacher are free to do whatever they want in their own classrooms. (See Berliner (2005) and others for a look at how outside culture and previous experience impacts student motivation and classroom behavior as much as or more than teacher expectations.)

The educators in my sample tended to imagine democratic classrooms as those involving sharing of pedagogical power and one even described "what kinds of kids you could try that with and which kind you can't" (Kathryn Queen, follow-up conversation, January 19, 2007). Some of the factors associated with the success or possibility of attempting this sort of democratic classroom model included age and maturity level of students, motivational level of the students and course designation. History and literature were widely though to have more possibilities than math and science; (See discussion of dialogue in the classroom in **Section IV**).Because of its correspondence to the values and behaviors of middle-class culture, the possibility for teacher-led democratic relationships and experiences may shrink with the age of the student among disadvantaged populations and increase with age of the student in advantaged populations. Not a single participant identified their own classroom (or for the principals, those of their teachers) as being democratic and perhaps this is thought to be impossible in this era of accountability. It has certainly been my contention that the new disciplinarity is a threat to democratic arrangements in schools (Hyde, Johnson & Carowick, 2005a).

Yet I did hear one story from elementary teacher David Quigley that made me think his 4th grade classroom might be described as somewhat democratic. When David was asked by his principal to deliver a Math presentation to parents, he asked his students to help with planning. Together they came up with ideas and a name for the presentation. Building on their fascination with popular crime drama CSI, the students suggested "Math Scene Investigations", a presentation that involved making geometric measurements using breakfast food. The parents were invited in to eat breakfast with the students, who had made all of the materials (except for

the food, which was donated by a famous restaurant chain). The teacher and students taught the parents how to measure the diameter of a circle (sausage patty) for example. This certainly sounds like an enactment of the democratic classroom as imagined by other classroom-level teachers (Cunat, 1996) that puts decision –making about curriculum planning in the hands of students and also goes a long way towards accomplishing what Freire proposes as collapsing the boundaries between teacher and students (Freire, 1998).

6.2   PART II: TEACHERS AS TRANSFORMATIVE INTELLECTUALS

Keeping in mind the distinction between Giroux's (1998) modernist notion of human emancipation, or work for the other, in his definition of "transformative intellectuals" which includes the requirement that teachers "struggle for institutional change…outside of schools in other oppositional public spheres" (p. xxiii), I wondered how teachers in real contexts of high stakes accountability might act as transformative intellectuals. It seemed to me that Foucault's postmodernist notion of self emancipation (Brocklesby & Cummings, 1996) drawn from his understanding of "care of the self" (Foucault *et al.*, 2005) as "a number of actions exercised on the self by the self…by which one takes responsibility for oneself and by which one changes, purifies, transforms and transfigures oneself" (p. 10-11) correspond easily with the work of the self upon the self involved in the notion of transformative education (Tennant, 2005).

The teachers that I spoke with invariably thought of transformation in terms of modern change, that is, as change in or for the other. But compared to Giroux, they had somewhat less stringent guidelines for what might be considered transformative education. For example, when I initiated conversations about transformation, teachers almost unanimously added some mention of relationships with students. This seems to be recognized by psychosocial theories of self and identity which inform the field of transformative education. Concepts of the "storied self"

sees the self as relational, a non-essentialized self that is the result of relationship (Gergen & Kaye, 1992).

A few teachers did approach a fuller definition of transformation as concurrently a change in the self and in others. One teacher described transformative education as a co-experience of learning and changing.

> It goes in a circle. For example, I have so many stories to share…like when I used to sit in the back of the bus with my buddy who was colored (sic). In those days they [African Americans] had to sit in the back. The kids are always surprised by that. (David Quigley, follow-up conversation, January 21, 2007)

Here is an example of a teacher taking a stand (or a seat in this case) for social justice/change, and sharing that change with students through his life stories. David recreates himself through a "return to the self", a "turning around toward oneself" (Foucault *et al.*, 2005, p. 208), which involves taking stock of oneself, and even more fundamentally knowing oneself "in the form of recollection." (p. 210). Foucault's "care of the self' is the very practice of self constitution that offers resistance to normalization of teacher selves and the work of the self upon the self that makes education transformative.

6.2.1 The Role of Intention

A critique of the individually responsible citizen (see page 8) reveals an ideology that limits civic activity to obedience and self-control. This ideology, which is related to the moral philosophical traditions of Hobbesian individual rights, excuses (or rather, normalizes) inequalities in political, social and economic systems. Achievement, gain, health, or any other benefit is the result of independent effort. Nevertheless, many educators, philosophers, scientist and mystics continuously point to the self as the originator of present conditions and the only path to change. As discussed in the review of literature, both the hard and soft science - physics

and psychology - acknowledge the power of intentionality, which is different than conscious intention and more like the concept of "conation" (Huitt, 1999) or "true will" (Mischel *et al.*, 1996) to alter matter. Even in random trial experiments, data have supported the position that intention can significantly influence inorganic and organic materials (Tiller et al., 2001; Tiller, 1997). This is all to say that intentionality may play at least as much a part in emancipation (work upon others, society) as it does in transformation (work upon the self).

6.2.2 Accountability for Equity – NCLB as Emancipatory Progress

With this understanding of transformation, I wonder if externally imposed accountability practices such as high-stakes testing (and especially NCLB) might ever help educators to accomplish transformative agendas. Recall the observation that power creates resistance (Hoy, 2004) and that power made visible is weakened (Foucault, 1979/1995). So if resistance via self constitution is a necessary element of (self) transformation, we might consider that such public and complete use of power (as in the case of federal mandates with punitive consequences) provides both the conditions of resistance and the means of its own eventual destruction.

Principals can and do influence teachers' philosophies. That is, they have the authority (legitimate administrative and supervisory power) to control the express of teachers' philosophies along official (school-level) lines. Principals who express awareness of this power note that this is a great advantage to transformative leaders, while this potentially robs teachers of agency. Sam has been involved in making what he feels are positive changes in his building/district, thanks in part to NCLB. He believes that NCLB provided him with the necessary external policies to effect changes that he already sought for his school. He also thought that the mandates of NCLB were a catalyst for change that allowed teachers to change safely; to change while not admit to needing or wanting to change. This specific understanding of school reform as change may be considered emancipation, but NOT transformation. This type of

change lacks the requisite work of the self upon the self called for by transformative education (Tennant, 2005, p. 103). Knowing that educators like Sam see real possibilities for change in NCLB and NCLB-inspired state mandates, I wondered if this was an expression of Enlightenment-era emancipation, the boundless procession of progress which was the foundation of classical liberalism and played so heavily into the ideological foundation of U.S. democracy (Tozer *et al.*, 2006).

I am also reminded of Skrla and Scheurich's (2004) call for educators to discover and exploit the tendencies of accountability systems that contribute to the goals of equity, particularly the achievement of children of color and children who live in poverty. In *Educational Equity and Accountability* (2004), editors Skrla and Scheurich argue that if accountability systems drive teachers from teaching, equity advocates should not be concerned, because the hardest working and most caring teachers will stay on board. They also call attention to the consistently low level of teaching quality that existed prior to the institution of accountability systems, especially for children of color and low-income children (p. 23). Speaking of the No Child Left Behind in particular, Sam said

> Personally I think it's been wonderful. I know that there are plenty of people who
>
> are detracting of NCLB and I am not saying that I love every part of it but I have
>
> seen more…blowing out of the cobwebs that has been needed, because of it.
>
> (interview transcripts line 346-349).

The blowing out the cobwebs was in reference to the stale practices of veteran teachers who have not been motivated on their own to make changes to their teaching in responses to the changing needs of their student populations. Sam repeatedly made the point that "principals don't have as much power [over teachers] as people think". He stated firmly that "teachers have to want to change"; for those who refuse to change, score-reporting gives the principals a point for challenging a teacher's resistance to change. It also generates pressure from parents and peers (or the potential for public shaming; see **Spectacle and Surveillance**) and perhaps even

the support of the superintendent in taking steps toward more formal reprimands (improvement plans with high stakes attached) and eventual dismissal or forced resignation.

Well, like I said, I know people say a lot of bad things but I have always been in favor of accountability…There is a lot of grumbling about it but I'm not one of them. Like I said before, with the strengths of the unions in PA, I found that as an administrator, that it is harder to get some things done…unless a person internally wants to change and I've seen NCLB require them to change. It's given me an additional tool. It was a much needed change and there's still more. It's not done and that's one of the things that I like about being an administrator…it's a constantly changing, evolving job. It's always different every year and… Looking at the big picture it seems that we needed consistency and we needed accountability. I need to know that the people in room 54 are covering the same material as the people in room 58. I don't tell my teachers how to instruct, what methods you use, but theses are the topics that you have to cover; these are the topic that we want the kids to know and then I have to make sure that they do that. And the timing and the schedule and the organization. All of that. (interview transcript, Lines 480-489 and 513-518).

6.2.3 Making the World a Better Place

With regard to the responsibility of the public school system, I felt that most respondents were searching their thoughts for some "right" answer; tapping a short list of acceptable responses ranging from access to education to job preparedness with some critical thinking sprinkled in between. Indeed both in-service and pre-service teachers and non-teacher college students tend to make use of the same list…what Foucault would call "the archive" (Foucault, 1972) . Although a minority of responses reflected an ideology of individual responsibility compatible with a laissez-faire approach to school-focused, programmatic, citizenship education, none outright rejected the charge for public schools to prepare future citizens.

Further, only two respondents rejected the suggestion that the public schools had primary responsibility for preparing future citizens. They both observed that it was first of all, the parent's responsibility to develop individual citizen behavior.

As principal Sam Galloway explained, the public schools have a responsibility only to offer a "generalized" notion of what it means to be a citizen. Since the public schools draw students from infinite backgrounds, teaching anything too specific would be an intrusion on the home culture. He felt that the schools should go no further than teaching and modeling what are often included in lists of universal character traits: polite speech, honesty, integrity, and good sportsmanship (Howard *et al.*, 2004; Hyde, 2004; Lickona, 1991; Noddings, 2002).

What was quite different was this educator's chief personal charge, which he has been practicing throughout all his years as a teacher, coach and principal: to teach students that they have a responsibility for "making the world a better place" (follow-up conversation, February 7, 2007). This could be identified as a justice-oriented pedagogy in the minimal sense that the assumption behind such a statement is that there is some identified need for change-even perhaps a recognition of injustice-and that each individual personal is implicated in the solution, if not indeed, the cause. When asked for clarification on what this participant meant when he talked about his philosophy of education [**See Repertoire of Resistance**], he acknowledged that he was in fact describing the purpose of education, and that the specific purpose was to "create better people that will create a better world", a distinctly civic rather than academic purpose. As an example about how he enacted this responsibility, he described a grade-level social studies simulation in which he played the part of King George while other teachers played the part of colonial governors in pre-revolutionary war United States. The students played English colonists who were petitioning the king for representation in parliament. Their petitions were accepted or rejected based on the sophistication of the colony's arguments and the diplomacy of their approach. Those who were rejected were counseled on how to make a more attractive appeal. This demonstrates an imaginative approach to living history and allowed for

practice in democratic organizing and activity. The leaders of this simulation were forthright in their intentions with the students; they wanted the students to be aware of and to experience the rationales for having (or attempting) a participatory democracy. This further demonstrates pedagogy of hope or a utopian notion of "unrealized possibilities [which] provides a foundation for analyzing and constituting critical theories of schooling and citizenship". (Giroux & McLaren, 1988, p. 173).

