

**THE TEACHER'S BODY: DISCOURSE, POWER, AND DISCIPLINE  
IN THE HISTORY OF THE FEMINIZATION OF TEACHING**

A Dissertation

by

CINTHYA MICHELLE SAAVEDRA

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of  
Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

May 2006

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

**THE TEACHER'S BODY: DISCOURSE, POWER, AND DISCIPLINE  
IN THE HISTORY OF THE FEMINIZATION OF TEACHING**

A Dissertation

by

CINTHYA MICHELLE SAAVEDRA

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of  
Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Co-Chairs of Committee,	Gaile Cannella Radhika Viruru
Committee Members,	Joseph Jewell Yvonna Lincoln Linda Skrla
Head of Department,	Dennie Smith

May 2006

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

## ABSTRACT

The Teacher's Body: Discourse, Power, and Discipline in the  
History of the Feminization of Teaching. (May 2006)

Cinthy Michelle Saavedra, B.A., Texas A&M University;  
M.Ed., Texas A&M University

Co-Chairs of Advisory Committee: Dr. Gaile Cannella  
Dr. Radhika Viruru

Historical studies of the feminization of teaching have provided important additions to feminist understandings of teaching and education in general. However, most historical accounts of the feminization of teaching have absorbed the body. Teachers are presented as body-less entities. *El cuerpo* is ignored, passed over, and perhaps denied to the point of invisibility. The absence of the body in educational research is problematic.

The purpose of this dissertation is to reveal the images of the body of the teacher in the history of the feminization of teaching (HFT) texts and to illuminate the discursive impacts on the body of the teacher in HFT texts. Multiple epistemologies of the body provide a theoretical framework and analytical tool to highlight the often-ignored and marginalized body of the teacher. I draw on multiple research methods of deconstruction, genealogical analysis, and carnal *metodologías* to allow for images of the body to emerge and for discursive impacts on the body to surface.

Four images of the body are discussed as possibilities: teacher as container, spatial organization of the teacher's body, teacher's body as performative, and resisting bodies. The implications of the study suggest a rethinking of the teacher's body as a vessel of multiple possibilities and counter discourses, beginning in a revolutionary teacher education. Western and androcentric conceptions of educational spaces must be

redefined in order to allow for new possibilities for teaching and learning. Unleashing the “unruly” passionate body of the teacher is a subversive act of contingency and critical transformative pedagogies.

The study concludes with recommendations for further research intended to broaden the research scope of current educational inquiry. Suggestions for deeper examinations include a genealogical analysis of teaching and the teacher in order to problematize current educational discourses (i.e., accountability, best practices, child centered, cooperative learning). Hybrid methodologies and examinations that center the body in current contexts could generate more discussion about the (im)possibility to carry out liberatory/radical projects in the classroom. Examinations of how research impacts and is impacted by the body could illuminate the inter- intrarelationship that research has with the body.

## DEDICATION

Para mi papi quien nunca dudo en mí.  
En memoria de mi Papa Bernardo quien siempre tuvo mucho amor.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Drs. Gaile Cannella and Radhika Viruru for their inspiring support and guidance. Thanks to Drs. Yvonna Lincoln, Linda Skrla, and Joseph Jewell for serving on my committee and for their critical feedback.

I also thank my dearest friend, Ellen Demas, for our many conversations and her support during this long journey. Thanks also to my friend Monica Rivera, who is an inspiration for living life to the fullest.

I thank my family, who have been by my side through thick and thin and always encouraging me in multiple ways to finish my program.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....		iii
DEDICATION .....		v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....		vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....		vii
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION: EXAMINING THE HISTORICAL BODY OF THE TEACHER.....	1
	Purpose of the Project.....	2
	Centering the Body of the Teacher: Rationale .....	3
	Locating the Self.....	5
	Defining Terms.....	5
	Research Assumptions.....	7
	Methodology.....	7
	Organization of the Dissertation.....	7
II	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	9
	The Body: A Review of Literature.....	11
	The Foucauldian (Poststructuralist) Body .....	13
	Sociology of the Body .....	16
	Feminism(s) and the Queer Body .....	21
	Border Bodies: Chicana Feminism .....	30
	Postcolonial Bodies.....	35
	Disciplining Bodies as Education.....	39
	Bifurcating Body and Mind .....	41
	Regulating Space and Bodies.....	43
	Civilizing Bodies .....	44
	Disciplining Teachers: Regulating Work and Bodies .....	46
	Regulating and Controlling the Field.....	46
	Creating and Constructing Subjectivities and Bodies: The “Good” Teacher.....	48
	Summary.....	54
III	EMBODYING RESEARCH.....	56
	Deconstruction, Genealogy, and Carnal <i>Metodologías</i> .....	57
	Deconstruction .....	58
	Genealogy .....	59
	Carnal Metodologías.....	60
	Performing and (En)Fleshing the Research.....	61
	Bricolage.....	62

CHAPTER	Page
	64
	65
	68
	69
	71
	72
	76
IV	78
	78
	81
	84
V	85
	88
	89
	95
	100
	102
	103
	106
	109
	111
	114
	115
	119
	126
	127
	128
	129
	132
	134
VI	137
	137
	139
	141
	143
	145
	147
	149
REFERENCES	151
VITA	163



**CHAPTER I**  
**INTRODUCTION: EXAMINING THE HISTORICAL**  
**BODY OF THE TEACHER**

The transfer of sons in our culture from their mothers to their fathers recapitulates . . . the reversal of the reproductive order, hostility between mothers and the patriarchal order, and an ideal of equality binding young men to each other and to the patriarchal order . . . in an elaborate and extended ritual that we call schooling . . . we do not banish all women from the scene . . . instead, we employ many women, even mothers, as the very agents who deliver their children to the patriarchy. (Grumet, 1988, p. 32)

This quote from Grumet irrevocably captures an image of the teacher as one of a “birthing body,” *un cuerpo* that delivers younger human beings to the patriarchal order. As I read this passage, I could not help but agree with Madeline Grumet, especially as I am now an early childhood *maestra* in the era of No Child Left Behind (U.S. Congress, 2001). After all, what kind of teacher (read as mother) would I be if I were to leave my child behind? I must make him/her successful, and successful in this society means being a contributing member in the capitalistic and patriarchal order.

Historical studies such as Grumet’s (1988) have provided important additions to feminist understandings of teaching and education in general. For example, Grumet’s metaphor of the teacher as mother stems from her critical examinations of the history of the feminization of teaching and her concern for the lack of emphasis on sex and gender in that process. Grumet’s project has illuminated how *mujeres* have been absorbed by education, ultimately hiding their *cuerpos* as well. Feminist explorations such as hers allow us to see continuity and discontinuities that are helpful in comprehending the field today. Grumet’s historical endeavor is especially helpful in trying to examine the field today from multiple perspectives. Also important is the contribution to the literature not

---

This dissertation follows the style of *Educational Researcher*.

only for women in education but for the history of education as a whole. Grumet's critical study of gender in the process of the feminization of the field of teaching helps to (re)consider how the history of teaching is viewed, a perspective from which multiple stories can be recognized and new stories can be told.

Most historical studies of the feminization of teaching have absorbed the body in their accounts. The absence of the body is problematic. *Maestras* are represented as body-less entities. Knowledge and power over teachers is unleashed without regard to the discursive impact on their bodies and those of their students. With few exceptions, such as the work of Grumet (1988) the body is ignored, passed over, and perhaps denied to the point of invisibility. Therefore, as O'Farrell, Meadmore, McWilliam and Symes (2000) concurred, the body "needs to be constantly reemphasized because it is often overlooked and taken for granted . . . [the body] should be "examined, probed, prodded and stretched almost to the breaking point" (p. 1).

### **Purpose of the Project**

The purpose of this project is two fold: (a) reveal the images about the body in the history of the feminization of teaching (HFT), and (b) illuminate the discursive impacts on the body of the teacher in the HFT. I draw from critical studies of education that have recaptured and centered the students' bodies in educational settings (Bailey, 1998; Boldt, 2001; Leavitt & Power, 1997; McLaren, 1991; Nespors, 1997). Conversations concerning the implications for the body of the teacher in the HFT are missing and needed. For example, my interpretation of Grumet's image derives from my own readings and interactions with various epistemologies of the body as a methodological tool in order to arrive at a new way of seeing historical (body) accounts of the feminization of teaching.

The key questions that guided this project are:

1. What are the *imágenes* of the *cuerpo* of the teacher within the HFT?
2. What are the discursive impacts on the *cuerpo* of the teacher in the HFT?

### **Centering the Body of the Teacher: Rationale**

This research, unlike traditional research modes of inquiry, was not conceived from the literature. I did not delve into the literature to find *un* gap or conflicting theories or to prove/disprove a long-held, taken-for-granted theory. As Saldivar-Hull (2000) said,

Because our work has been ignored by the men and women in charge of the modes of cultural production, we must be innovative in our search. Hegemony has so constructed the ideas of method and theory that often we cannot recognize anything that is different from what the dominant discourse constructs. As a consequence, we have to look in nontraditional places for our theories. (p. 46)

Thus began my search in nontraditional places. My inquiry began *con mi cuerpo* as a *maestra* and consequently listening to my carnal voice (Anzaldúa, 1987); my flesh, my physical being was placed at the forefront. My *experiencias* as an early childhood education teacher have led me to question and challenge the way I act and behave as I embody this pre-kindergarten teacher. *Empecé a preguntarme* about my embodiment as a teacher, such as, How is my body influenced by social forces and discourses? How is it that, even though I consider myself progressive and *feminista*, I still contribute to the constant mental and physical regulations of my students and myself? As a teacher, I am deeply concerned with the ways in which *mi cuerpo* reacts and enacts power. Do I embody a docile shell and demand docility from my students? How is *mi cuerpo* already infused with power relations that ultimately reproduce and perpetuate colonizing relationships? I am not looking for the answers, the truth, or specific historical origins; rather, I am looking for different illuminations in order to consider *nuevas posibilidades*.