In the next section, I make several analytical claims to represents my efforts to make sense of the above enactments of critical civic pedagogies. I consider what a more contextualized understanding of self-constitution as resistance within a culture of compliance offers to my own practice. Finally, I anticipate the direction of my future scholarship as I reflect on the lessons of this dissertation and as a whole.

7.0 SECTION VII: CONCLUSIONS AND ANTICIPATION

7.1 INTRODUCTION

This section portrays a post-study understanding of teacher resistance within a culture of compliance; of the ways in which some teachers constitute themselves; and of how these self-constitutions might support a critical social theory of citizenship education. Throughout this conclusion, I develop a more complicated understanding of teachers' conceptions of education for citizenship and warrant acknowledgement of teachers' self-constitution as resistance to normalization. I also consider what a more contextualized understanding of self-constitution as resistance offers to my own practice as I connect my learning to the social foundations curricula within a teacher-education program. I recognize the unanticipated "findings" that are a result of inquiry into my own theorizing and attempt to disclose and address problems and disconnections within this work as a postcritical project. Finally, I anticipate the direction of my future scholarship as I reflect on the lessons of this dissertation and as a whole.

7.2 FROM SOCIOLOGY TO PHILOSOPHY

I asked myself throughout this project, why it was that I was working through a philosophy of resistance rather than a sociology of resistance. My prior scholarship had been in sociology and before engaging with Foucault and other postcritical theories, I would have

thought that the implications for resistance would come more readily from a sociological study. But philosophy, in this case, rescues sociology from the quandary between critical and interpretive theories by offering a space to explore the possibilities "on the borders" between critique and hope. While Giroux's work makes a sociological statement about the possibilities inherent in the role of teaching, I am more interested in making a philosophical statement about the locus of agency and the possibilities for resistance inherent in constructions of non-essentialized teacher-selves. My study requested that I and my participants co-construct a critical theory of citizenship by acknowledging and imagining ourselves as other than what we are supposed to be according to dominant discourses; in other words, acknowledging our agency in self-constitution. As educators, it seems that we can more easily imagine our selves by discussing our personal philosophies, rather than our personal sociologies. Although in self-theorizing via personal relationships, educators begin this later work as well. Sloan (2006) attends to an interactionist understanding of identity.

> Through his dialogical perspective of human agency, Bakhtin (1981) asserts that human behaviors are mediated through a continuous process of self-fashioning an 'I', or an identity. Because these processes of self-authoring, or telling others who we are, take place through and around specific social and cultural systems, people develop situative identities—such as "daughter," "mom," "wife," "council member," and "teacher" - by which they are identified and by which they identify themselves (p. 125).

This echoes Palmer's description of identity as "a moving intersection of the inner and outer forces that make me who I am, converging in the irreducible mystery of being human." (Palmer, 1998, p. 10).

Resistance in this era of intensified educational accountability is so small, yet "[agency] happens daily and mundanely, and it deserves our attention" (Holland *et al.*, 1998, p. 5). Just realizing a disconnection between what educators believe is right and what they are forced to do

is an act of resistance. This is what Levinas called "ethical resistance", the resistance of the powerless.

> For Emanuel Levinas, ethical resistance is not the attempt to use power against itself or to mobilize sectors of the population to exert their political power…A more mundane example…would be the day–to–day resistance to decline and death of someone with chronic disease or serious disability…The ethical resistance must live with its embodied limitations, and in limit–situations it may have to acknowledge its powerlessness vis–à–vis that which ultimately cannot be resisted. (Hoy, 2004, p. 8)

Katherine Reynolds makes a stance of ethical resistance as she employs this response to her fellow teachers who share her frustration over the restrictions and mandates associated with NCLB, but do not entertain her vision of how things could be better: "It is what it is, but it isn't what it should be." (follow-up conversation, January 25, 2007). This particular act of resistance illustrates Hoy's (2004) claim that "unlike resignation, resistance can lead to hope – that is, to openness to the infinite possibility that things could be different, even if one does not know exactly how" (p. 10).

7.3   TEACHER SELF CONSTITUTION AS RESISTANCE TO NORMALIZATION

Self-constitution as ethical resistance involves a risk to a concretized, ego-stabilized or essentialized notion of the self. Interpretive sociologists might focus on the multiple roles that teachers play, with an understanding of role as something that is unfixed and constantly negotiated between individuals (Mead, 1934). For example, role strain describes the tension that educators experience in trying to do "a good job" in the era of accountability. For a teacher, doing a good job usually means educating students (by whatever approach seems best, on any

given day, with any given student), but it also means performing duties, and appeasing administration (by raising test scores, by confining content to the standards, and/or using a prepared curriculum). Role strain produces an inner tension –also called cognitive dissonance – in our unified view of our identity. This leaves one with a feeling that "this just doesn't make any sense" and in fact it is not uncommon to hear this from educators in reference to the mandates of NCLB. Self-constitution takes place within - perhaps is even nurtured by- this discomfort. Ethical resistance, though risky, serves as a disruption in the normalizing discourse that constrains individualized notions of "good teaching".

In some instances, I asked the educators in my study about their own upbringing and schooling experiences but in most cases, they volunteered this information in describing their philosophies and classroom practices. Those engaged in doctoral study made reference to their professors and coursework and sometimes educational theorists. All participants mentioned the community in which their school was located and talked specifically about the political and economic environment as well as the life-worlds of their students. As some explained the student's natures, personalities and prior experiences were semi-determinant of teachers' choices of pedagogical goals –as separate from those of official curriculum - and of the possibilities for achieving them.

In *The Courage to Teach*, Parker Palmer (1998) explores the question, "Who is the self that teaches?" (p. 7). In many ways, my study was driven by this same question. It was important to me to hear educators' stories about themselves and their practices. I asked my participants directly about their styles of teaching and philosophies of education, about their opinion on policies and how they would do things if they were in charge.

Certainly, teachers' philosophies - what my participants described as the meanings, values/uses or purposes of education and their theories of classroom teaching, learning, environment and teacher-student relationships - influenced how they imagined themselves to be as educators. The public school as a site of practice seems to engender a pragmatic idealism

109

that my participants reflected in their individual field theories. They seemed to fluctuate on the pragmatism-idealism spectrum depending on years of practice, subject area, demographics of the work environment, the ability and motivational level of their students, and the teachers' own schooling experiences.

7.4   TOWARD A CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Teachers talked generously and often about critical thinking in response to my request that they describe their own responsibility for preparing future citizens. I tried to portray the variety of meanings behind this idea, from critical thinking as developing the ability to locate the hidden intentions behind propaganda (a "higher order" thinking skill) to thinking critically about what groups and interests are served by advancing a standardized curriculum and the political consequences for "failing" schools under test-based accountability. All interpretations involved a hope, on the part of the teacher, that students would be curious, would ask questions, and would look beyond given "texts", but even the most self-described subversive teachers did not advise students to protest the standardized curriculum, test preparation or test taking. This is congruent with my thoughts on the low possibilities for academic resistance. But all teachers communicated in some way the importance of students thinking for themselves. Further, in describing their pedagogies to me, they revealed their own conception of their teaching, their constitutions of their teacher selves. In almost every case (the exception was the educator who saw the present incarnation of school reform as complementary to his ideal), participants could imagine conditions, arrangements, programs and policies that were different and better than what they were currently experiencing in their work environments. And they looked within for a higher authority and relied on their own conceptions of good teaching - which had very little to do how well they could follow a curriculum, match their lessons to the standards or raise

students' test scores. The participants in my study followed their own internal evaluations of themselves based on how hard they had worked to achieve their own teaching goals. I see these as daily acts of resistance. As Palmer's (1998) now famous tenet declares, good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher. Here identity is a nexus between multiple and shifting selves and integrity is "whatever wholeness one can find" within identity (p. 13). As a result of analyzing the data from interviews and conversations, I named six clusters of teacher-selves: *Teacher as Agent of the State; Teacher as Job Skills Trainer; Teachers as Role Model; Teacher as Facilitator; Teacher as Agent of Student Empowerment; and Teacher as Subversive*. (I explain later why I removed this "finding".) However, any one teacher might express their teaching as more or less consistent with any one of these constructions, or all of them at once, depending on what they determine is the best way of being in the classroom for their students. For example, bisecting all constructions was a notion of student responsibility. At first glance this seems more consistent with a teacher self that is uncritical and complicit with social reproduction. (Westheimer and Kahne's personally responsible citizen). But even the most self-identified subversive educator in my study, George Griffin, promoted student responsibility as a way of having students take ownership of their own learning and some control over their own lives. George specifically sought to give his students/encourage them to take the tools of the oppressor: personal responsibility, a strong work ethic, knowledge of the cannon, and mastery of Standard English. Jill Bartoni, who identified herself as a critical theorist, spoke of wanting to show her students the excitement and empowerment of learning new things and the radical notion of "claiming an education" (Rich, 1977), while as Kathryn Queen, who is just now beginning to recognize her critical projects, felt that it was both her responsibility and her passion to combat her students' refusal to take responsibility.

The premium that the educators in this study put on student responsibility and their lament of seeing less and less of it "these days" parallels William Pinar's call to encourage learning as a result of "study" rather than as the result of teaching (Pinar, 2006). Study, in this

sense is a process of self-education; a process of self-formation. Pinar reminds us of Montaigne's concern that "relying on teachers for one's education could replace one's self-engaged labor of discovery with passivity" (p. 111). As Pinar notes, the instructional authoritarianism that No Child Left Behind legislates portends the same results.

My point is that viewing an insistence on student responsibility as reifying individual responsibility and legitimating social hierarchies or as a shirking of teachers' own responsibility misses the specificities of teachers' interpretations and intentions. I understand the attention that teachers give to student responsibility in theorizing about their own responsibilities for preparing future citizens as a component of many different constructions of teacher selves. Student responsibility is a complicated notion that is meaningful only in the broader context of each individual teacher's self constitution.

My work only makes sense in light of the recognition of the historic dual mission of U.S. public schools: to educate students for further academic study (and/or eventual employment) and to prepare future citizens to exercise their responsibilities in a liberal democratic society. The content and methods of education/preparation as well as what constitutes citizenship responsibilities has been debated and changed over time and other "missions" for public education such as social amelioration and personal fulfillment have at times vied for dominance. As the standardization of curriculum increases and the spread of test-based accountability spreads to all subjects and grades, the possibilities for enacting critical pedagogies -those that question the official curriculum, policies, structures or practices of schooling - from within the academic subject disciplines is constricted. In the areas of math and English/language arts, which have been the focus of NCLB test-based accountability the longest, I see the possibilities for academic resistance as very nearly closed. Elementary teachers of "testable grades" and secondary math and English/language arts teachers have experienced the requirements of NCLB most directly and intensely. Certainly teachers of students who score well on standardized tests do not experience the same constriction and restriction, though they may feel

112

the pressure to keep the scores up. Much has been written about the unequal degree and kind of pressure felt by teachers whose students score poorly. At the same time I have noted, in this study as well as in my conversations with other teachers and pre-service teachers, that it seems English/language arts teacher are better positioned to resist the normalizing discourses that accompany high-stakes accountability. Though I still see very little possibility for resistance to the requirements themselves in the form of public criticism and refusal, perhaps a solid foundation in the humanities prepares teachers and students for imagination and creativity and therefore resistance via self-constitution.