My project is a contribution to feminist research that addresses and explores the feminization of teaching. Centering *el cuerpo* in the HFT can result in the unearthing of

education as disciplinary power imposed on physical bodies. Further, examining history in this project is important because history is played out in everyday lives (Tuchman, 1994) in political, gendered, and racialized bodies. As Tuchman affirmed, history has relevance in the present. In the most mundane activities of our lives we experience (consciously or unconsciously) the hidden assumptions of our *époque*. This is what Raymond Williams (1977) termed “structure of feeling” (as cited in Tuchman, 1994, p. 313). This structure of feeling steers even the most trivial aspects of our lives. History is present in our bodies. As Fiske (1989) wrote, “The body is where the social is most convincingly represented as the individual and where politics can best disguise itself as human nature” (p. 70). Agreeing with Fiske that bodies are political and social and thus historical, examining the discourse of the HFT can provide different *posibilidades* and stories for seeing and imagining teachers.

Examining *el cuerpo* of the teacher illuminates how the body has been relegated to the margins. It is the absent present in the HFT and in many educational discourses (Boldt, 2001; Tobin, 1997). Further, centering the body in educational research is important in three ways. First, it challenges discourses and constructions of the *maestra*. Second, it reveals how inextricably intertwined the body and pedagogy are in education. Third, these epistemologies investigate how power relations are created in and out of education through the regulation of the body.

Perhaps it is important to examine how the body resists and can transform oppressive and colonizing ideology, history, discourse, space and movement. A reconsideration of the curriculum and bodily expectation can be contemplated as multiple possibilities are generated for students and teachers in relation to teaching and learning.

### **Locating the Self**

Important in this project is to locate *mis perspectivas* and biases as a cautionary tale to the reader. Research is often conducted and performed as a neutral and harmless endeavor, where the goal is to advance a field. In this project, nothing is neutral and harmless. On the contrary, I want to provoke critical and political discussions that illuminate the disciplinary powers of discourse on *el cuerpo* even through my own *metodologías* and research.

Therefore, I do not intent to debase the work of other authors by critiquing their research methods and epistemologies and situating and labeling them *modernist*. My readings of the historical texts in this study are not in direct opposition to their work; rather, my analysis is a continuation of that important work. Postmodern critical analysis does not suggest instant polarization of ideas. I use postmodern critical analysis as a way of highlighting the multiplicity of discourses embedded within texts and research. Revealing hidden messages and their discursive impacts serves to promote critical engagement with histories and not to provide dichotomous understanding.

### **Defining Terms**

*Body/cuerpo*: The body is defined in this study as socially constructed by multiple discourses (Foucault, 1978; Shilling, 1993; Turner, 1996). A detailed discussion of this construct is presented in the review of literature (chapter II).

*Disciplinary power*: Based on the work of Foucault (1977), disciplinary powers are the subtle external techniques (e.g., through discourse) that control the human body internally. These techniques are then desired by subjects as the “natural” way to be, exist, and view the world. Different from traditional notions of power, disciplinary power works invisibly but imposes a principle of obligatory visibility on those who are its subjects. Thus, subjects want/desire to act and be seen in certain ways.

*Discourse:* Discourse refers to the attitudes, rules, ways of being, actions and language used to construct a particular knowledge. Language, power, and knowledge are joined. Discourse ultimately serves to control not just *what* but *how* subjects are constructed. Language, thought, and desire are regulated, policed, and managed through discourse. It is important to note that there is not just one discourse but a polyvalence of discourses that are simultaneously occurring and sometimes even contradicting each other. Discourse can be an instrument of power as well as an effect of power. Foucault (1978) contended that discourse can transmit, produce, and reinforce power, but at the same time discourse can undermine and expose power, rendering it unstable and possible to thwart.

*Discursive practices:* Discursive practices are practices that a subject embodies, lives, and experiences as s/he interacts with discourses. For example, the discourse of femininity inadvertently informs, influences, and shapes women's identity to the point that women act out and behave according to what has been labeled as acceptable and true about females. Discourses, in turn, are shaped and informed by practices. Discourse and practices then enter into power relations. One does not have more or less power than the other but each equally shapes each other (Foucault, 1977). Discourse can be seen in the everyday practice of humans. Therefore, discourse is not only text but also action.

*Surveillance:* Surveillance can be thought of as the constant and ever-present monitoring and observation by experts and others that attempt to regulate the behaviors of human beings. The gaze is legitimated by societal discourse in ways that increase acceptance, even by those who are its subjects. Consequently, subjects, cognizant of the gaze, monitor and control their own behaviors to avoid being seen or judged as inadequate or lacking, even pathological (Foucault, 1977; Prado, 2000). Surveillance is one type of disciplinary power.

### **Research Assumptions**

1. Because of the emergent nature of the study, the guiding questions may change as the researcher experiences and interacts with the data and documents.

2. The findings in this project are not a “new truth” but are another contingency. The findings serve to add to multiple ways of *seeing* or experiencing current/past conditions.

### **Methodology**

The methodology employed in this study reflects a postmodern approach to research. Postmodern approaches to research are varied and interdisciplinary in nature (Canella & Bailey, 1999). In this project I employed methods that allowed me to examine how historical discourses provide hidden messages and impact the body of the teacher. I used (a) deconstruction and genealogical analysis as the foundation for examining historical texts, (b) carnal *metodologías*, (c) devising a guide to analysis, (d) keeping a continuous reflexive/methodological journal, and (e) using peer debriefing.

### **Organization of the Dissertation**

In Chapter I I began by setting the conditions and concerns for examining the historical body of the teacher. I provided the purpose and guiding questions of the project. Further, I defined key terms that are used in the study as well as the assumptions of the study and researcher.

Chapter II outlines the theoretical framework and reviews the philosophical theoretical/perspectives of the body that grounded the project. I examine the literature in education that has created as absent and invisible the body of students and teachers. Chapter III is a discussion of the methodology and mechanics of the project as well as the sites and sources chosen for the study. Chapter IV presents the centering of the body in historical texts. Chapter V offers the “findings/stories” generated through interactions

and reading of the HFT on the body of the teacher. Chapter VI highlights the questions, implications, and concerns of the project and identifies areas for further investigation.

Because this project is unlike traditional research, the conclusions of this dissertation do not suggest specific areas of action in response to the questions and concerns raised. Rather, the results further problematize and offer new possibilities for the images presented in the study.



## **CHAPTER II**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This project is influenced by the research that has been labeled critical analyses of the dominant forms and constructions of education. Poststructuralist, postmodern, feminist(s), queer theory, as well as Chicana feminist and postcolonial scholarship, inform and influence my perspective and research. There are many definitions among critical perspectives, even major contradictions. Therefore, to situate this project among these perspectives, I offer a theoretical framework in which the investigation is grounded.

Postmodernism is the broad umbrella under which most critical scholarship (poststructuralism, feminist and queer theory) is subsumed (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). According to Pinar et al., postmodernism is a historical moment that has brought shocking new ideas in which we are no longer sure of perceived reality. The subject is dead. Truth-oriented metanarratives such as history, science, and the canon are rejected. Reason is no longer thought to be the only way to understand the world. The transparency of language is an illusion and obtaining final meaning is an impossibility. Pinar et al. contended that postmodernism signifies an end to the enlightenment project and ideals. “The end of history, meaning, and the subject come to characterize a radical break with ways of knowing and being which constituted modernism, now itself seen as at end” (p. 469).

In this project I raise questions about the “truths” that have been constructed in relation to the lives and work of teachers. This project is concerned with the active deconstruction of the meta-narratives that define the teacher. Postmodernism also welcomes a centering of the body because it is through the body and its challenge to physical/mental dualisms that Cartesian thinking has the potential to be contested

(Turner, 1996). Centering the body requires careful consideration of the discourses that enter into power relations with the body. The body becomes a site of examination for understanding Western thought and culture.

This project also has poststructuralist concerns. Marshall (1992) explained that the poststructuralist project is to highlight the power that is created using dualistic constructions of difference, examining not only the logic of dichotomous thinking such as black/white, beautiful/ugly, objective/subjective, but that the style of language represents a form of hierarchy where white is preferred over black and beauty over ugliness. However, poststructuralists resist closure and instead emphasize textuality and intertextuality. Margrit Shildrick (1997) wrote of poststructuralism:

What poststructuralism has done is to begin to . . . open the cracks, to expose those gaps and silences that undermine the claims of modernist philosophy to impartiality and universality. Above all, it deconstructs the boundaries between categories, be they ontological, epistemological, ethical or material; and it demonstrates the inescapability of the leaks and flows across all such bodies of knowledge and bodies of matter. One of the major concerns of this project is the ways in which the discourse of teaching relies on binary and hierarchical constructions of teaching practices. (p. 4)

Feminism(s) is also important in my work, for it allows me to politicize gender and gender relations for effects on the bodies of teachers. I use the plural to denote the multiplicity of feminists' perspectives that contribute to my understanding of not only this project but of the world as well. My feminist concerns echo and merge with those of postmodernism. Anna Yeatman (1994) described the epistemological orientation of postmodern feminists: (a) Modernist theories are deconstructed; (b) minority voices disrupt the inevitable universalistic tendency of theorizing; (c) instabilities and ambiguities of borders, binaries and categories are highlighted; (d) theorizing is seen as an historically specific and contingent activity; (e) any theory of knowledge is perspectivalistic as opposed to relativistic; (f) the location, position of the theorist(s) is a

concern and is significant; (g) the importance of embodied subjectivity is highlighted; and (h) and language is significant.

I also draw from queer theory to inform and guide the concerns and practices of this research. Deborah Britzman (1995) contended that queer theory insists on posturing how the creation of normalization is a problem of thought and culture. For Britzman, queer theory “offers methods of imagining difference on its own terms: as eros, as desire, as the grounds of politicality. It is a particular articulation that returns us to the practices of bodies and bodies of practices” (p. 165). Through a queer theory lens, I am able to ask questions of and about the normalizing discourses in education and the effect on the *cuerpos of maestras*.