Pennsylvania currently has no plans to include civics standards in its accountability system and so in this state, at least, many immediate and unlimited possibilities still exist for interpreting the mission of citizenship preparation, especially outside of the social studies, where citizenship education programs (if schools have them at all) are typically located. This opening will only remain so large until content standards for civics are made part of the core curriculum, the standards are evaluated by a standardized test and the scores are made part of the state's accountability system. So, if there is no official curriculum for citizenship, no clear instance of domination, then how can there be resistance? We can think of resistance as being active instead of reactive. Imagination and creativity contribute to self-constitution as resistance along the lines of a personal ethic of teaching: an individual notion of what is means to be a good teacher. In the case of preparing future citizens, it is not necessary to react against an official curriculum in order to resist - although resistance often happens against dominant discourses of citizenship. Teachers can resist by being themselves in their classrooms because "teacher identities are powerful means through which to understand these varied experiences with and responses to accountability-explicit curriculum policies" (Sloan, 2006, p.119)

I began this study with the idea that all teachers reflected some notion of what it means to be a citizen in their teaching practice. I was listening with an ear to complicate the notions reflected in Westheimer and Kahne's citizen typology, where being a good citizen means: taking

113

personal responsibility, participating in democratic practices or questioning status quo arrangements and working to correct injustices. As I described in **Section VI**, educators in this study were more concerned with student "success" (which was multiply defined) and happiness than with whether or not they would participate in civil society or take up positions of protest. Teachers were sensitive to their students' hopes and dreams for the future, which was usually expressed in terms of career aspirations. They were also aware of parents' wishes for their children to be happy as youngsters and prepared for college acceptance as adolescents. In many cases, teachers did not receive instructions for preparing students for citizenship beyond issues of good conduct - getting along with others, following rules, doing your own work, etc. A thorough and easy structural critique of the most conservative interpretation of the personally responsible citizen as communicated via the hidden curriculum, both within and outside of any social studies/citizenship curriculum, could be made based on this very observation. I see rather that because teachers so seldom are asked to advance an official notion of citizenship (outside of the social studies) they are free to advance their own. So, even though it may be that teachers interpret their responsibility for preparing future citizens along the lines of "the personally responsible citizen" and without analyzing the most widely distributed curriculum material and the NAEP civic standards which support this interpretation, teachers may and do take it upon themselves to educate for more "participatory" or "justice-oriented" citizenship.

7.5   CONNECTIONS TO PRACTICE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

In *Creating Democratic Classrooms* long time teacher educator Landon Beyer (1996) outlines the components of a socially responsible teacher education curriculum that I have tried to apply in my own practice. It is one designed to raise issues of social inequalities and their

implications for schooling and teaching. In particular such a curriculum highlights the role of education in reproducing or altering patterns of domination and oppression. Beyer suggests a curriculum that emphasizes:

1. The need for students to avoid uncritically accepting the ideas, claims, interests of others;

2. The importance of developing philosophical approaches to teaching and curriculum to inform more concrete (practical) pedagogical and curricular activities;

3. A view of schools and teaching as embedded within historical and social parameters that often have been largely obscured through a reliance on behaviorist psychology and objectivist epistemologies that are seriously flawed;

4. A realization that the current world of schooling is only one among several possibilities, which often serves the interests of certain groups at the expense of others; and

5. The importance of a synthetic or synoptic vision that is critical of current realities in schools, without becoming dismissive, and productive of alternative approaches, without being naively idealistic. (p. 4)

Most relevant to this study is the attention to critical questioning, philosophical thinking, big-picture thinking, imagination of alternatives and a stance between critique and hope. These are the very "tools" that my participants helped me to identify in their repertoire of resistance.

For the past two years, I have been teaching an instructional certification prerequisite class called Social Foundations of Education, which uses a justice oriented perspective and a democratic class room model[2] All of the instructors for this course meet weekly, as an instructional team, to discuss observations and thoughts surrounding course texts, classroom

---

[2] We have since been referring to this as a "dialogic classroom" to reflect a more precise understanding of deliberation as an avenue to cultural democracy in the classroom.

dialogues and student writing. This allows us to reflect on the joint intentions of our pedagogical work as well as our own, individual, deliberative projects and related scholarship. As a team we struggle; we bring to our deliberations individual and not always complementary visions and emotions with regard to our hopes for our students and for the plotting of the course curriculum. This requires that our pedagogies be flexible enough to hold tension and give way to visions that do not always express the exact images of the democratic classroom that we hold in our hearts. We talk often of the discomfort involved in dialoguing across difference.

As a member of the instructional team, I think about how to talk to my students about how social justice and democracy are related, how our course came to be, and how it differs from other education courses. Working from the premise that "teaching and teacher preparation for social justice are vital elements of an educational system in and for a democratic society" (Cochran-Smith, 2004, p.18), I set out to locate images of "the democratic classroom" and to explore the connection between social justice work, education within a democratic classroom setting and education for democratic citizenship. What I have found is that, most simply, education for social justice follows a vision of a better society and strives to achieve it. Progressing from critical literacy to self-determination or agency, interpretation, imagination, resistance, deliberation, emancipation and transformation are the modes of scholarship, research and practice favored by social justice advocates working in education. These are also the desired dispositions of teacher and students of the quality of the relationships between the two.

What seems to me the most basic and universal possibility for teacher agency in social justice work is to engage the self and others in counter-discourses about the meaning and value of education. In other words, self-constitution as resistance to dominant discourse about education IS social justice work. For example, my undergraduate students often wonder what teachers could possibly do to make things better for all students. Students criticize Jonathan Kozol (Savage Inequalities, Shame of the Nation) for not giving any "practical advice" for

teacher action. When pushed to come up with "action" that would make a difference, students have said "all we can do is care, think and talk." I tell them that those are all important actions that any of us could do; that all could be considered critical pedagogy and social justice work; and that, in fact, "WE ARE DOING ALL THOSE THINGS RIGHT NOW."

When it comes to understanding teaching practice, I am quite adamant about the prime requirement of "going there to know there" (Hurston, 1990, p. 183) but less disturbed that my undergraduate students my not have first hand knowledge of the head and heart at this point in their education. For me, the scope of transformative education or any transformative experience is much longer than the length of a single class session, course or program of study. In fact, the reason that transformative educators practice hope is that we understand that we might not see the change the we hope to create in ourselves and that we wish our students to create for themselves.

As mentioned in a proceeding section (**Repertoire of Resistance**), Parker (2006) illustrates the distinction between seminar and deliberation: The purpose of seminar is to "reach an enlarged understanding of a powerful text", while the purpose of deliberation is "to reach a decision on what 'we' should do about a shared problem" (p.113). He is making this distinction for in-service teachers to accompany a larger argument that they should attempt to claim more space in an ever narrowing curriculum for these two modes of discussion or "discourse structures." Parker uses examples from his own teacher education classes because, he says, "discourse structures in teacher education programs can provide situated models for teachers' appropriation in their own classrooms" (Parker & Hess, 2001, p.274). This made me consider the connections between our use of seminar and deliberation in the social foundations courses and the possibilities for our students who are both pre-service and in-service teachers to use them or to imagine how they might be used.

I now have a third piece to weave into this connection: the stories that my research participants have shared with me about the "discourse structures" of their own classrooms. Like

117

David Quigley's class, they might use deliberation in planning an after-school program for their parents; or like Jill Bartoni's class, they might spend time in seminar untangling allusions and exemplifying a more personal way of knowing in Truman Capote's short story, "A Christmas Memory." But far more numerous were the stories of teachers employing more intimate talk with their students, sharing their personal stories or conferencing with students one-on-one. Rather than presiding over student talk, however productive and valuable, it is more vital to a project of resistance via self-constitution to struggle along with students; to have a willingness to do work upon the self and then share it with students. The progression involves a "return to the self", in order to "know oneself" and to care for oneself. This is the very practice of self constitution that offers resistance to normalization. This is the work of the self upon the self that makes education transformative.

Throughout this three-year dissertation process, I have been interested in examining my own doctoral education as I reflect on the process of learning-by-teaching. I have often wondered how my practice pedagogy influences my own education. What I have come to understand is that the living and changing knowledge, which is constantly being socially created though dialogue with my students, is a process and product of my doctoral education. Also, if I examine my practice - as part of my scholarship - through the lens of the justice oriented practitioner-citizen, I find that by allowing meaning to emerge organically from interactions with students, I carry out a project of social justice intended for the liberation of my self. Alternatively, when I attempt to impose meaning from outside of these interactions I am exercising oppression over my self as well as my students. The discussion below represents a great example.

7.6   PROBLEMS AND DISCONNECTIONS

As I read through the pieces of this document to get a feel of how each element hangs together, the six constructions of teacher-selves that I had developed from the participant's responses[3] (originally placed at the end of **Enacting Self Constitution as Resistance**) felt out of place but more. They felt wrong. I was overtaken by a desire to yank all mention of them from the dissertation document. After a momentary crisis, and then a somewhat longer period of reflection, that is exactly what I did.

The clusters are really quite similar in nature to Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) citizen typology. I was trying to see beyond that kind of thinking in my dissertation. A structural critique could make good use of a typology for representing the intermingling of inner and outer forces that contribute to the adoption of a role, or role construction, but I am developing a "post-critique" (Hoy, 2004) which seeks to illuminate those elements and processes of self-construction. It is confirming for me to notice that what Foucault (1972) says about the archive is as true for me as for anyone else; that I can no more easily escape the dominant (in this case structuralist) discourse than any other critical researcher.

As a default response to data, I sort and categorize. This could be part of my academic training as a social scientist or just a function of the cognitive processing –though probably semi-conditioned - of the human brain. It is a testament to my training in vigilance, perhaps, that I was able to catch this incongruence, this hypocrisy in my own writing. This dissertation project was about examining my own processes of theory building and, in this way, this piece on the clusters is an important finding. What I had hoped to accomplish in this writing is an

---

[3] I named six clusters of teacher-selves: *Teacher as Agent of the State; Teacher as Job Skills Trainer; Teachers as Role Model; Teacher as Facilitator; Teacher as Agent of Student Empowerment*; and *Teacher as Subversive*. I think of these constructions as belonging to a continuum of reproduction-revolution, where teaching moves between two extremes, reproducing dominant ideologies (liberalism, capitalism, democratization, globalization, etc) and dismantling them. I in no way intended to bound and fix what I saw as fluid selves but to bracket out some common constructions that surfaced for me in theorizing self-constitution as resistance.

interrogation of my own tendency to "other" groups of people; to categorize them as being or doing this or that such thing. I say that "I in no way intended to bound and fix what I saw as fluid selves" but naming always has this effect. I am willing to name self-constitution as a means of resistance because it troubles a more common understanding of resistance as reactive and oppositional. It is a rhetorical move, an affirmative action that promotes contextualized, non-specified, non-defined concepts of resistance as agency.

It might be interesting for me to further develop this typology for publication with much work to delineate my own constructions from those of the Frankfurt School critical theorists and their lineage. But, it is too much and the wrong kind of effort for this dissertation project. Yet, as I already mentioned, it is a very important finding, especially for a discussion of postcritical inquiry and the danger of resinscribing domination (a constraint on self-determination) and oppression (a constraint on self-development) (Young, 1990, p.37). With a bow to Foucault and a wink to the more ludic of the postmodern critics, I recognize that my own complicity in exercising power has a "gotcha" quality that is no doubt typical of so-called emancipatory research that seeks to work with participants rather than work for them (Lather, 1986).

Thinking about this makes me wonder whether education for social justice, that I suggest and perhaps even propose to model in my own pedagogy, requires political activity, community service or some sort of advocacy; or could self-transforming practices alone be considered social justice work. I wonder if I should encourage my students to place themselves physically in circumstances and social environments from which their White or middle-class privilege has so far excused them. This is one of those nagging thoughts that sometimes make me feel like a fraud for trying to talk about other people's experiences even though I try to be vigilant against any "unwarranted othering".

7.7   FOUCAULDIAN MISSION ACCOMPLISHED?

Earlier I said that, borrowing from Foucault, my project was to show people that they are much freer than they feel. Here is another example of the postmodern dilemma that lives in all interpretive emancipatory research; all research is done for the benefit of the researcher, with some specific purpose and with some investment of hope for the results or outcomes. The only difference with postcritical research is that all bias and personal interests are disclosed *to the best of the researcher's ability* as a result of attentiveness to non-exploitation. In this case, my hope for the participants in this study was that they would see their own agency. At the same time, and not incompatible with this specific hope, I wanted to hear and portray the elements and processes of my participants' self constitution which is in all cases, subjective, contextual and unpredictable. The notion of a "Foucauldian mission" being "accomplished" is decidedly ludic and, considering the political rhetoric of the G.W. Bush Administration, a bit cheeky. Nevertheless, a reflection on how close I may have come in my heretofore "hidden" project is in order. Two clear incidents stand out for me as some acknowledgement of my "success" in this endeavor.

After almost two hours of a follow-up conversation about her interview (that was conducted almost a year earlier), one teacher blurted out that I had helped her to realize that she does communicate her own critical values to her students by choosing examples that touch on the edges of the social implications of science. This was the only participant who taught simultaneously at a private school and at a public school. Kathryn Queen told me a story of her lesson on a genetic disease called cri du chat (cry of the cat) that is associated with pervasive birth defects and malformations so severe as to render life short and painful. There is doubt that children born with this disease ever achieve consciousness, so extensive is the cerebral damage. The disease is so named because children with this disease often moan, perhaps in pain, but perhaps not, in a way that sounds like a cat screeching and yowling. Students were to

research and write about the progression of the disease, including prevention and treatment options. Some invariably brought up the option of abortion and wondered tentatively if this might be the most humane, the most ethical option. Though Kathryn could not make a statement to contradict a pro-life position, she felt satisfied when she later realized through our conversation that she had fulfilled her personal obligation of good teaching. "Wow, you have really helped to realize that I misrepresent myself, my vision of good citizenship, by continuously hitting on individual responsibility" (follow-up conversation, January 19, 2007). Kathryn realized that despite several instances during the interview where she took a strong stance of "teacher neutrality" (Noddings, 1995b), she does bring her personal beliefs into the classroom and that through self-constituting herself according to these beliefs, she advances her own more critical vision of good citizenship. With a big smile Kathryn added, "I do feel free to be myself in my classroom."

Another example of how far this research went in accomplishing my project was when Katherine, an elementary teacher, realized with some surprise that she had been teaching in a critical way. This teacher made conscious choices in children's stories that they should have mostly heroines and in drawing attention to the women of herstory "get it, her story." She and her fellow teachers also wore little paper hearts to show solidarity for union contract negotiations. Even though she was not allowed to tell the students much about the contract negotiations, nor would that have made much sense to them, this teacher explained that she and the other teachers were in a union which was a teachers club that helped teachers. She was thus modeling participation and protest.

In general, it pleased me to hear at the end of the interviews and especially the follow-up conversations that teacher had learned something about themselves through our exchanges and that they would be thinking about the interview questions and reflecting on their own practices even more, now.

7.8   FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

I am still interested in studying how citizenship programs are affected by the curriculum standards for civics, especially in those seven states that include citizenship assessments in their state-wide accountability systems. This might be interesting as a future field study where a new typology may emerge, such as my tentatively sequestered "clusters". It is also curious to me that responsibility (accountability) for preparing future citizens rests soley with social studies educators. In the future, I may wish to review and analyze the data on inclusion of civics in assessment and accountability systems; observe classrooms where citizenship education programs are enacted, assessed, and included in state-wide accountability systems (reported); and interview teachers (in the above situations) about citizenship education and accountability.

7.9   TENTATIVE SUMMATIONS

Parker Palmer (2002) captures my sense of empathy for active teachers and the duty that I feel toward them as a praxis-oriented researcher.

> We who depend on their efforts owe our teachers a gift - not another empty
> teacher appreciation day or teacher of the year award but a gift of real substance
> that will help them renew their spirits so that they can continue to serve our
> children and our world well (p. 2).

Naming teachers' daily resistance and recognizing their agency as I offer more multidimensional portraits of real teachers' lived classroom experience are the gift that I offer. At the same time, by acknowledging teacher self-constitution, educational researchers can contribute their own resistance to normalized versions of both teacher-as-obedient technician

and of teacher-as-victim, in relation to test-based accountability. We can offer this gift to principals, as well.

I did not begin this research project with Parker Palmer in mind, yet for me his focus on teacher identity represents the wisdom of practice. At the same time his reliance on the self is intimidating and ripe for exploitation by conservative reformers who manage a discourse of individual responsibility which excuses (or rather, normalizes) inequalities in political, social and economic systems. As a social scientist, I note the political and psychological consequences of individual responsibility. As a social justice educator, I am interested in the effect that structural inequality and/or dominant ideologies have on one's capacity for imagination. As I further refine my thinking about the possibilities for self-constitution, I realize that the principles of "cause and effect" in the physical and social realms are mirrored in the causal - though bidirectional - relationships that exists between self-constitution and transformative education. Further, I see how these relationships bridge the social and personal realms, which affords me a glimpse of future scholarship where I might pursue my praxis into the newly formed interdisciplinary fields of contemplative studies and transformative education.

I have been asked many times throughout this research experience to explain what this dissertation is "about." In listening to my own answers and in conversation with others about this experience, I have arrived at several tentative summations. On one level, this study is about twelve local educators' thoughts on education for U.S. citizenship (civic pedagogies), their individualized notions of citizenship and their own self-constitutions as citizens. Then again, the study is about the way that these specific educators constitute themselves and about how these self-constitutions are a form of resistance to normalized notions of teaching and education. Still, the study is about my own journey of ad hoc theorizing toward a critical social theory of citizenship education.

As for the emancipatory nature of this project, what I have come to understand is that it is not that teachers cannot or do not offer resistance in the current context of high-stakes

accountability but that, for the most part, educational researchers and teacher educators do a poor job of recognizing and naming their resistance. Much of Foucault's work has been used to overcome naïve hopes about the emancipatory potential of education (Mayo, 2000, p.103), but I have found that through Foucauldian self constitution, educators may claim recognition for enacting resistance and thereby find hope and possibility for more and more freedom as they continue to work within highly problematic relations of power.

APPENDIX A

APPROVED PROTOCOL (0506172; M. GUNZENHAUSER P.I.).

Research Protocol Abstract

This project is a collaborative effort of a faculty member and a doctoral student on the implications of high-stakes accountability for the ways in which educators think and talk about the meaning and value of education. The co-researchers have approached this issue from separate but similar vantage points – individually their studies of educational reform and innovation have led them to appreciate the predominant effect that accountability policy has on any and all conversations about education.

IRB Research Protocol

1.0 OBJECTIVE AND SPECIFIC AIMS

This project has developed in consideration of the growing literature on the effects of accountability and high-stakes testing on schools and critical and post-structural social theory that addresses the exercises of power through policy, its implementation, and day-to-day practices of educators. The study addresses the following research questions and sub-questions:

1) How do educators in an era of high-stakes accountability view the meaning and value of education?
   a. How do educators talk about the meaning and value of education?
   b. What are the specific implications in educators' views about the role of education for democracy?
   c. How are educators' views about the meaning and value of education differentiated in different settings and with students of different race, class, and gender?

2) How are educators in an era of high-stakes accountability viewing their roles as educators?
   a. How do educators view their relationships with students, parents, and communities?
   b. In what ways do educators believe themselves to be responsible for student learning?

3) How does high-stakes accountability affect critical agency and thought of educators?
   a. In what ways do educators "under surveillance" constrain their practice?
   b. In what ways do educators "under surveillance" resist efforts to constrain their practice?

4) How have educators' practices changed in light of high-stakes accountability?
   a. What practices, curricula and materials are facilitated by high-stakes accountability?
   a. What practices, curricula and materials are hindered by high-stakes accountability?

2.0. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

2.1 Background

In this study, we use an interpretive theoretical perspective (Crotty, 1998) to focus on the meanings that educators make of their experience in particular settings and contexts. Taking this focus, we start also with prior related studies and throughout analysis aim to engage educators' meanings with multiple constructs. Our research questions and methodology are informed by prior research but also the emerging research and scholarship on high-stakes accountability by policy researchers, teacher educators, and philosophers of education. Research in four areas is particularly relevant and informs our research questions.

Our primary theoretical framework comes from Foucault's (1975/1995) genealogical study of discipline, surveillance, and normalization, *Discipline and Punish,* which has been particularly useful for studying the effects of power in education and is relevant for its articulation of domination and resistance. Foucault provides a lengthy analysis of how constant surveillance effects disciplinary power over inmates of an asylum, prisoners in a penal colony and students

in a school. In each of these systems, observation by an evaluative and judgmental authority, invested with the power to reward or punish, creates a sense of self-consciousness that objectifies the self as something lacking; something in need of control. From a functionalist perspective, this leads to structural efficiency and order, but for the individual, "panopticism" (the system of omnipresent gaze) promotes a pathological egocentricity in the individual under surveillance, which robs that person of the ability to make critical assessments of their own relative situation. An individual under surveillance acts as if he/she is always being watched, not because that is the case, but because it may be true at any one time. Most importantly, when one is concerned with behaving in accordance with expectations -- now internalized -- of the observers, one is not able to (or tends not to) recognize one's subjugation.

Educational researchers have explored Foucault's sense of knowledge/power in this context and theorized accountability as an example of surveillance (Vinson & Ross, 2004). When schools, administrators, students, teachers and (to some extent) communities are rated hierarchically according to the distribution of test scores, and when this information (knowledge) is published "for all to see", it serves as a mechanism of control (power). Conversely, those who determine what curricular components (knowledge) are important for students to know, or what knowledge is test-worthy, privilege the form and content of that knowledge (power) by making it testable. This is accomplished by the overuse of test questions that elicit specific (forced, closed set) answers. For Vinson and Ross, the most devastating consequence of this new disciplinarity is its threat to democracy. As they contend, surveillance runs contrary to the aims of democracy (as articulated by Dewey, 1966) because its disciplinary power is wielded by a few to the neglect or even detriment of the interests of the many. Further, the points of contact between groups are closed, scripted, standardized and mediated by images, not free and varied as Dewey's democratic ideal requires.

128

Second, also relevant to our work are studies by teacher educators and others demonstrating a "constriction" of the curriculum. For example, science educators are concerned that the pressures of high-stakes accountability has curtailed efforts to make significant improvements in content-area instruction and led to the de-emphasis (or elimination) of content areas (Jones, Jones, & Hargrove, 2003; Jorgenson & Vanosdall, 2002).