As a way to bring multiple voices and concerns to my project, I also incorporate Chicana feminism and postcolonial concerns. Chicana feminism is usually seen as separate from mainstream feminisms (Moya, 1997). However, in this project it adds *color* to my theorizing and a sense, albeit fleeting and ambiguous, of the “real” to my investigation. Using Chicana feminist perspectives does have the potential to welcome ambiguity and reject binary thinking that is pervasive in the United States (Saldivar-Hull, 2000). Postcolonial critique is also equally important. Because schooling can be the site of colonization and imperialistic projects (Cannella & Viruru, 2004), postcolonial critique draws attention to the complexity of imperialism and colonialism and the various relations that it creates between the colonized and colonizers (Donaldson & Pui-lan, 2002). In this project I can then ask questions of the colonizer/colonized space that teachers embody.

### **The Body: A Review of Literature**

In this review of literature I facilitate examination of a well-grounded philosophical and theoretical base for centering the body in education. Explorations of

the body, genealogies, and archaeologies of education draw mainly from the work of Michel Foucault, who has influenced and informed poststructuralist and feminist inquiry as a flexible, ambiguous, and fluid guide to multiple ways of researching, knowing, and being in the world.

*El cuerpo* is the site of inquiry for many theoretical perspectives and disciplines. For feminists, the body is the source of their oppression, as it is linked to the notion of an inferior sex that has been more closely linked to nature than culture in a patriarchal science and society. The female is the “other” of the male or, as Beauvoir (1952) posited, the “second sex.” A sociology of the body theorizes the body as an opportunity to deepen and expand the intersections of race, class, and gender and has borrowed from poststructuralist ideas. The poststructuralists, influenced mainly by Foucault, attempt to demonstrate that bodies are the focus of regulation, control, and discipline through multiple and varied discursive practices that enter into webs and relations of power with the body. No one source is responsible for creating bodies as objects of regulation. Instead, many discourses are at work and are internalized as desires to regulate our own *cuerpos* and selves. Queer theorists problematize the idea that identities are fixed and determine who we are, based on the socially constructed categories of sex and gender. For Chicana feminists, *el cuerpo* is their medium to theorize and inadvertently challenge Western’s conception that the *mente* is separate and can be dissected from the *body*. Postcolonial perspectives address the concerns of the colonizer/colonized predicament in the lives of teachers.

The review of literature that follows explores, in more detail, the various theoretical perspectives and philosophies of the body. I have divided the epistemologies of the body into five sections. The first section examines the Foucauldian body. The second section explores the literature of the sociology of the body. The third section

reviews the feminist(s) and queer body. *El cuerpo* in Chicana feminism is explored in the fourth section, as well as postcolonial theory. In the fifth section I discuss how and what it looks like to center the body in educational research.

*The Foucauldian (Poststructuralist) Body*

Michel Foucault's influence is vast and has been challenged by feminist and ethnic/race scholars. To articulate these challenges, as important and crucial as they may be, would be outside of my scope and bear no relevance to my project. Instead, I am working under the assumption that Foucault's influence is pervasive and critical to many disciplines, including education. It was through readings/conversations of/about Foucault and others who have been influenced by him that this project was born and informed through my own personal and professional experiences that compelled me to explore postmodern philosophy and research for this project.

In *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, Foucault (1978) challenged naturalist views of the body and offered several implications into what it means in modern and postmodern times to be, have, and live in a body. Chelsea Bailey (1998) argued that Foucault's examination of the body contributes to critical understanding of Western culture and thought. For Foucault, "the body is not just *a* site of investigation, but perhaps, *the* site of investigation" (author's emphasis, p. 12). The body, poststructuralists, queer theorists and (some) feminists can concur, is socially constructed (Butler, 1990; Shilling, 1993; Turner, 1992). Our bodies are given meaning through how they are conceived, perceived, and constructed. Various discourses, such as science, psychology, law, and myriad others, inform and act upon our bodies. For Foucault (1978) the body is given meaning through the webs and relations of power in society. His aim in *The History of Sexuality* was to demonstrate

how deployments of power are directly connected to the body, to bodies' functions . . . , sensations and pleasures; far from the body having to be effaced,

what is needed is to make it visible through an analysis in which the biological and the historical are not consecutive to one another, as in the evolutionism of the first sociologists, but are bound together in an increasingly complex fashion in accordance with the development of modern techniques of power that take life as their objective. (1978, pp. 151-152)

It is clear that Foucault's project is to highlight those modern techniques that inform, mold, and create desires within ourselves and are evident in and through our *cuerpos*. These modern techniques of controlling our bodies are ultimately in the form of a self-imposed surveillance and improvement on our selves that places limits on our minds and bodies (Bailey, 1998). As Foucault (1978) explained, there was a shift during the 17th century to tell everything, even to one's self, anything having to do with pleasures, sensations, and thoughts as many times as possible. This was demanded: "The important point no doubt is that this obligation was decreed, as an ideal at least, for every good Christian" (pp. 20-21). "An imperative was established: Not only will you confess to acts contravening the law, but you will seek to transform your desires, your everyday desire, into discourse" (p. 21). In other words, all we would feel/think with regard to sex, and ultimately our bodies and desires/pleasures, should be talked about in specific ways through discourse. This would allow for sex, desires, and pleasures to be not only talked about but also administered and managed.

These discourses have effects on the body and pleasures and vice versa. For example, Foucault (1978) explained that sexual perversions did not become noticed because it was time to favor a sexuality that would reproduce a labor force and the family. These perversions or conducts were actually taken from "people's bodies and from their pleasures; or rather they were solidified in them; they were drawn out revealed, isolated, intensified by multifarious power devices" (p. 48). For Victorian society, the growth of perversion is not a moral obsession of the Victorians. "It is the real product of encroachment of a type of power on bodies and their pleasures" (1978,

p. 48). In this way, pervasions were identified in order to control them through the careful management of discourse.

Hence, during the 18th century a policing of sex ensued. “A policing of sex: that is not the rigor of a taboo, but the necessity of regulating sex through useful and public discourses” (Foucault, 1978, p. 25). Once a concept, idea, or body is identified, categorized, and classified, it is easier to regulate and control it through the management of discourse. The same could be said about managing educational constructs such as special education, accountability, gifted and talented, ability, and aptitude, and ultimately the subjects and objects of education: the teacher and student.

In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault (1977) examined how bodies are produced as docile and obedient subjects. He analyzed this production of docile bodies in an examination of the change from monarchical overt and brutal authority to the prison as rehabilitation (Prado, 2000). In this change Foucault explored how the body was no longer the target of torture and brutal acts of domination and violence. The body became the target of schedules, habit formations, evaluations, and diagnostics. The body could be controlled internally. The control of humans went from overt to subvert techniques. Foucault called these techniques of control that are very subtle *disciplines*. It was during the 17th and 18th centuries that “disciplines” became everyday formulas for dominations. Foucault explained that these disciplines had been used in the monasteries, armies, and workshops. What had changed was the general application of disciplines to bodies (populations). For Foucault this became the historical moment “when an art of human body was born . . . entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it” (1977, pp. 137-138). This would allow, Foucault contended, for the body to be expected to perform as others and oneself would desire and wish, with the techniques, speed, and efficacies of those desires and wishes.

Foucault significantly contributed to understanding of the body as a social construction. For Foucault, the body is at the intersections of multiple discourses and knowledges that attempt to manage and control it. However, power over the body is not unilateral and overbearing. Power also has the potential to work to the body's advantage. In return, the body can also act upon power, defy, and rebel.

### *Sociology of the Body*

This section introduces the emergent field of sociology of the body. The work is eclectic and varies in depth and scope. The literature of sociology of the body draws heavily from the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1984), Emile Durkheim, Erving Goffman (1969), and Norbert Elias (1978, 1982), as well as Michel Foucault (1977, 1978). Weber and Durkheim did not directly address the body as a site of investigation but made enough allusions to it that were worth reinvestigating by Turner (1996) and Shilling (1993). Contemporary social theory took Foucault's ideas to expand and create a deeper examination of the intersection of race, class, gender, and disability as well as religion and medicine. For sociology, as Turner (1996) and Shilling contended, centering the body is an important act. It challenges the Cartesian mind/body split that has been pervasive in sociology. They contended that the body of the social actor is important and crucial in the study of social actions. Further, sociologists interested in the body as a site of investigation have incorporated or maintained certain aspects of philosophical anthropology and phenomenology. For Turner (1992), these approaches were relevant in a theory of the body so as to not negate the importance of the "lived body." Therefore, Merleau-Ponty's (1962) *Phenomenology of Perception* is influential in the sociology of the body (Shilling; Turner, 1992).

Our modern bodies can be changed, altered, and mutilated. We are obsessed with our body yet live in constant paradox by ignoring it. The body is a constant target as well



as an intimate and integral part of the media, popular culture, and capitalism (Cruz & McLaren, 2002). Taking into consideration the omnipresence of our bodies in sociology is a way to disrupt our Cartesian heritage ingrained to erase and negate our bodies by splitting it from the mind—the disembodiment of the self. Therefore, some sociologists argue that the body could inform social theory, contributing to and deepening the explorations and intersections of gender, race, class, disability, and religion (Shilling, 1993; Turner, 1992, 1996). For far too long sociology has been negating the body as a site of investigation due to the Cartesian bifurcated system of thought and the “maleness” of sociology (Shilling; Synnott, 1993; Turner, 1992, 1996). Sociology can no longer ignore the body of the social actor in the study of social actions, systems, and structures. Turner (1984, 1992, 1996) and Shilling held that a theory of the body should be developed to broaden and deepen the scope of sociology as well as to impel a research agenda that would produce empirical research (Turner, 1996).

In *The Body and Social Theory* (1993) Chris Shilling was primarily concerned with putting forth a theory of the body. He viewed the body as an “unfinished biological and social phenomenon” (p. 12). The body is transformed as it enters and participates in society. The body is important as it contributes toward understanding of social relations. For Shilling, the body is not only acted upon by society but also acts on society. “Social relations may take up and transform our embodied capacities in all manner of ways, but they still have a basis in human bodies” (p. 13). The body is not only transformed by society; it is helpful in understanding society.