Third are studies by advocates of high-standards and those who research their implementation (Carnoy, Elmore, & Siskin, 2003; Elmore & Fuhrman, 2001), who have advanced the concept of "internal accountability" as a way to distinguish processes in schools that encourage educators' accountability to student learning from processes of mere compliance, arising from "external accountability." Among the features of internal accountability is coherent vision, which Elmore describes as being the result of discussion among educators in a particular setting. Philosophers of education have similarly articulated the importance of coherent visions of the meaning and value of education. As Eisner (2002) argues, lack of attention to these fundamental questions leads to aimless pursuits of school reform. He further argues that in the rush to reform, too little emphasis is placed on the underlying philosophy of education that is being served. Prior research suggests that processes for promoting internal accountability are rather difficult (but not impossible) in a context of external accountability (Carnoy, Elmore & Siskind, 2003).

Fourth are works by social theorists and philosophers of education who have articulated the larger, philosophical implications of high-stakes accountability through analysis of significant concepts. Among these works is Biesta's (2004) distinction between accountability for test scores and responsibility for student learning. Biesta suggests that the conceptual focus on accountability alters the relation between teacher and student from a learning relation to a "consuming" relation, focusing on individual wants and needs rather than collective responsibility for all children. An implication is that by changing the student-teacher relation,

public schooling becomes a consumer good rather than a public good, leading to fundamental changes in public education.

2.2 Significance

The study is significant in that it moves forward a progression of research about the effects of high-stakes testing to the level of philosophy of education. As an empirical project, it is open to the moments of surveillance, self-regulation, but also resistance. The phenomenon of high-stakes testing represents a significant test for social theories that attempt to articulate the extent to which individual actors are capable of acting in resistance to dominating social structures.

By focusing on individuals' meaning-making, the research has potential for understanding the role that educational reformers may play in an era of high-stakes accountability and provide the grounds for successor policies. Perhaps most importantly, the research should provide important implications for schools of education on how to prepare teachers, administrators, and other personnel for creating meaningful philosophies of education in an era of high-stakes accountability.

3.0 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

3.1 Research Design and Methods

Most significant in this study are the perspectives of individual educators in particular settings. We take on a qualitative methodology based primarily on in-depth, open-ended interviews that ask respondents to focus on the four main research questions. Prior research has suggested that high-stakes accountability has differential effects in different settings (Carnoy, Elmore, & Siskin, 2003). The differentiation depends on how states, districts, and

130

schools institute practices and structures in response to high-stakes accountability legislation. Our sampling strategy is designed to obtain maximum variation (Patton, 2002) with the chosen population of Western Pennsylvania. True to an emergent design in qualitative research, maximum variation will be determined through ongoing analysis. During the first 12 months of the study, during which time we plan to interview 25 respondents, we will interview a sample of educators who are teachers and administrators in urban, rural, and suburban settings at elementary, middle and high schools in Western Pennsylvania.

We will interview each respondent using an interview protocol, modified from prior research conducted by the faculty collaborator. The semi-structured interview script was shown to elicit a comprehensive overview of respondents' perspectives on high-stakes accountability and elicited significant themes that could be explored in follow-up interviews. Follow-up interviews will focus on the same themes and seek elaboration of respondents' meanings (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). The collaborators will conduct the interviews, starting Fall 2005, pending IRB approval, and continuing through Summer 2008. Additional doctoral students interested in the topic will be recruited beginning in Fall 2005 to conduct interviews and participate on the research team.

In this interpretivist theoretical perspective, contextually-rich depictions of multiple participants within an individual setting are valued along with responses to a survey distributed to samples of teachers and administrators. Researchers use both methods in tandem to understand the perceptions and meanings that school personnel make of their experience, explore the language that they use to describe their experience, and locate the multiple, alternative explanations that school personnel use to describe their settings.

3.2 Data Collection and Statistical Considerations

All data will be recorded and transcribed by a hired transcriptionist. Qualitative research software will be used to manage the data. The research team will read the transcribed interviews to identify significant themes. The primary methods for transforming data into meaningful themes will be memo-writing, dialogue, and recursive data collection. This method of analysis is based upon the work of Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) and Coffey and Atkinson (1996), anthropologists and sociologists influenced by grounded theory, but who advocate conducting qualitative analysis without the assumptions from traditional grounded theory about underlying order and causality. This framework allows for multiple possible avenues of meaning to be captured, encouraging the researcher not to foreclose too quickly possible meanings that may be embedded in text. Particular attention will be paid to how respondents use language, how they define significant words and concepts that they use to describe their experience, and how they use metaphors to ascribe meaning to their experiences. Meanings are explored through the use of analytic and theoretical memos, the procedure for which is influenced by Strauss (1987), but again augmented to reflect an interpretivist theoretical perspective. The analysis is significantly a process likened to that of collaborative team ethnography, wherein multiple interpretations are brought to bear on data (Gerstl-Pepin & Gunzenhauser, 2002).

The team expects written projects to emerge after the first nine months of data collection. The team intends to produce conference papers for presentation at national professional conferences beginning in the 2005-2006 school year, including the American Educational Research Association and the American Educational Studies Association. The focus will be on providing the doctoral student co-researcher and other graduate student researchers who join the team a shared base of data from which co-authored and individually authored work may emerge.

4.0 HUMAN SUBJECTS

4.1 Population Non-discrimination Statement

The subject population is composed of adult persons employed as certified professionals in Southwestern Pennsylvania's public schools. The racial, gender and ethnic characteristics of the proposed subject population reflects the demographics of teachers and school administrators in Southwestern Pennsylvania.

4.2 Recruitment Procedures

The investigators will identify representative interview subjects from school districts in Southwestern Pennsylvania with the intentions of maximizing geographical and demographic variation.

The investigators will begin by interviewing teachers and administrators that are already known to us. Additional potential subjects will be identified by recommendation from educational leaders and scholars from Pittsburgh's multiple university communities. These leaders and scholars, who we term "gatekeepers," are colleagues in the School of Education and current and former students of the School of Education. We will explain the research project to the gatekeepers and ask them to contact colleagues and associates who are currently working as teachers or administrators in public schools. The gatekeepers will inform the research team members of the names and telephone numbers or email addresses of teachers and administrators who are willing to be contacted by the research team.

Members of the investigational team will then contact potential subjects by telephone. (See telephone script in appendices.)

Each subject's informed consent will be obtained in writing, prior to initial interview.

Each subject will receive a copy of their informed consent letter which describes the nature of the research, the risks and potential benefits of study participation, and their rights as a research subject prior to obtaining their signature on the informed consent document.

4.3 Risk/Benefit Ratio

There are NO potential risks for interview subjects in participating in this study. In the event of unforeseen adverse events, the primary investigator will make a reasonable effort to ensure that subjects who have suffered by association with/as a consequence of research participation receive adequate care to correct or alleviate the consequences of the adverse event to the extent possible.

4.4 Data and Safety Monitoring Plan

A data and safety monitoring plan will be implemented by the Principal Investigator to ensure that there are no changes in the risk/benefit ratio during the course of the study and that confidentiality of research data is maintained. Each member of the study team will meet with the PI and review confidentiality issues and complete a confidentiality agreement, prior to having contact with research subjects. Investigators and study personnel will meet twice monthly to discuss the study (e.g., study goals and modifications of those goals; subject recruitment and retention; progress in data coding and analysis; documentation, identification of adverse events or research subject complaints; violations of confidentiality) and address any issues or concerns at that time. Minutes will be kept for these meetings and will be maintained in the study regulatory binder. Any instances of adverse events will be reported immediately to the University of Pittsburgh IRB using the standard forms and/or procedures that have been established by the IRB. The yearly IRB renewal for this study will include a summary report of the Data and Safety Monitoring Plan findings from the prior year.

Signed consent forms will be required of all interview subjects. During the interviews, we will take notes for later analysis. With the subject's permission, the interview will also be audio-taped to help in the note-taking process. At the conclusion of the study, the tapes will be erased. In order to protect the subject's identity, the interviewer will assign pseudonyms for the subject, their school, and their school district. All information collected will be kept confidential, and the list indicating the subject's actual name will be kept in a secure place by the primary investigator. Other than the interviewer, no other graduate students will be made aware of the subject's identity. The study may result in published articles, dissertations, and/or presentations at professional conferences. Any reporting that arises from this research project will not identify individuals, place names, or events. Subjects freely choose to participate in the study, are free to withdraw at any time, and will not be penalized in any way for withdrawing or declining. Subjects may direct questions or concerns to members of the research team. Subjects will be furnished with contact information and a copy of their signed consent forms.

There are no potential benefits to the subject for participation in this research study. This research may potentially benefit society by providing important implications for schools of education on how to prepare teachers, administrators, and other personnel for creating meaningful philosophies of education in an era of high-stakes accountability.

5.0 COSTS AND PAYMENTS

5.1 Research Study Costs

Interview subjects will NOT incur any cost in relation to this research study.

5.2 Research Study Payments

Payments will NOT be made to the interview subjects Resources are allocated primarily to pay for transcription services and to support a graduate research assistant for several weeks during the fall semester 2005.

6.0 APPENDICES

6.1 Qualifications of Investigators

With this project, the primary investigator, a visiting faculty member at the University of Pittsburgh's School of Education continues inquiry in an area begun while part of a research team at another university. He has conducted several qualitative research studies and co-directed a two-year mixed-methods evaluation study. The co-investigator is a doctoral student and Teaching Fellow in the School of Education's Department of Administration and Policy Studies. The co-investigator is a certified teacher in the state of Pennsylvania, with graduate degrees in both the social sciences and education and experience in public policy research. The collaboration builds on the research design of the primary investigator's prior work to establish a new line of inquiry and the basis for creating a larger research team of graduate students at the University of Pittsburgh (Gunzenhauser, Mathers, Barnett, & Burkhalter, 2004).

6.2 Informed consent letter

See attached.

6.3 Telephone recruitment script

See attached.

6.3 Bibliography/References (if applicable)

Biesta, G.J.J. (2004). Education, accountability, and the ethical demand: Can the democratic potential of accountability be regained? *Educational Theory, 54*(3), 233-250.

Carnoy, M., Elmore, R., & Siskin, L.S. (Eds.) (2003). *The new accountability: High schools and high-stakes testing.* New York: Routledge Falmer.

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research.* London: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education.* New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E.W. (2002). The kind of schools we need. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(8), 576-583.

Elmore, R.F., & Fuhrman, S.H. (2001). Holding schools accountable: Is it working? *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(1), 67-72.

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I., & Shaw, L.L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison,* 2nd ed. (Alan Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1975)

Gerstl-Pepin, C.I., & Gunzenhauser, M.G. (2002). Collaborative ethnography and the paradoxes of interpretation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *15*(2), 137-154.

Gunzenhauser, M.G., Mathers, J.K., Barnett, J., & Burkhalter, B. (2004, November). *New exercises of power in schools: The discourse and politics of accountability.* Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Studies Association. Kansas City, MO.

Jones, M.G., Jones, B.D., & Hargrove, T.Y. (2003). *The unintended consequences of high-stakes testing.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jorgenson, O., & Vanosdall, R. (2002). The death of science? *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(8), 601-605.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods, 3rd edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rubin, I., & Rubin, H.J. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A.L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Vinson, K.D., & Ross, E.W. (2004). *Image and education: Teaching in the face of the new disciplinarity.* New York: Peter Lang.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE AS A RESPONDENT IN A RESEARCH STUDY

TITLE: The Effects of High-Stakes Accountability on Educators' Discourse About the Meaning and Value of Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael G. Gunzenhauser, Ph.D., Visiting Associate Professor,

School of Education, 5708 Posvar Hall, Pittsburgh PA 15260

Phone: 412/343-0357, Email: mgunzen@pitt.edu

CO-INVESTIGATORS: Andrea Hyde, Ph.D. Student, Administrative and Policy Studies

School of Education, 5902 Posvar Hall, Pittsburgh PA 15260

Email: ahyde@pitt.edu

FUNDING SOURCE: Internal grant from University of Pittsburgh School of Education

Why is this study being done?

The purpose of this study is to understand the views of Pennsylvania educators about the

meaning and value of education and the ways in which public school accountability policies

have contributed to their views.

Who is being asked to take part in this study?

Approximately 75 teachers and administrators in public and private schools in Pennsylvania will

be invited to participate in this research study.

What are the procedures of this study?

If you agree to participate in this research study, you will be interviewed by the principal

investigator, the co-investigator, or another graduate student on the research team. The

interviewer will ask about your views regarding the meaning and value of education, and the

interview will take approximately 45-60 minutes to complete. You will also be asked questions about your professional practice as an educator, the mood and climate where you work, and your views on accountability policy. To help us more accurately capture your views, we will audiotape your responses.

How will my eligibility for the study be determined?

All teachers and administrators in Pennsylvania will be eligible to participate.

What are the possible risks and discomforts of this study?

There is little risk involved in this study. No invasive procedures are included. The major potential risk is a breach of confidentiality, but we will do everything possible to protect your privacy. To reduce the likelihood of a breach of confidentiality, all researchers have been thoroughly trained to maintain your privacy.

Will I benefit from taking part in this study?

You will receive no direct benefit from participating in this study. However, you may learn more about yourself as a result of completing the interview.

Are there any costs to me if I participate in this study, and will I be paid for my

participation?

There are no costs to you for participating in this study. There is no compensation for

participation in this study.

Will anyone know that I am taking part in this study?

All records pertaining to your involvement in this study are kept strictly confidential and any data

that includes your identity will be stored in locked files at all times. On the transcript of your

interview, a pseudonym will be assigned to your name and the name of your place of

employment. At the end of this study, any records that personally identify you will remain stored

in locked files and will be kept for a minimum of five years. Your identity will not be revealed in

any description or publications of this research. Although we will audiotape the interview, we

will not refer to you by name during the taping, and we will retain the tapes only until the

completion of the study; we will then destroy them.

In unusual cases, your research records may be released in response to an order from a

court of law. It is also possible that authorized representatives from the University of Pittsburgh

Research Conduct and Compliance Office, or the University of Pittsburgh IRB, may review your

data for the purpose of monitoring the conduct of this study. Also, if the investigators learn that

you or someone with whom you are involved is in serious danger of potential harm, they will

need to inform the appropriate agencies, as required by Pennsylvania law.

Is my participation in this study voluntary?
Yes. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may refuse to take part in it,
or you may stop participating at any time, even after signing this form. Your decision will not
affect your relationship with the University of Pittsburgh, nor will you lose any benefits that you
might be eligible for because of your decision.

How can I get more information about this study?
If you have any further questions about this research study, you may contact the investigators listed at the beginning of this consent form. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the Human Subjects Protection Advocate at the University of Pittsburgh IRB Office, 1-866/212-2668.

****

SUBJECT'S CERTIFICATION

- I have read the consent form for this study and any questions I had, including explanation of all terminology, have been answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that I am encouraged to ask questions about any aspect of this research study during the course of this study, and that those questions will be answered by the researchers listed on the first page of this form.
- I understand that it is important that I not withhold any information regarding my past history.
- I understand that this interview may be audiotaped.
  I agree _____ I do not agree _____ to the audiotaping.
- I understand the researchers are often seeking subjects for other studies.
  I agree _____ I do not agree _____ to allow these researchers to contact me about the possibility of participating in additional interviews.
- I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I am free to refuse to participate or to withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation in this study at any time without affecting my future care at this institution.
- I agree to participate in this study.
- I will receive a copy of this consent form.

_____   _____
Participant's Signature   Date

CERTIFICATION of INFORMED CONSENT

I certify that I have explained the nature and purpose of this research study to the above-

named individual(s), and I have discussed the potential benefits and possible risks of study

participation. Any questions the individual(s) have about this study have been answered, and

we will always be available to address future questions as they arise.

_____   _____

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Consent   Role in Research Study

_____   _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent   Date

IRB Approved Interview Appointment Script

Hello, this is (name of interviewer) from the University of Pittsburgh. May I speak with (name of interviewee)?

(Name of gatekeeper) suggested that you may be interested in participating in a research study on the effects of accountability systems on teaching and learning in Pennsylvania public schools. I'm calling today to provide you with more information about the study and to invite you to participate.

I am working with Dr. Mike Gunzenhauser and Ms. Andrea Hyde, who are directing the study.

I want to reiterate that your participation in this study is completely voluntarily and that you may withdraw at any time without penalty to you.

The interview will take about an hour. I'd also like the opportunity to schedule a follow-up interview at some time to clarify anything that you say during the first interview or to get an update on how things are going in your school. Each time I interview you, you will have the opportunity to choose if you wish to participate.

With your permission, I will audiotape the interview and transcribe it. I will change all names on the transcription – yours, your school's and your district's. In addition to you and me, only Dr. Gunzenhauser and Ms. Hyde will know your identity.

What questions do you have about the research study at this point?

When may I schedule an interview with you? (Schedule at a location of the interviewee's choosing, preferably the interviewee's school).

QUESTIONS FOR INITIAL INTERVIEWS

1. What is the meaning and value of education?

    a. What is your vision of education?

    b. What would education be like if you were in charge?

2. What is the relationship between education and democracy?

    a. What are your views about the role of education for democracy?

3. How do you view your relationships with students?

4. How do you view your relationships with parents?

5. How do you view your relationships with the community (as you define it)?

6. In what ways do you believe yourself to be responsible for student learning?

7. What does accountability mean for you?

8. What does accountability mean for your students?

9. What does accountability mean for your school?

10. What is the relationship between accountability and assessment?

11. What is the relationship between accountability and assessment in your school?

12. How has No Child Left Behind (NCLB) affected you?

13. How has NCLB affected your students?

14. How has NCLB affected your school?

15. In what ways does testing affect your practice?

a. In what ways does it constrain your practice?

b. In what ways does it facilitate your practice?

c. What is the possibility for resistance?

16. How have your curricula and materials been affected by testing?

a. In what ways does it constrained your curricula and materials?

b. In what ways does it facilitate your curricula and materials?

c. What is the possibility for resistance?

REFERENCES

103rd-Congress. (1994). Goals 2000: Educate America act (Vol. H.R. 1804): 103rd Congress of the United States of America.

107th-Congress. (2002). *The elementary and secondary education act. The no child left behind act of 2001* (No. Pub. L. No 107-110, 115 Stat.). Washington, DC: 107th Congress.

AFT. (2004). NCLB: Let's get it right.   Retrieved February 18, 2007, from http://www.aft.org/topics/NCLB/index.htm

Alston, K. (2001). Re/thinking critical thinking: The seductions of everyday life. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 20*(1), 27-40.

Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Anyon, J. (1982). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 1*(1), 3-42.

Anyon, J. (2005). What" counts" as educational policy? Notes toward a new paradigm. *Harvard Educational Review, 75*(1), 65-88.

Apple, M. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. T. Burbules (Ed.), *Globalization and education. Critical perspectives* (pp. 57-77). New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London; Boston: Routledge & K. Paul.

Apple, M. W. (1985). Teaching and "women's work': A comparative historical and ideological analysis. *Teachers College Record, 86*, 445-473.

Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (Eds.). (1995). *Democratic schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Applebaum, B. (2004). Social justice education, moral agency, and the subject of resistance. *Educational Theory, 54*(1), 59-72.

Appleman, D. (2000). *Critical encounters in high school English: Teaching literary theory to adolescents*: Teachers College Press.

Arnove, R. F., & Torres, C. A. (2003). *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (2nd ed. ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Aronson, J. M. (2002). *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education.* Amsterdam; Boston: Academic Press.

Atman, K. (1991). Skills for developing the conative capacity.

AYPF-ASCD. (2005). *Restoring the balance between academics and civic engagement in public schools.* Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays by m. M. Bakhtin (C. E. M. M. Holquist, Trans.). In M. E.Holquist (Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Ben-Porath, S. R. (2006). *Citizenship under fire: Democratic education in times of conflict.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Bentham, J. (Ed.). (1787/1995). *The panopticon writings.* London: Verson.

Berliner, D. C. (2005). Our impoverished view of education, *Teachers College Record.*

Bernstein, B. B. (1975). *Class, codes, and control: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language.* New York: Schocken Books.

Beyer, L. E. (1996). Introduction: The meanings of critical teacher preparation. In L. E. Beyer (Ed.), *Creating democratic classrooms: The struggle to integrate theory and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bickel, R., & Cadle, C. (2004). Instructional software and "no child left behind" in poor, rural schools: Rationality and the subversion of math achievement: Appalachian Collaborative Center for Learning, Assessment and Instruction in Mathematics, Ohio University.

Bloom, H. (1985/2005). *Essayists and prophets* (20th Anniversary Edition ed.). New York: Chelsea House Publishers.

Bloomfield, D. C. & Cooper, B.S. (2003). NCLB: A new role for the federal government, *Technological Horizons in Education*: ETC Group LLC.

Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power: Emotions and education.* New York: Routledge.

Boler, M. (2004a). All speech is not free: The ethics of "affirmative action pedagogy". In M. Boler (Ed.), *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech. Disturbing silence* (pp. 3-14). New York: Peter Lang.

Boler, M. (Ed.). (2004b). *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence* (Vol. 240). New York: Peter Lang, Inc.

Booher-Jennings, J. (2005). Below the bubble" "educational triage" and the Texas accountability system. *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(2), 231-268.

Boston, B., Sarah S. & Halperin, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Restoring the balance between academics and civic engagement in public schools*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.

Boyte, H. (2003). Civic education and the new American patriotism post - 9/11. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(1), 85-100.

Brocklesby, J., & Cummings, S. (1996). Foucault plays Habermas: An alternative philosophical underpinning for critical systems thinking. *Journal of the Operational Research Society, 47*(6), 741-754.

Brockman, J. (2002). *The next fifty years: Science in the first half of the twenty-first century.* New York: Vintage Books.

Brookfield, S., & Preskill, S. (1999). *Discussion as a way of teaching*: Open University Press Buckingham.

Brown, D. (2005). Test scores must not underpin merit pay for California teachers.   Retrieved March 11, 2007, from http://www.imdiversity.com/Villages/Careers/articles/pns_calif_teachers_0105.asp

Burch, P. (2006). The new educational privatization: Educational contracting and high stakes accountability. *The Teachers College Record, 108*(12), 2582-2610.

Butin, D. (2005). Is anyone listening? Educational policy perspectives on the social foundations of education. *Educational Studies, 38*(3), 286-297.

Butler, J. (1999/1990). *Gender trouble* (Tenth Anniversary ed.). New York: Routledge.