Similarly, Turner (1996) concurred with Shilling (1993) that social theory needs a theory of the body. However, Turner contended that an analysis of the body is important for different, perhaps more political, reasons. In *The Body and Society* (1996) Turner intended to expand Foucault’s contribution by supposing that an examination of

the body should be a historical one, where the spatial organization of desires, pleasures, and bodies are in relation to society and reason. Turner outlined five major points to consider when centering the body in research: (a) The body is part of nature but also part of culture; (b) the regulation of populations occurs along two dimensions of time and space; the regulation of reproductions between generations and the regulation of populations in political and urban spaces; (c) the body is the center of political struggles and thus should be subject to a materialist analysis; (d) the body is the study of problems of social order; and (e) the body informs about how cultural polarities are politically enforced through patriarchal institutions of sex and family. Turner's (1983, 1992, 1996) contribution has been to point out possible and important connections that an examination of the body can bring to the sociology of religion and to the sociology of medicine. "The generative question in sociology of religion and medical sociology is the problem of the body in society" (1996, p. 83).

In *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* Bourdieu (1984) attempted to "deconstruct" the notion of "taste" as a universal concept. Taste is loaded with socially constructed ideas of what is high and low status based on the middle-class socially constructed space, reality, and knowledge. For Bourdieu, social structures (class, race, and gender) are embodied. When we examine subjects, we are classifying not just their social world but also their social practices, which are carried out throughout their bodies. However, Bourdieu pointed out that we are classifying based on pre-existing classification systems that the observer cannot escape because s/he is also part of the classified world that others have classified for him/her. The body in modern times has become a symbol of power and position. What the body is able to do and achieve, such as work in a 8-to-5 job, exercise, leisure, read, and so forth, is indicative of what Bourdieu called *habitus*, where the body is located from multiple social structures. The

body then becomes an entity that maintains social inequalities. Social scientists classify, objectify, and gaze at bodies with their sociocultural, historical, and political dispositions. Much like his theory of education, in part, our bodies are entities that maintain or can transform social inequalities. It is through our bodies that social relationships are carried out.

For Bourdieu the management of the body is indicative of social class, status, and locations, as well as racial and gendered, sometimes intermixed and perhaps never static. In Bourdieu's work, bodies become a form of physical capital (Shilling, 1993).

In *Five Bodies* John O'Neill (1985) draws from the work of Merleau-Ponty to see the lived body as the communicative body. For O'Neill, the body is important because it experiences life. The body is seen as the medium for humans to live in the world.

The body is our general medium for having a world. Sometimes it is restricted to the actions necessary for the conservation of life, and accordingly it posits around us a biological world; at other times, elaborating upon these primary actions and moving from their literal to a figurative meaning, it manifests through them a core of new significance: this is true of motor habits such as dancing. Sometimes, finally, the meaning aimed at cannot be achieved by the body's natural means; it must then build itself and instrument, and it protects thereby around itself a cultural world. (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, p. 146, as cited in O'Neill, p. 17)

What O'Neill hoped was that social theory not forget about the lived body or the communicative body. His project was not only to examine how institutions think the body but how the body can rethink institutions. Turner (1996) and Shilling (1993) were also influenced by the phenomenology of the body and were careful to consider the lived body in their research.

The anthropologist Mary Douglas (1970) contributed to understanding of a socially constructed body. In *Natural Symbols* Douglas argued that the body is a symbol of society. On the body we can see the image of social systems at work. Our ideas of the body correspond with our ideas about society. The body then becomes a receptor of social meaning. The physical body is determined by the social body.

Anthony Synnott (1993) also worked within a framework that examines the body as a social construction. For Synnott, the body is “the prime symbol of the self, and the prime determinant of the self” (p. 2). He suggested that the body is also a symbol of society and that it is what we have as well as what we are. Therefore, the body is an object and subject at the same time. Synnott held that the body is an individual creation, a creation that is physical and phenomenological. The body is personal as well as the property of the state. His aim in *Symbolism, Self and Society* was to highlight how the body has been constructed through time in various ways by different populations. He stated that his thesis was to examine how “the body is constructed and why, and also why these constructions vary and change” (p. 1). Influenced by the work of Foucault, his agenda was to scrutinize the body as a historical creation and to witness how and why constructions of the body change through time.

The work of Erving Goffman (1963, 1969) has also influenced the social constructionist view of the body in sociology. His work on behavior and public and private places examined the location of the body in social relations. Goffman content that, through the management of the body, individuals interact and maintain social relations and social roles. This is evident in daily routines, leisure, work, and family life encounters. Encounters are important because it is in these situations that people play out specific roles, such as that of teacher, professor, principal, and so forth. Thus, for Goffman, the body is inextricably linked to social identity as well as self-identity.

Thomas Laqueur (1987, 1990) and Ludmilla Jordonava (1989) examined historical understandings of the body through time. The sex of the body has had multiple representations through time (Laqueur, 1990). Their examinations have helped to expose the gendered body as a new invention. For example, Laqueur (1987, 1990) posited that the body, until the 1700s, was seen as generic and having no gender. Even though the

body of the male was seen as the standard, the female body had the same parts of the male, just arranged in an inferior matter. It was not until the 1700s that naturalistic notions of the body took hold, regarding the stark distinction between the male and female bodies as a natural difference. It is this distinction that Jordonava argued has been used to outline the separate and distinct roles between men and women.

In *The Civilizing Process, Vol. 1* (1978) and *Vol. 2* (1982) Norbert Elias examined how the body has become a civilizing project. He used the term *civilizing* not in the traditional rationalist terms of progress and hierarchical connotations but in the way in which society's values and constructions have come to understand what civilized bodies should be and look like. For Elias, the body is unfinished and dependent on social contexts. Therefore, the body is not a rigid entity but rather fluid and ever changing.

Together, the abovementioned works have outlined and informed the sociology of the body. They have contributed to and researched the body as a social construction and a complex and changing entity. The works of Turner (1996) and Shilling (1993) are good examples of how contemporary social theory is renegotiating dualistic thinking. The body not only becomes a central focus but also becomes a resistance to rationalist and Cartesian thinking in the social sciences.

#### *Feminism(s) and the Queer Body*

The review of literature in this section explores the ideas of feminists and queer theorists who have examined and challenged rationalist ideas of the category of woman, gender, sexuality, and the body. This project benefits from such analysis because the site of investigation becomes the feminization of *the body* of the teacher, regardless of the physicality as female or male. The subjectivity of the teacher is not necessarily dependent upon his/her body as male or female. Queer theory is equally important to this

project. Queer theory seeks to defy static notions and definitions of subjectivity, identity, and sexuality. The feminist(s) works explored in this section fall under queer theory because they often engage in moments and spaces that call for a rethinking of current and dominant ideas of sexuality, identity, and subjectivity.

Contemporary postmodern/feminist and queer theorists engage in critical examinations of gender, sexuality, and the body (Butler, 1990, 1993; Grosz, 1994, 1995, 1999; Grosz & Probyn, 1995; Haraway, 1991; Martin, E., 1987; Sawicki, 1991; Shildrick, 1997; Singer, 1992; Spelman, 1982; Wittig, 1982; Zita, 1998). Critical examinations of rationalist categorizations such as gender and sexuality are important because they problematize and rupture traditional understandings of what gender and sexuality *is* and should *be*. The categories of gender and sexuality have limited possibilities for existing as humans. Postmodern feminist thought has challenged the category of women as it tends to produce a grand narrative account (Butler, 1990; Shildrick). Postmodern/poststructuralist feminist thought has been greatly influenced by French feminists such as Simone de Beauvoir, Helene Cixous, Luce Irigaray, and Julia Kristeva.

Largely ignored by American and British feminism during the mid-1970s (Moi, 1987), French feminism can now be seen as having a great influence on many of the American poststructuralist and postmodernist feminist writings and theory. French feminism was seen as too foreign and obscure by Anglo American feminists. Toril Moi best described this trepidation on the part of Anglo American feminists:

Where we [Americans] were empirical, they were theoretical; where we believed in the authority of experience, they questioned not only the category of experience, but even that of the “experiencer”—the female subject herself. If we were looking for a homogenous female tradition in art or history, they insisted that female writing could only never be visible in the gaps, contradictions or margins of patriarchal discourse. And when we were looking for women writers, they sought feminine writing, which, they confusingly claimed, could equally well be produced by men. No wonder, then, that the myth of the French as the dangerous

(or fascinating) Other rapidly became an all too common cliché of our own intellectual scene(s). (p. 5).

Kelly Oliver (2000) observed how French feminism has influenced and dialogued with Anglo American feminist in social and psychoanalytical theory. French feminism, although not an all coherent and unified theory, has moved away from traditional conversations of *nature* toward conversations of socially constructed categories of gender, sexuality, and sex roles, as can be seen in the works of Judith Butler (1990, 1993). According to Oliver, some French feminists are more concerned with “psyche structures and patriarchal colonization of the imaginary and culture” (pp. vii- viii). Further, French feminism, in particular the works of Luce Irigaray and Julia Kristeva, has examined the androcentric character of Western discourse that has limited or denied women’s ability to speak in any other way but through a masculinist voice (Sawicki, 1991). Thus ,a brief introduction to French feminism is important here.

In Simone de Beauvoir’s (1952) *The Second Sex* she questioned the notion of being born a woman and posited that we are made woman by patriarchal minds and creations. If we are made woman, then we can imagine gender and sex to be a social construction (see Butler, 1990). Monique Wittig (1982), Colette Guillaumin (1982), and Christine Delphy (2000) have examined the social construction of sex and race. This denaturalization of gender, sex, and race are important contributions to American feminist thought. It allows American feminist to question “natural” difference as a way to keep women or feminist politics oppressed.

Luce Irigaray (2000) has important challenges for feminists to contemplate. She problematized how sexual difference has been used to repress women. She challenged us to rethink the ethics of sexual difference and how it can be used to reimagine society. Julia Kristeva (1987) asked important questions regarding traditional maternal discourse, thereby opening a dialogue on the multiplicity that maternity can be. Further, Kristeva

(1986) critically examined the invariant system of sexual differentiation as well as how language is used to define us and how we define language. Helene Cixous wrote between literature, mythology, philosophy, and poetry (Alphonso, 2000). For Cixous, women need to write from the body in order to subvert phallogocentric reason. Cixous challenged us to rethink what is male and female. She contended that writing from the body is neither a male or female activity, but a form of giving without expecting anything in return. French feminism provided new ideas and perspectives for American and British feminists. Postmodern feminists and queer theorists extended their own perspectives and analysis of the body, gender, sexuality, and subjectivity from their readings of French feminists. The following works fall well under the broad categories of postmodern feminist and queer theory scholarship.