Byrne, R. (Ed.). (2006). *The secret*. Hillsboro, OR: Beyond Words.

Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2005). The future of teacher education and teaching: Another piece of the privatization puzzle. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 3*(2).

Cahn, S. M. (1997). *Classic and contemporary readings in the philosophy of education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Calhoun, C. J. (1995). *Critical social theory: Culture, history, and the challenge of difference.* Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell.

Capra, F. (2002). *The hidden connections: Integrating the biological, cognitive and social dimensions of life into a science of sustainability*. New York: Doubleday.

Carnegie, D. (1998). *How to win friends & influence people* (Rev. ed.). New York: Pocket Books.

Carter, S. C. (2000). *No excuses: Lessons from 21 high-performing, high-poverty schools.* Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

148

CCE. (2004). *From classroom to citizen: American attitudes on civic education*. Washington, DC: The Center for Civic Education.

CEP. (2006). *A public education primer: Basic and sometimes surprising facts about the U.S. Education system*. Washington, DC: Center for Education Policy.

CEP. (2007). *Why we still need public schools*. Washington, DC: The Center for Education Policy.

CIRCLE. (2003). *The civic mission of schools*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Clifford, G. J. (1989). Man/women/teacher: Gender, family, and career in American educational history. In D. Warren (Ed.), *American teachers: Histories of a profession at work*. New York: Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). No child left behind: 3 years and counting. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(2), 99-103.

Cohen, J. (2001). *Caring classrooms/intelligent schools: The social emotional education of young children*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic* (1st Fireside ed. ed.). New York: Simon and Schuster.

Cramer, J. G. (1986). The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics, 58*, 647-688.

Cunat, M. (1996). Vision, vitality and values: Advocating the democratic classroom. In L. E. Beyer (Ed.), *Creating democratic classrooms: The struggle to integrate theory and practice* (pp. 127-149). New York: Teachers College Press.

Dai, D. Y., Sternberg, R. J., & ebrary Inc. (2004). *Motivation, emotion, and cognition*

integrative perspectives on intellectual functioning and development. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*: Westview Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Standards, accountability, and school reform. *Teachers College Record Volume, 106*(6), 1047-1085.

Debord, G. (1995). The society of the spectacle, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith: New York: Zone Books.

DeBord, K. (1997). *Child development: Creativity in young children*. Raleigh, NC: National Network for Child Care - NNCC.

deCerteau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Delgado-Bernal, D. (1998). Using a Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review, 68*(4).

Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Minton Balch & Company.

Dewey, J. (1966/1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.

ECS. (2004). *The progress of education reform 2004, citizenship education*. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Edelman, M. (1988). *Constructing the political spectacle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

edweek.org. (2007). Education week. from http://www.edweek.org/ew/index.html.

FairTest.org. (2004). Draft principles for authentic accountability.   Retrieved February 18, 2007, from http://www.fairtest.org/nattest/Authentic%20Accountability/Draft%20Principles.html.

Feagin, J. R. (2001). Social justice and sociology: Agendas for the twenty-first century. *American Sociological Review, 66*(February), 1-20.

Feyerabend, P. (1978). *Against method: Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge*. London

New York: Verso;distributed in the United States and Canada by Schocken.

Feynman, R. P. (1998). *The meaning of it all: Thoughts of a citizen scientist*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Flavell, J. H. (1987). Speculations about the nature and development of metacognition. In F. E. W. R. H. Kluwe (Ed.), *Metacognition, motivation and understanding*. Hillside, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fordham, S. (1999). Dissin' 'the standard': Ebonics as guerrilla warfare at capital high. *Anthropology of Education Quarterly, 30*(3), 272-293.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* ([1st American ed.] ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1979/1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (pp. 78-108). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The use of pleasure: The history of sexuality, volume 2* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1986). *The care of the self: The history of sexuality, volume 3* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1988). *The history of sexuality* (1st Vintage Books ed.). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1990). *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interview and other writings 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M., Gros, F., Ewald, F., & Fontana, A. (2005). *The hermeneutics of the subject: Lectures at the collège de france, 1981-82* (1st ed. ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M., Martin, L. H., Gutman, H., & Hutton, P. H. (1988). *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Freire, P. (1973/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Annv edition ed.). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Freire, P., & Horton, M. (1990). Can you just teach biology? In M. Horton, B. Bell, J. Gaventa & J. M. Peters (Eds.), *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change* (pp. 150-158). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fusarelli, L. D. (2004). The potential impact of the no child left behind act on equity and diversity in American education. *Educational Policy, 18*(1), 71-94.

Garman, N. (1989). The closed and open contract: Two irreconcilable structures in the curriculum. *WCCI Forum: Journal of the world council for curriculum and instruction, 4*(2), 176-182.

Garman, N. (2001). *On becoming a study group*. Unpublished manuscript.

Garman, N. (2007). On becoming a dialogic classroom: Walking the path of social justice and democracy: University of Pittsburgh.

Garman, N. (n.d.). *Philosophy and educational practice*. Unpublished manuscript.

Garrison, J. (2004). Ameliorating violence in dialogues across difference. In M. Boler (Ed.), *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence* (Vol. 240, pp. 89-104). New York: Peter Lang.

Gaztambide-Fernandez, R. A., Harding, H. A., & Sordé-Martí, T. (2004). *Cultural studies and education: Perspectives on theory, methodology, and practice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Gergen, K., & Kaye, J. (1992). Beyond narrative in the negotiation of therapeutic meaning. In S. McNamee & K.J. Gergen (Ed.), *Therapy as social construction* (pp. 166-185). London: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development* (Reissue edition ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling: A critical reader*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Giroux, H. (2005). *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Democracy's promise and education's challenge* (Updated Edition ed.). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1988). Teacher education and the politics of democratic reform. In H. A. Giroux (Ed.), *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning* (pp. 158-176). Granby, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H., & Purpel, D. (1989). *The hidden curriculum and moral education*: McCutchan Publishing Company California.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (1991). Border pedagogy and the politics of modernism/postmodernism. *Journal of Architectural Education, 44*(2), 69-79.

Glass, R. D. (2001). On Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and the foundations of liberation education. *Educational Researcher, 30*(2), 15-25.

Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom*. New York: HarperCollins.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Goleman, D., & National Professional Resources Inc. (1996). *Emotional intelligence*

a new vision for educators. Port Chester, N.Y.: National Professional Resources.

Goodman, J. (2003). *Mapping civic debate following September 11, 2001: Civic courage, social cartography & curriculum theorizing*.

Goswami, A., Reed, R. E., & Goswami, M. (1993). *The self-aware universe: How consciousness creates the material world*. New York: Putnam.

Greene, B. (2003). *The elegant universe: Superstrings, hidden dimensions, and the quest for the ultimate theory* (1st ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gribbin, J. R. (1984). *In search of Schrödinger's cat: Quantum physics and reality*. Toronto; New York: Bantam Books.

Gunzenhauser, M. (2005a, Apr 13). *Caring about the educated self in a context of accountability.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, CAN.

Gunzenhauser, M. (2005b, Nov 5). *Foucauldian resistance to economic accountability.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Charlottesville, VA.

Gunzenhauser, M., & Hyde, A. (2005). The effects of high-stakes accountability on educators' discourse about the meaning and value of education (pp. in press): University of Pittsburgh.

Gunzenhauser, M. G. (2006a, September 29, 2006). *Resistance as a component of educator professionalism.* Paper presented at the Ohio Valley Philosophy of Education Society, Dayton, OH.

Gunzenhauser, M. G., & Hyde, A. (2006b). What is the value of public school accountability? *Educational Theory, 57*(2), (in press).

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education.* Princeton. NJ: Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans. Vol. 1). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1987). An alternative way out of the philosophy of the subject: Communicative versus subject-centered reason (F. Lawrence, Trans.). In *The philosophical discourse of modernity* (pp. 294-326). Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

Henslin, J. M. (2005). *Sociology: A down-to-earth approach* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Hill, D. M., & Barth, M. (2004). NCLB and teacher retention: Who will turn out the lights? *Education and the Law, 16*(2-3), 173-181.

Holland, D. C., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Holland, R. (2005). *Merit pay for teachers: Can common sense come to public education?* Arlington, VA: The Lexington Institute.

Howard, R., Berkowitz, M., & Schaeffer, E. (2004). Politics of character education. *Educational Policy, 18*(1), 188-215.

Howe, K. R. (1998). The interpretive turn and the new debate in education. *Educational Researcher, 27*(8), 13-20.

Hoy, D. C. (2004). *Critical resistance: From poststructuralism to post-critique*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Huitt, W. (1999). Conation as an important factor of mind.   Retrieved 4/19/04, from http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/regsys/conation.html

Hunter, J. D. (2001). *The death of character: On the moral education of America's children*. New York: Basic Books.

Hurston, Z. N. (1990). *Their eyes were watching god* (Perennial Library Edition ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Hyde, A., Johnson, K., & Carowick, C. (2005a). The costs of no child left behind (pp. 29): University of Pittsburgh.

Hyde, A. M. (2004). *Proposal for a character education program*. Unpublished manuscript, Pittsburgh.

Hyde, A. M. (2005b). Images of "the democratic classroom" in the united states, *American Educational Studies Association Annual Conference*. Charlottesville, VA: unpublished.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Who controls teachers' work? Power and accountability in America's schools*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Jardine, G. M. (2005). *Foucault and education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Jefferson, T., & Washington, H. A. (1853). *The writings of Thomas Jefferson: Being his autobiography, correspondence, reports, messages, addresses, and other writings, official and private: Published by the order of the joint committee of congress on the library, from the original manuscripts, deposited in the department of state*. Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Maury.

Johnson, S., & LDJ Film Productions. (2003). *Who moved my cheese?The movie!* [United States]: Spencer Johnson.

Kaplan, M. A. (Ed.). (1998). *Character and identity: The philosophical foundations of political and sociological perspectives*. St. Paul: Professors World Peace Academy.

Kincheloe, J. (2005). *Critical constructionism*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research*. Chicago: Rand, McNally.

Kohn, A. (2004). NCLB and the effort to privatize public education. In D. M. G. Wood (Ed.), *Many children left behind: How the no child left behind act is damaging our children and our schools* (pp. 79-100). Boston: Beacon Press.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools* (1st ed. ed.). New York: Crown Pub.

Kozol, J. (2005). Still separate. Still unequal. *Harper's Magazine, 311*(1864), 0017-0789X.

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 25-53.

Kumashiro, K. (2002). Against repetition: Addressing resistance to anti-oppressive change in practices of learning, teaching, supervising, and researching. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(1), 67-92.

Kumashiro, K. (2003, October 19, 2003). Leaving good teachers behind. *Tallahassee Democrat*.

Langer, E. J. (1997). *The power of mindful learning* (paperback ed.). Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(3).

Leonardo, Z. (2004). Critical social theory and transformative knowledge: The function of criticism in quality education. *Educational Researcher, 33*(6), 11-18.

Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity; an essay on exteriority*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Linley, P. A., & Joseph, S. (2004). *Positive psychology in practice*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.

Logsdon, M. B. (2000). *A pedagogy of authority: Speculative essays by an English teacher*.

Luttrell, W. (1992). Working-class women's ways of knowing: Effects of gender, race and class. In J. Wrigley (Ed.), *Education and gender equality* (pp. 173-191). Washington, D.C.: Falmer.