Elizabeth Grosz (2001) grappled with the question of architecture and the body. Her explorations examined how the body occupies and moves through space. She incorporated Luce Irigaray's (1993) claim that space and time have been constructed as oppositional forms. Space is feminine and time is masculine. This conceptualization of space and time renders space as the external

and extended positions and connections, and time as the field of internal and subjective positions and connections [and it is] already set up in such a way that space is defined as smooth, continuous, homogeneous, passive, and neutral, as that which has no folds, no complexity, no interiority or intensity of its own. It is already set up such that it morphologically reproduces the passive attributes of femininity. (Grosz, 2001, pp. 158-159)

According to Irigaray (1993), woman has functioned as the container and place for man. Woman then affords a place in which

man can situate himself as subject, which means that she represents a place that has no place, that has no place of its own but functions only as a place for another . . . the exchange: she gives him a world; he confines her in his. (Grosz, 2001, p. 159)



Judith Butler (1990), in *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, challenged the (Anglo American) feminist movement by positing the idea that perhaps the category of *women* is a limiting label. The notion that women can be wholly represented only acts as a normative discourse that attempts to restrict all the possibilities for being a woman. Feminist of color such as bell hooks (1984), Gloria Anzaldúa (1990), and Patricia Hill Collins (1998) have also contested American feminists for usurping experiences and piling it under the broad category of women. The argument is well founded as the experiences, positions, and the lives of those women who are not White and middle class are denied and marginalized (Anzaldúa, 1990; Collins; hooks, 1984).

Hence, for Butler, feminist investigations should not use the subject of women as primary source to advance feminist politics. Perhaps Butler is right to ask us to rethink the category of women. “Feminist critique ought to also understand how the category of woman, the subject of feminism, is produced and restrained by the very structures of power through which emancipation is sought” (1990, p. 20). She suggested rather having a feminist project that would have the category of women nowhere presumed. This has serious implications for the body. If the category of women is nowhere presumed, then what makes a woman or the study feminist? Obviously, this challenges the fact the women or men have a true sex or gender that determines who they are, as Butler argued. The body of *man* or *woman* is a social construction. Gender and sex act as performative discourses. That is, woman acts out a set of learned behaviors that are internalized and seen as feminine. The same is true for men. Even gender transgressors exhibit/act out certain characteristics that are deemed feminine or masculine.

In *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* Butler (1993) explored how the physicality and materiality of bodies are represented by social constructions of

gender and sexuality. Butler problematized essentialist understanding of subjectivity and questioned whether subjectivity can possibly be thought of outside the perimeters of critical deconstruction. If matter (body) is unsettled, then perhaps this may lead to “new ways for bodies to matter” (p. 30). Similarly, Elizabeth Grosz (1994) in *Volatile Bodies* denied the “real” body as well as the cultural and historical representations of the body. Her goal was to demonstrate how cultural and historical representations constitute bodies and help reproduce them as real and material.

I hope to show that the body, or rather bodies cannot be adequately understood as ahistorical, precultural, or natural objects in any simple way; they are not only inscribed, but marked, engraved, by social pressures external to them but are the products, the direct effects, of the very social constitution of nature itself. It is not simply that the body is represented in a variety of ways according to historical, social, and cultural exigencies while it remains basically the same; these factors actively produce the body as a body of a determinant part. (p. x)

Margrit Shildrick (1997) echoed the concerns of Butler and Grosz. In *Leaky Bodies and Boundaries* Shildrick challenged the concept of *real* bodies. For Shildrick, the materiality of bodies is loaded with cultural constructions and she therefore contended that it is impossible to access a pure corporeal state. To make her point, she recalled Gayatri Spivak (1988): “There are thinkings of the systematicity of the body, there are value codings of the body. The body, as such, cannot be thought” (p. 149). Shildrick contended that bodies are always changing and are known by “environmental processes and by power, but given to us only in our texts” (p. 15). Shildrick, influenced by Foucault, posited that the different body texts can be read or examined through a genealogy of the body. Like Shildrick and Butler, Grosz (1995) insisted that bodies cannot be known outside of their subjectivity.

Corporeality can be seen as the material condition of subjectivity, and the subordinated term in the opposition, can move to its rightful place in the very heart of the dominant term, mind . . . . By body I understand a concrete, material animate organization of flesh, organs, nerves, and skeletal structure, which are given a unity, cohesiveness, and form through the psychical and social inscription of the body’s surface. (pp 103-104)

In other words, the body becomes real after social inscriptions through language, discourse, and knowledge/power are imprinted on the body.

Donna Haraway (1991) also challenged bodies as material and real by positing that bodies do not necessarily have to be of the flesh. She blurred the physicality and materiality of the body. In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women* Haraway contended that a cyborg, a hybrid creature that is machine and organism, is the new body. The cyborg is both lived experience and fiction. This new conception changes what counts as women's experience in the late 20th century. She claimed that we are all cyborgs, chimeras, "theorized and fabricated hybrids of machine and organism; in short we are cyborgs" (p. 150). The idea of the cyborg would allow, as Butler (1990) suggested, to be engaged in a feminist project where the category of woman is nowhere presumed. Instead, the cyborg, a mythical and real organism/machine, would transgress boundaries and allow dangerous possibilities for feminist and liberatory politics to explore.

Emily Martin (1987), Denise Riley (1988), and Elizabeth Spelman (1982) examined how bodies are imagined in society. Martin's project was to deconstruct bodies and to show how conceptions of the body have allegiance to cultural shifts in scientific and technological regimes of truth. Her genealogical investigation explored how these rifts create bodies. Riley asserted that the category of women has not always been stable or constant. Only at times will the body of man or woman be identified only through the sexed body. Riley claimed that the body "is never above or below history" (p. 104). Therefore, we cannot know the body outside cultural and historical contexts. Spelman took up philosophy's phallogocentric core and examined how the beliefs of philosophers equated women to the body. She concluded that philosophers' ideas and attitudes about the body ultimately shaped and informed the constructions of women,

and she stated that bodies can be conceptualized and then be categorized by those who have power or access to name in society.

Grosz and Probyn (1995) put queer methodology to work as they examined bodies as social constructions. Their edited book is a collection of possibilities for the body. The book is about becoming and not just being. The collected essays struggle with rigid definitions of sexy bodies and challenge established notions of bodies. *Sexy Bodies* is about acknowledging “the disquieting effect of sexuality as it spills the boundaries of its proper containment” (p. xi). Sexuality, like bodies, is examined with a critical lens to allow for it to roam free and become with no determined destination. The collected essays also explore beyond the traditional dichotomy imposed on investigations of the body as either docile or resistant.

In *Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self* McNay (1992) argued that Foucault’s theory of power and body allows feminists to remove the body from the margins and allocate it at the “center of explanations of women’s oppression that does not fall back into essentialism or biologism” (p. 11). She highlighted how Foucault developed his theory of the self without “recourse to psychoanalytic theory . . . at the most fundamental level, most psychoanalytical models posit a basic sense of self which is constituted at an early age and continues into adult life cutting across division of race, class and ethnicity” (p. 9). She contended that this makes Foucault’s work intriguing. A critical contribution that Foucault’s theory of the body has made to feminist thought is a way of imagining the body as a “concrete phenomenon without eliding its materiality with a fixed biological or prediscursive essence” (p. 17).

Similarly, in *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power and the Body* Jana Sawicki (1991) attempted to merge Foucauldian thought and feminism. She attempted to make connections between Foucault’s work and feminists’ projects. She thus engaged in

a genealogical investigation of mothering theories. Central to her project were questions such as, “When did the idea of mother as an emotional nurturer emerge? When did the idea of women’s status as reproducer prevail?” (p. 13). Genealogical investigations are important to feminists. “Genealogy as resistance involves using history to give voice to the marginal and submerged voices [bodies] which lie a ‘little beneath history’—the voices of the mad, the delinquent, the abnormal, the disempowered” (p. 28).

In *Erotic Welfare* Judith Butler and Maureen MacGrogan (1992) presented the collected essays by Linda Singer. Singer was mostly concerned with the ways in which medicine and juridical discourse interplay with women’s bodies. She examined how the logic of contagion and the fear of AIDS ultimately contributed to regulating bodies and pleasures. In “Disciplining Pleasures” (1992) Singer wrote:

One of the historically specific consequences of the sexual epidemic has been the emergence of a managerial calculus in which pleasure is evaluated not within a differential economy of rights, privileges, and relative utilities which has been dominant in liberal logic since utilitarianism, but in the more highly charged and hysterically invested currency of life and death, health and disease. (p. 63)

Important here is the regulation of bodies through discourse. Foucault contended that it is not important to ask or to know why we do the things we do, but to know or ask what what we do does. Thus, Singer answered Foucault’s concern by highlighting that, even though it is important to be aware of the epidemics, awareness (discourse) forms or enters into power relations with our bodies.

Jacquelyn Zita (1998) imagined bodies as caught up in the contemporary tensions of modernism, postmodernism, feminist, and queer theory. In *Body Talk* Zita posited that the body is “a sturdy but fragile thing, a historical matter of political struggle” (p. 4). Thus, the body is not above or below history but inextricably tied to history. She challenged the reader to imagine new ways of thinking about sexuality and the body. The male lesbian, the lesbian femfire, and the omnisexual nomad are just examples of

how Zita flirted with categories to rethink the strict and limited boundaries placed on what is deemed normal heterosexual bodies. An example of how to rethink this limited tradition is in her examination the works of Chicana lesbian feminist Gloria Anzaldúa. “Anzaldúan body, unlike the Cartesian body, breaks into history, geography, race memory, political struggle and ancient practices of the flesh. Her writing returns to matters of the body through an evolution of non-Cartesianized discourse” (p. 164).

*Border Bodies: Chicana Feminism*

Because our work has been ignored by the men and women in charge of the modes of cultural production, we must be innovative in our search. Hegemony has so constructed the ideas of method and theory that often we cannot recognize anything that is different from what the dominant discourse constructs. As a consequence, we have to look in nontraditional places for our theories. (Saldivar-Hull, 2000, p. 46)

Chicana feminism is situated in the interstices of colonizer and colonized (Anzaldúa, 1987), a postcolonial moment, perhaps. I cannot have a discussion on the body without at least contemplating how Chicana feminists have used the body as a medium to theorize my search for a “non-traditional place,” as Saldivar-Hull (2000) suggested. It is important because these voices have traditionally been ignored and marginalized not only from the feminist movement but from feminist theorizing as well (Anzaldúa, 1990; Moraga, 1983; Moya, 1997; Saldivar-Hull). Although this project could be well defined under the broad term of *postmodernism*, I use postmodernism as a way to facilitate a space and moment where multiple perspectives, including contradictory ones, can dialogue and be explored. Some would claim that Chicana feminism is realist and grounded in essentialist notions of race, gender, and class, and thus irrevocably foundationalist (Moya). Others contend that Chicana theorizing, spaces, and bodies have potential for identity, subjectivity, and sexuality subversions (Haraway, 1991). For the purpose of this project I take the liberty to invoke a Chicana feminism that performs the latter. With some trepidation I attempt to explore how Chicana

feminist works have implications for theorizing about and through the body. This disclaimer is to acknowledge the difficulty and complexity of interpreting deeply personal texts such as those written by Chicana feminists. My intention is to look for those uncharted spaces that are often neglected in feminist(s) projects.

I begin with the pedagogy of Gloria Anzaldúa. Her work (em)bodies theory and adds flesh and movement to the stoic bones of theory. Carnality is not only read but felt by all senses through her writings. She sews back together mind and body, defying the Cartesian mind and body split that has for too long reigned in modernist and enlightenment minds. Anzaldúa is able to combine geography, history, poetics, spirituality, different languages, and experiences to create possibilities for new theories. Although her work centers race, class, religion, and gender and she takes on a specific location as a lesbian of color, colonizer/colonized of a bastard race *mestiza*-origin(White-Spaniard, Indian), in her work moments and spaces of ambiguity and uncertainty and subversion are numerous and important. In *Making Face, Making Soul* Anzaldúa (1990) conjured an image of theory made of flesh. For Anzaldúa, to theorize is to make face, *caras*.

For me, hacienda *caras* has the added connotation of making *gestos subversivos*, political subversive gestures, the piercing look that questions and challenges. . . . “Face” is the surface of the body that is most noticeably inscribed by social structures, marked with instructions on how to be *mujer*, macho, working class, Chicana. As *mestizas*-biologically and/or culturally mixed—we have different surfaces for each aspect of identity, each inscribed by a particular subculture. We are “written” all over, or should I say, carved and tattooed with the sharp needle of experience. (1990, p. xv)

Here, to make theory, face is to be subversive. But it is the face and body that have been carved on through/with discourses that enable her to produce theory. The power of dominant discourses like patriarchy, capitalism, and homophobia interact with the Chicana body to produce various forms of resistance, identities, and subjectivities. Thus, through these needle-piercing experiences, identities, subjectivities, and

sexualities have the potential to push imposed borders and allow them to be fluid and fragmented. Through the body of *la mestiza*, Anzaldúa contended that dominant discourse can and should be challenged. In *Borderlands, La Frontera: The New Mestiza* she wrote:

The work of *mestiza* consciousness is to break down the subject-object duality that keeps her prisoner and to show in the flesh and through the images in her work how duality is transcended. The answer to the problem between the white race and the colored, between males and females, lies in healing the split that originates in the very foundation of our lives, our culture, our languages, our thoughts. A massive uprooting of dualistic thinking in the individual and collective consciousness is the beginning of a long struggle, but one that could, in our best hopes, bring us to the end of rape, of violence, of war. (1987, p. 80)

This is almost a *mestiza* manifesto, so to speak. What *mestiza* consciousness has the potential to perform is to act and seek out moments and spaces where identities are blurred. The Western-determined and -defined lines of what is male and female, White race and colored race, would not be demarcated but rather fragmented, zigzagged. Does *la mestiza* forget who she is and get lost in the struggle? Perhaps, but that is exactly what she seeks: a body that does not have to perform according to what is expected. “I want the freedom to carve and chisel my own face, to staunch the bleeding ashes, to fashion my own gods out of my entrails . . . with my own lumber, my own bricks and mortar and my own feminist architecture” (1987, p. 22). It is through the body that Anzaldúa can achieve her own identity-face, entrails.

In *Loving in the War Years: Lo Que Nunca Paso Por Sus Labios* Cherie Moraga (1983) explored, through an autobiographical journey, her personal struggles with race, class, gender, and culture. For Moya, “Her ‘theory in the flesh’ is derived from, although not uniformly determined by, the ‘physical realities’ of her life, her ‘social location’” (p. 150). The body in her work is always present, ignored but present. For example, she discussed how her chronic back pain and the pain that she felt from the pressures for speaking for others culminated in producing her works.



The issue of being a “movement writer” is altogether different. Sometimes I feel my back will break from the pressure I feel to speak for others. A friend of mine told me once how no wonder I had called the first book I co-edited (with Gloria Anzaldúa), “This Bridge Called My Back.” *You have chronic back trouble*, she says. Funny I had never considered this most obvious connection, all along my back giving me constant pain. And the spot that hurts the most is the muscle that controls the movement of my fingers and hands while typing. I feel it now straining at my desk (author’s emphasis; p. v)

In *Building with Our Hands: New Directions in Chicana Studies* editors Adela de la Torre and Beatriz M. Pesquera (1993) compiled a critical anthology by Chicana feminists that explored and contested resistance, representation, sexuality, gender, and class. These are examples of how Chicana feminists are attempting to theorize, challenge, and construct subjectivities-bodies. Antonia Castañeda examined the sexual violence that drove the politics and policies of conquest on Amerindian women and the Spanish conquest of Alta California. Similar to postcolonial examinations, Castaneda highlighted how the relationship between sexual violence, racist ideology, and the discourse of conquest merged to construct power over the bodies of Amerindian women.

Angie Chabram scrutinized Chicana subjectivity. She deconstructed the hegemonic and androcentric tendencies of Chicana politics, much like poststructuralist feminists expose the Western male voice in cultural production of theory, history, science, and other disciplines. Emma Perez (1999) challenged oppressive and limiting socially constructed notions of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality, using French feminism, especially that of Luce Irigaray, as a starting point.

Deena Gonzalez explored how subjectivities are negotiated and reinvented. For example, she grappled with the intersections of colonization and subjectivities and she problematized victimization by challenging us to reconsider the fatalistic approach that is often seen in dominant discourse. She posited that the subjectivities of women constructed by and through colonization are reconciled in their own terms. Dominant

power(s) and knowledge(s) are thus seen as interacting with, as opposed to determining, the lives of women.

In Cindy Cruz's *Towards an Epistemology of the Brown Body* (2001) she explored the importance of centering the brown body in educational research. Her re-reading of Gloria Anzaldúa and Cherrie Moraga allowed her to address the "absence and elusiveness of the body in educational research" (p. 657). She highlighted how the brown body is regulated and governed in schools. These bodies are seen as wild and need of constant surveillance. They are the "other" that must be made docile and compliant.

Carla Trujillo's *Living Chicana Theory* (1998) is a critical and important compilation of the type of work being produced by Chicana feminists. It explores "Chicana consciousness, theory, and practice in ways not spoken of before" (p. 14). Women are centered in these pieces, but not through essentialist's claims of who is the *mestiza*, *Chicana*, and *the* collective experience of *la mujer Latina*, rather as the multiplicity of *posibilidades* for the Chicana and *mestiza*. The pieces in this book give *el cuerpo de la Chicana* a voice and language to be heard, to challenge, deconstruct, and reconstruct theory.

Emma Perez's work in the *Decolonial Imaginary* is an example of how Chicana feminist work is expanding and diversifying. Through a historical analysis of Mexico during the 1900s she excavated the bodies of Mexican women who for too long had been buried. Perez (1999) coined the phrase the *decolonial imaginary* to create a space where power is not all encompassing but is balanced, rejected, and reconstructed in our lives. The image of the decolonial introduces the scholarship that is attempting to create more decolonial spaces.

### *Postcolonial Bodies*

Although postcolonial theory does not address the body directly, it does refer to a “methodology of revisionism which enables a wholesale critique of Western structures of knowledge and power, particularly those of the post-Enlightenment period” (Mongia, 1996, p. 2). I plan to use its language/discourse as just another way to add multiple perspectives and critique to the study.

The term *postcolonial* is a problematic one. Just like *poststructuralism* and *postmodernism*, it has multiple meanings and implications when used, not to mention that it is highly criticized (Viruru & Cannella, 2000). In this study the term *postcolonial* is used as providing another voice in the language of critique. As Cannella and Bailey (1999) have argued, postcolonial scrutiny and insights could have potential for influencing educational research, perhaps even challenging Western constructions of research. An important insight that postcolonial theory could add to the project is examining how teachers’ bodies are positioned as colonizers but are themselves colonized through educational discourse. Schools have been set up to “tame” and “civilize” younger human beings, especially those who represent White middle class values (McLaren, 1994; Spring, 1997). However, as Spivak (1996, 1999) contended, we should not negate the agency of humans by setting them up as dichotomous figures such as *colonizer* and *colonized*. Therefore, postcolonial theory perspectives in this project are intended to add to the complexity of examining power, discourse, and bodies, thereby avoiding simple descriptions and binary analysis. Postcolonial critique in this project signifies a position against Eurocentric and imperialistic tendencies in education. Teachers encounter these forms of disciplining pedagogies on their bodies every day.