Macedo, S. (2004). Crafting good citizens. In J. W. Noll (Ed.), *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial educational issues* (pp. 402-407). Dubuque, Iowa: McGraw-Hill/Duskin.

Marsden, B. (2003). Hope springs eternal: Some historical reflections on citizenship education. In M. Williams & G. Humphrys (Eds.), *Citizenship education and lifelong learning: Power and place* (pp. 19-31). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Marshall, J. D. (2001). A critical theory of the self" Wittgenstein, Nietzsche, Foucault. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 20*(1), 75-91.

Martin, R. J. (2002). *Cultural miseducation: In search of a democratic solution*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Matera, D. (2001). *A cry for character*. New York: Prentice Hall.

May, R. (1965). Intentionality: The heart of the human will. *The Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 5*(5), 202 - 209.

Mayo, P. (2004). *Liberating praxis: Paulo Freire's legacy for radical education and politics*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

McDowelle, J. O., & Buckner, K. G. (2002). *Leading with emotion: Reaching balance in educational decision making*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press.

McGinn, N. F. (1996). Education, democratization and globalization: A challenge for comparative education. *Comparative Education Review, 40*(4), 341-357.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meier, D., & Wood, G. H. (2004). *Many children left behind: How the no child left behind act is damaging our children and our schools*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J. (2004). *Citizenship education in 10 U.S. High schools*. Denver, CO: ECS National Center for Learning and Citizenship.

MINDS. (2004). Minds partners with Dr. Jim Cox to deliver data-driven decision making (d3m) streaming video professional development via the internet.   Retrieved March 19, 2007, from http://d3m.minds.tv/.

Mischel, W., Cantor, N., & Feldman, S. (1996). Principles of self-regulation: The nature of willpower and self-control. *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*, 329–360.

Morrow, R. A., Torres, C.A. (1995). *Social theory and education: A critique of social and cultural reproduction*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

NAEP. (2006). Civics framework for the 2006 national assessment of educational progress. In U. S. Dept. of Education (Ed.) (pp. 76): Developed under contract number ZA95001001 by the Council of Chief State School Officers with the Center for Civic Education and the American Institutes for Research for the National Assessment Governing Board.

NASBE. (2006). *Citizens for the 21st century: Revitalizing the civic mission of schools*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Nash, R. J. (1997). *Answering the "virtuecrats": A moral conversation on character education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

NCEE. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform* (A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education United States Department of Education). Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.

NCES. (2006). The nation's report card: Civics.   Retrieved October 26, 2006

NCSS. (2005). The civic mission of schools. *Social Education, 69*(7), 414 (412).

NCTE. (2003). *NCTE/NCATE program standards for initial preparation of teachers of secondary English language arts, grades 7-12*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

NEA. (2002). Issues in education: 'no child left behind' act/ESEA.   Retrieved April 4, 2005, from http://www.nea.org/esea/index.html .

NEA. (2006a). *Data on schools/districts not making adequate yearly progress (ayp)*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

NEA. (2006b). *NEA's positive agenda for the ESEA reauthorization*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

NEA. (2007). *NCLB/ESEA it's time for a change: Voices from America's classrooms*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Ninnes, P. (1998). Freire, Paulo. (1998). Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach (translated by Donald Macedo, Dale Koike and Alexandre Oliveira). Boulder: Westview press., *Education Review*.

Noblit, G. W., & Dempsey, V. O. (1996). *The social construction of virtue: The moral life of schools.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (1995b). Ethics and moral education. In *Philosophy of education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Happiness and education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Novak, M. (2000). Defining social justice. *First Things, 108*(December), 11-13.

NRC. (1996). *National science education standards*. Washington, DC: National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences.

Nussbaum, M. (2005). Education for democratic citizenship: University of Athens.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press.

O'Sullivan, E. (2001). *Transformative learning: Educational vision for the 21st century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

OED. (1989). Oxford English dictionary. 2nd. 1989, from http://digital.library.pitt.edu/oed/

Ohanian, S. (2007, 2007-01-23 11:59:35). Before the fall: Or how I see NCLB impacting me. Retrieved February 16

Orlofsky, D. D. (2001). *Redefining teacher education: The theories of Jerome Bruner and the practice of training teachers*. New York: P. Lang.

Paige, R. (2004). Memo to editorial writers: No child left behind implementation.   Retrieved April 4, 2005. http://www.ed.gov/news/opeds/edit/2004/03112004.html.

Paley, V. G. (1992). *You can't say you can't play*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life* (1st ed.). San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. J. (2002). Listening to teachers. In S. M. Intrator (Ed.), *Forward to stories of the courage to teach: Honoring the teacher's heart*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Parker, W. (2006). Public discourse in schools: Purposes, problems, possibilities. *Educational Researcher, 35*(8), 11-18.

Parker, W., & Hess, D. (2001). Teaching with and for discussion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 273-289.

PDE. (2006a). Academic standards for reading, writing and listening. In P. D. o. Education (Ed.): PA State Board of Education.

PDE. (2006b, 1/30/2007). Pennsylvania value-added assessment system (pvaas).   Retrieved February 10, 2007, from http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/view.asp?A=108&Q=108916&pp=12&n=1.

Perelman, M. (2006). Privatizing education, *Monthly Review* (pp. 10).

Peters, M., Burbules, N. (2004). *Poststructuralism and educational research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Piaget, J., Elkind, D., & Flavell, J. H. (1969). *Studies in cognitive development; essays in honor of Jean Piaget*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pignatelli, F. (1993). What can I do? Foucault on freedom and the question of teacher agency. *Educational Theory, 43*(4), 411-432.

Pinar, W. F. (2006). The problem with curriculum and pedagogy. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *The synoptic text today and other essays* (pp. 109-120). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1991). *A political sociology of educational reform: Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Rich, A. (1977). Claiming an education. Speech delivered at the convocation of Douglass College.

Richardson, L. (2001). Getting personal: Writing-stories. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14, 33.

Roth, H. D. (2006). Contemplative studies: Prospects for a new field. *Teachers College Record, 108*(9), 1789-1815.

Ryan, K. & Bohlin, K.E. (1999). *Building character in schools: Practical ways to bring moral instruction to life.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Salamone, R. C. (2000). Education for democratic citizenship. *Education Week, Mar 22, 2000*, 48-52.

Scheffler, I. (1981). Moral education and the democratic ideal. In *Reason and teaching*: Hacket Publishing.

Schubert, W. (1991). Philosophical inquiry: The speculative essay. In E. C. Short (Ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 61-76). Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Schultz, B. C. (2005, October, 29 2005). *Teachers' perspectives of how high-stakes testing influences instructional decisions and professionalism.* Paper presented at the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS) Annual Conference, Athens, GA.

Scobey, D. (2001). The specter of citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 5*(1), 11.

Seals, G. (2006). Mechanisms of student participation: Theoretical description of a Freirean ideal. *Educational Studies, 39*(5), 283-295.

Sedlak, M. J. (1992). A history of teachers and teaching. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of educational research - sixth edition* (pp. 1369-1373): Macmillan Publishing Company.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). *Building community in schools.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Sirotnik, K. A. (2004). *Holding accountability accountable: What ought to matter in public education.* New York; London: Teachers College Press.

Skrla, L., & Scheurich, J. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Educational equity and accountability: Paradigms, policies, and politics.* New York: Routledge Falmer.

Slattery, P. & Rapp, D. (2003). *Ethics and the foundations of education: Teaching convictions in a postmodern world.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sloan, K. (2006). Teacher identity and agency in school worlds: Beyond the all-good/all-bad discourse on accountability-explicit curriculum policies. *Curriculum Inquiry, 36*(2), 119-152(134).

Smith, M. L., Miller-Kahn, L., Heinecke, W., & Jarvis, P. F. (2004). *Political spectacle and the fate of American schools.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Soder, R. (2004). The double bind of civic education assessment and accountability. In K. A. Sirotnik (Ed.), *Holding accountability accountable* (pp. 100-115). New York: Teachers College Press.

Spring, J. (2002). *Political agendas for education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spring, J. (2005). *American education* (12th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Spring, J. H. (1988). *American education: An introduction to social and political aspects* (4th ed. ed.). New York: Longman.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Sullivan, A. (2001). Cultural capital and educational attainment. *Sociology, 34*(4), 893-912.

Sunderman, G. L., Kim, J. S., & Orfield, G. (2005). *NCLB meets school realities: Lessons from the field.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.

Tennant, M. (2005). Transforming selves. *Journal of Transformative Education, 3*(2), 102-115.

Thomas, G. (1997). What's the use of theory? *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(1), 75-105.

Thomas, P. L. (2004). *Numbers games: Measuring and mandating American education.* New York, NY: P. Lang.

Thompson, S. (2001). The authentic standards movement and its evil twin. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(5), p358-362.

Tiller, W., Dibble, W., & Kohane, M. (2001). *Conscious acts of creation.* Walnut Creek, CA: Pavior Publishing.

Tiller, W. A. (1997). *Science and human transformation: Subtle energies, intentionality and consciousness.* Walnut Creek, CA: Pavior Publishing.

Tiller, W. A. (2005). Some science adventures with real magic, *What the Bleep Do We Know! Prophets Conference.* Santa Monica, CA.

Tozer, S. E., Senese, G. B., & Violas, P. C. (2006). *School and society: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (5th ed. ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Tyack, D. B., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Urban, W. J., & Wagoner, J. L. (2004). *American education: A history* (3rd ed. ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Valencia, R. R. (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*: Routledge.

Valencia, R. R., Valenzuela, A., Sloan, K., & Foley, D. E. (2001). Let's treat the cause, not the symptoms: Equity and accountability in Texas revisited. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(4), 318-326.

Vinson, K., & Ross, E. (2003). *Image and education: Teaching in the face of the new diciplinarity*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Vinson, K. D., & Ross, E. W. (2001). Education and the new disciplinarity: Surveillance, spectacle, and the case of SBER.   Retrieved January 23, 2005, from http://eserver.org/clogic/4-1/vinson&ross.html.

Weare, K. (2004). *Developing the emotionally literate school*. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Paul Chapman.

Weber, M. (2001/1904). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Routledge.

Westheimer, J. (2006). A special section on patriotism and education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(8).

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237-269.

Wilkins, D. B. (1995). Redefining the" professional" in professional ethics: An interdisciplinary approach to teaching professionalism. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 58*(3/4), 241-258.

Williams, M., & Humphrys, G. (2003). *Citizenship education and lifelong learning: Power and place*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Williams, R. M. (1970). *American society: A sociological interpretation* (3rd ed.). New York: Knopf.

Willis, P. & Carden, P. (2004). Introduction. In *Lifelong learning and the democratic imagination*. Underdale, South Australia: University of South Australia.

Willis, P. E. (1981). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower.

Wolf, F. A. (1994). *The dreaming universe: A mind-expanding journey into the realm where psyche and physics meet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Wolf, F. A. (1996). *The spiritual universe: How quantum physics proves the existence of the soul*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Wolff, K. (Ed.). (1950). *The sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: Free Press.

Wood, G. W. (1992). *Schools that work*. New York: Dutton.

Wright, R. (1994). *The moral animal: Why we are the way we are, the new science of evolutionary psychology*. New York: Vintage Books.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Young, M. F. D. (1971). *Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education*. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Zaman, H. (2006). *Teachers perceptions of citizenship and citizenship education: A comparative study*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.