*Postcolonialism* is a term that has been debated greatly (Aidoo, 1991; Gandhi, 1998). De Alva (1995) argued that it is beneficial to reconsider current understandings of

postcolonial as the end of colonial rule and the beginning of new era, but rather to think of it as the present struggles that question and problematize the legacies that colonial rule left behind. However, as Loomba (1998) cautioned, colonization was not a simple process. A clash between colonizer and colonized knowledge (re)produced both colonizer and colonized knowledges, making it difficult to tease out where colonizer knowledge intrudes and where it meshes with colonized knowledge. This is reminiscent of Foucault's (1977) concept of power relations in which power does not belong to anyone or any thing but rather is pervasive and interrelational.

According to Musa Dube (2002), postcolonialism theories originated with the emergence of Western empires during the 18th to 20th centuries. Western empires anxiously wanted to divide the world among themselves. "The strategies of subjugation, resistance engendered by colonialism, and the chain of reactions that have been in motion ever since" define postcolonialism (p. 101). Dube pointed out how postcolonial theories attempt to examine and highlight the complex nature of imperialism.

Postcolonial theories . . . seek to understand the complex construction of the colonized and the colonizer: how history, geography, anthropology, travel writing, navigation, novel writing, Christian missions, and more concurred on proclaiming the superiority of the West, and how they concurred on converting the world to Western patterns of thought, religion, education, economy, and culture. [Further, they examine] the various strategies adopted by colonized nations to resist this domination, to decolonize their own lands, minds, and to charter their own liberation as well as to propose better, more just form of international relations. (p. 102)

Of further interest is Said's (1996) argument of how discursive practices of colonization created new identities. For example, European colonization created the concept of "Orientalism." It was constructed through the European's observations and understandings of those whom they were colonizing. This construction was not an accident; it served a purpose. Said discusses how it produced a relationship of domination and "varying degrees of a complex hegemony" (p. 24).

Postcolonial scholarship in educational research is limited (Cannella & Bailey, 1999); however, important work has been produced in which issues and concerns of postcolonialism and education are discussed. For example, Hewett (1996) examined her lived experience as a native Hawaiian educator. Thirugnanam (1996) explored children's conceptions of race and ethnicity. Cannella and Viruru (2004) discussed the ways in which the field of early childhood is potentially a colonizing space and discourse. Educators and teachers seem to be caught at the intersections of the colonial project. The colonial project is channeled through their bodies.

What does a colonial project entail? Gandhi (1998) argued that the colonial project was far more than mere physical force. It also included a push toward cultural enlightenment and reform. Educators often speak of the need to create in students the desire of life-long learning, a sort of enlightenment of the mind that must be taught in order to create in students the need for learning. Loomba (1998) described colonial rule as systematically altering the world views of colonized people. Although such rule was first enacted physically, it soon was formally and informally institutionalized, thereby creating colonialists' desires and needs in indigenous people long after physical colonization ended. Cahan, Mechling, Sutton-Smith, and White (1993) and Tobin (1997) suggested that the discourse of need in education creates power for those in position to dictate the needs of others. This is just one example of how educational discourse has a colonizing potential to construct needy bodies.

Lafeber (1963, 1993) suggested that American imperialism did not engage in a physical takeover of nations because it was deemed ineffective and costly; rather, American imperialism colonized by encouraging a liaison of economic interests. Through notions of American democracy, economic liberalism and capitalism nations are encouraged to partake and expand their horizons in order to have the illusive

“American dream.” In schools the hegemonic idea that education is the savior to economic and cultural problems is one way to colonize those who do not already adhere to such views. Certainly, this is not only language; it has bodily expectations and modifications to perform in order for bodies to comply with such thinking (Boldt, 2001; Phelan, 1997). Viruru and Cannella (2000) have posited that the European-American agenda for education might inadvertently be a venue for the new form of colonization. With the growing number of brown-skinned immigrants coming to the United States, a more effective way to colonize them is not through the physical (although this inadvertently happens) but through the discourse of education as savior.

Another important issue that emerges in postcolonial scholarship (although not limited to postcolonial theory; see Kristeva, 1991) is the creation of the “other.” Bhabba (1996) examined the way in which colonization not only constructed the concept of the indigenous as the “other” but also constructed the indigenous as lacking agency, thereby legitimizing colonists’ control and regulation. This can also be seen in education: Students are the “others” who must be controlled and regulated (Cannella, 1997).

The Western constructions of time and space are also key issues in postcolonial perspectives (Mohanran, 1999; Smith, 1999). Smith contended that space was/is defined for colonized people. She pointed out that in many languages there is no word for the construction of space. According to Smith, space is objectified in the West and, therefore, it is controllable with what she called *spatial vocabulary of colonialism*. She explained that the vocabulary of space is threefold: the line, the center, the outside. The line was utilized to show the boundaries of colonial power. To express the need to support the colonial power, the center was an important idea. The outside was created to position those who do not exist. These ideas can be seen in the schools (Viruru & Cannella, 2000). Students and teachers are also regulated by the concept of space. They

are relegated to their classrooms and, within those classrooms, space is even more defined and controlled (Johnson, J. E., Christie, & Yawkey, 1999; Moore, 1987; Neumann & Roskos, 1993). Time is another Western construction used to control and regulate students and teachers. This can be seen in the enforcement of daily schedules (Viruru & Cannella). Smith contended that time is of essence in Western minds and is seen as lacking in indigenous populations. Students (and even teachers) are seen as lacking any concept of time and therefore they must adhere to daily schedules so that learning can occur (Nespor, 1994, 1997).

In a different vein, Mohanran (1999) discussed the concept of space and women. For Mohanran, women's bodies are not only racial, cultural, social, and historically encoded; they are also spatially encoded. She posited that woman ultimately represents the nation space, that women's bodies function "as mediator for the male citizen to experience the landscape and the nation as the nurturing, comforting and familiar" (p. 83). Teachers embody this landscape as they nurture and comfort students to participate and perpetuate Western colonizing and patriarchal ideals (Grumet, 1988). Mohanran encouraged examination of women's role and connected it to her history while at the same time investigating within that nation/culture constructions of sexuality and gender.

The body has become a central site of investigation as well as a contested terrain. These epistemologies examine the body for a variety of different reasons. It is a powerful way to decenter Cartesian thinking in philosophy, thought, and culture.

### **Disciplining Bodies as Education**

The epistemologies of the body in educational research examine the ways in which the body has been constructed, monitored, controlled, and resisted in education and in other pedagogical settings and moments. (Bailey, 1998; Boldt, 2001; Fine, 1993;

Leavitt, 1991; Leavitt & Power, 1997; Nespor, 1994; O'Farrell et al., 2000; Phelan, 1997; Silin, 1995, 1997; Tobin, 1997). O'Farrell et al. argued that, even though schooling aims to strip students and teachers of their bodies, the body is always present—marginalized but present. We have not completely vivisected the student from the body because in schools and in society we spend a great deal of time and energy trying to discipline, control, and contain it (Bailey; Boldt; Leavitt & Power; Nespor; Phelan). Anything associated with the body in education is also suspect, such as sexuality, pleasures, desires, and eros, and must be regulated (Fine; Phelan; Richardson, 1997; Tobin).

These epistemologies use the regulation of the body as the primary focus of examination. Their work draws heavily from sociology of the body, poststructuralist, postmodern, feminist, and queer theory perspectives. The body as a focus of educational research attempts to reject the strict boundaries and the bifurcation of the mind/body. Centering the body in educational research is important in three ways. First, it challenges scientific discourses and constructions of the child/teacher dichotomy. Second, it reveals how inextricably intertwined the body and pedagogy are in education. Third, it investigates how power relations are created in and out of education through the regulation of the body. A reconsideration of the curriculum and bodily expectation can be contemplated as multiple possibilities are generated for students and teachers in relation to teaching and learning.

In schools it is not uncommon to see lines of children standing still and teachers waiting for students to get quiet, asking children to sit down, requesting that they keep their hands to themselves, praising those who look “ready,” reprimanding those who do not, asking them to be still, demanding that they use the restroom and get a drink water at a certain time, and so forth. These mini scenarios are enacted every day in the schools.



Even I expected my third grade students to be still while I was introducing something new or giving what I deemed to be important instructions. Too much movement in the classroom is seen as students not engaged in learning. Education obsesses with the spaces, movements, and bodies of students.

*Bifurcating Body and Mind*

Boldt (2001), Nespor (1997), Phelan (1997), and Macrine (2002) claimed that schools work hard to separate the mind from the body. This Cartesian dualism is pervasive throughout school settings. Grounded in the modern belief of a bifurcated world, students are seen as incomplete, immature, and savages, or completely opposite of the adult, who is self-contained, reflexive, ordered, rational, and male (Cannella, 1997). The child must have the “right” bodily experiences so that s/he can develop into a mature adult body. Therefore, the student’s body is a constant target for surveillance and control by teachers, administrators, other child experts, and curriculum designers (Bailey, 1998; Boldt; Leavitt & Power, 1997). The student’s body must be disciplined to fit a civilized and ordered world (Leavitt & Power). School staffs persistently struggle to teach the student not only abstract concepts associated with the mind, such as mathematics, reading, and writing, but also struggle to teach the listening, intellectual, respectful, and maturing body.

Boldt (2001) contended that educators determine the success or failure of the student according to how the student’s body moves. Evidently, the body that is most still and attentive to the teachers’ lessons, demands, and instructions is seen as the most successful body. It is held that, if a child is not in control of his/her body, then s/he is not learning and developing. In schools, bodies seem to interfere with academic learning. Therefore, more or less than 70% of the time spent in school is actually spent in disciplining bodies (Weinstein & Mignano, 1993, p. 97). Bolt stated that this has serious

implications in how the student is perceived as a success or failure. If the motionless body is the most successful, then the opposite is true for the “wild” body of the child; that child is seen as a failure.

Boldt’s (2001) argument is of further importance in relation to the role of power relations and how they are enacted in education. She contended that disciplining the student’s body surpasses the obvious notion that educators engage in repressing the child’s body. The persistent obsession with how students move, position themselves, and make themselves aware of the incongruence between required actions and their physical needs and desires functions as “a central site for the enactment of power relations” (p. 94). Leavitt (1991) also observed how schools teach children how to disregard their own needs and desires and to learn to prefer external control and discipline. Boldt contended that this allows a space for children and families to comply and seek the advice of the experts as far as to what “good” children should look like and be doing in schools. The child experts, educators, and even curriculum designers then create power over the knowledge and experiences of the student and his/her family (Cannella, 1997).

Implications for race and class are also considered in Boldt’s (2001) thesis. Since success and failure in schools are indicative of race and class, it is not surprising that a majority of poor and minority children seem not to be capable of disciplining themselves in school as do the majority of privileged children. Minority (racial and poor) children are constructed as the “other,” who are wild, unruly and in need of intervention. Hence, there is an overidentification of African Americans in special education programs. Thus, the constant surveillance and regulation of the body is not color blind and may have more of tighter grip on the poor and colored bodies. These observations echo Bourdieu’s (1984) ideas on physical capital.

### *Regulating Space and Bodies*

Spaces must also be controlled in education. According to Nesor (1997), in order to look at how the body experiences life, we must first examine the process that organizes people in space and time. Nesor (1994) argued that the student's body is subject and objects of organization of spaces and time. Bodies not only have to be controlled; they have to be taught how to spread across space and time. Based on his 2-year ethnographic study, Nesor (1997) pointed out how the students perceived the space of school (inside) and the space outside. The body that is in the confined space of the school is the body that is monitored and controlled. The body that is outside is free to express and move. This quote from one of his students reflects the dichotomous meaning of the inside/outside spaces: "It's almost time to get out of school. That means I'll get to play outside anytime I want. And I won't be stuck in a stupid windowless room without going outside" (Nesor, 1997, p. 120). For this student, being inside the classroom or school constricts her movement and feeling of freedom, and being outside is synonymous to moving and being in control of her desires.

As students in Nesor's (1997) study got older, spaces began to be identified not only by their bodies and embodied activities but also by their position in the "formal, abstract bureaucracies and markets" (p. 121). Bodies are sites where complex constructs such as race, gender, and class intersect with politics and organizational fields. These forces carve, shape, direct, and instill bodies to certain frameworks, beliefs, and dispositions that take them from one activity to the next across time (Nesor, 1994). In other words, it is through our bodies that we carry and move these social constructions from space to space in very predefined ways (Fiske, 1989). Students and adults are considered deviant when they do not conform to the bodily expectations (as well as gender, race, and maturity expectations) that are supposed to be carried out through their

bodies. For example, when gender bending occurs in the classroom, heterosexist and homophobic responses reinforce and exert normalizing techniques to reinscribe societal expectations of normal and abnormal gender and sexual behaviors (Boldt, 1997).

Nespor (1997) used Certeau's (1984) concept of body as generator of space or object in space to explain the impact of schooling on students. Certeau's concept of the body is twofold. On the one hand is the body as experienced from atop a skyscraper; the body observes the city from a detached perspective, and bodies become objects easily movable, like game pieces. On the other hand is the body as experienced through the senses; the city is felt, bodies move, desire, and feel pleasure, pain, and passion. Nespor asserted that schools attempt to vivisect students from their bodies so that they become the detached observer from the top of the skyscraper. The student becomes the object of space, as opposed to the generator of space. Being the generator of spaces is equated to childish immaturity, whereas being the object of space is an extension into adulthood. In other words, the body that feels is childish where as the body that is detached is mature, adult. Cannella's (1997) observation of the clear distinction that is often constructed as truth about and between adult and child is clearly reaffirmed in Certeau's skyscraper metaphor. One way to send students to the top of the skyscraper is to regulate and control their bodies ("educate" them).

### *Civilizing Bodies*

Civilizing the body is also part of, if not, *the* curriculum. Leavitt and Power (1997) posited that how a child is thought of and treated, and how the body experiences life, is indicative of the contemporary social, political, cultural, and historical construction of the child (Leavitt, 1991; Power, 1992). Leavitt and Power's works focus on how caregivers overmanage the space and bodies of children. Because the child's body is seen as disruptive and in need of correction, the role of the teacher is that of

civilizing the body to fit the norms and societal expectations over the well-being of the child. Leavitt and Power (1997) held that civilizing the body translates into constant regulation, control, and constraints of the body and bodily expression. Younger human beings are seen as not holding the behavior norms of society and thus are constantly breaking the rules. Caregivers are there to make sure that young children learn how to control their bodies. They are there to civilize. This includes teaching children through the hidden curriculum (McLaren, 1994) the norms, conventions, and standards that should be evident in their body. A body that is self-contained, self-regulated, and self-controlled is the civilized body.

In writing about the body, Leavitt and Power (1997) made the point to connect the body to the self; the physical body is the self (Sartre, 1956; Synnott, 1993). The self that is reflexive, social, emotional, and moral is contained within the body, not outside of it. Social identity and self-identity are mediated by and through the body (Leavitt & Power). The process of civilizing or disciplining students' bodies inadvertently shapes, molds, and defines their identities as well.

According to Leavitt and Power's (1997) research in day care centers, the body of the child is disciplined not only through direct control of how the child moves about the classroom but also through the use of time. Young children and older students as well must adhere to the daily time schedules and agendas of teachers. These time chunks become, as Leavitt and Power contended, regimes. Time is of essence for teachers; therefore, the day is broken into time chunks. There is instructional time, snack time, bathroom time, play time, and nap time. Any mixtures of these are seen as disrupting the order and schedule of the classroom. Therefore, as Leavitt and Power suggested, transition time is critical in day care. Performing an activity at the right time is so engrained into the children that even they began to internalize the temporal order of the

day care. This allows for teachers to have tight control of the physical needs of the child. Foucault (1978) held that this regulation of the child's life in school is disciplinary time. Consequently, the child even begins to regulate self and peers.

### **Disciplining Teachers: Regulating Work and Bodies**

“To understand the female body in the present culture is to critically apprehend the way oppression is not merely imposed, but an act of participation by those who are oppressed” (Shapiro, 1999, p. 60).

It is no great mystery that the work of teachers is constantly regulated, controlled, and under surveillance (Acker, 1983, 1994, 1999; Apple, 1986; Grumet, 1988; Smyth, 2001). Teachers face a tremendous transformation that attempts to control and regulate their work. The scholars cited herein have challenged current and past educational reforms that perpetuate the low status position that is afforded to teaching as well as the loss of autonomy that is increasing in the field. Further, students are not the only ones who enter the institution of schooling. Like the bodies of students, the bodies of teachers are also dissected from the mind (Bailey, 1998; Macrine, 2002; Phelan, 1997). In this section I review the literature that focuses on the issues surrounding the regulation of the work, bodies, and subjectivities of teachers.

#### *Regulating and Controlling the Field*

Teaching has been largely examined, documented, and discussed as a gendered and classed profession (Acker, 1983, 1989; Apple, 1986, Danylewycz & Prentice, 1984). Critical examinations of the field of teaching have shown the field of teaching as gendered because it has traditionally been peopled by women, not to mention thought of and constructed as a woman's sphere and a feminine space (Grumet, 1988). Marxist examinations have also highlighted the classed space that teaching occupies. It is classed because teaching, like many blue and pink collar jobs, has experienced tremendous

proletarianization (Apple, 1986). That is, teaching has become a less autonomous profession, where control is exerted from the outside.

Apple (1986) contended that teachers face the same loss of control that is experienced by other workers and people of color. Women are more likely to face proletarianization than men. Because teaching is by far made up of women, it has experienced what most female-occupied professions face: It has been deskilled. Apple offered explanations for the proletarianization of teaching: (a) the sexist system of hiring and promotion, (b) the overall tendency to de-emphasize the importance of the working conditions under which women labor, and (c) the historical conditions of the feminization of teaching and its ties to domesticity over time.

Engvall (1997) questioned the validity of equating teaching with a profession. He contended that teaching does not have the same privileges as the medical and law professions. Teachers' work is externally controlled; to keep trying to equate is futile. Similarly, Kanpol (1997) examined the gender contradictions found in the discourse of professionalism. For example, he discussed the gentle, nurturing, and caring teacher who is also expected to be the disciplinarian who keeps constant control of her students. She must be the professional who must be "objective, disciplinarian, managerial and detached" (p. 69). Cannella (1997) critically questioned the aims and purpose of the construction of professionalism in teaching. Calling teaching a profession is a way to control those who do not fall in the category of children and families. But it also controls and regulates those within. "The discourse of professionalism has constructed concepts of normality that internally discipline the self-perceptions of teachers" (p. 154).

For some scholars these are questions and concerns that should be addressed in the education of teachers so that future teachers are aware of the sociocultural, historical, and political conditions of schooling (Curtis & Rasool, 1997; Demas & Saavedra, 1999;

Giroux, 1996; Giroux & McLaren, 1986; Kincheloe, 1993; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Liston & Zeichner, 1996; Martin, R. J., 1995; Zeichner, Melnick, & Gomez, 1996). At the same time, this realization falls prey to how teacher education is conceptualized. Controlling and regulating teacher education is just part of the same dynamics that are played out in the public schools. Liston and Zeichner, as well as Tom (1997), examined how teacher education has undergone the same regimentation that can be found in the teaching profession. For example, professors are facing less autonomy in their areas as accreditation standards drive the teacher education curriculum. Similarly, Smyth (2001) contended that the work of teachers is driven by educational reform, with very little input from teachers. Teachers face constant measures of efficacy and accountability that drive classroom practice and pedagogy (Kanpol, 1997; Smyth, 2001). The regulation and control of teachers' work has implications for constructing the subjectivities and bodies of teachers.

*Creating and Constructing Subjectivities and  
Bodies: The "Good" Teacher*

Students' bodies are not the only ones that are shaped and informed by education; teachers' bodies are also part of the discursive practices of education. "The act of knowing is largely a form of corporal shaping in which women are transformed into objects of display and identity, their image circumscribed and policed by the male gaze" (McLaren, 1997a, p. x). In education the male (scientific) gaze is disguised as curriculum, standards, and accountability measures. For many scholars, the body deserves attention in education as knowledge and pedagogy are clearly implicated and enfolded through the body (McWilliam, 1996; Shapiro, 1997). From preservice to practicing teachers, their subjectivities and bodies are objects of regulation and control through the various discourses that are aimed at producing the "good" teacher.



Britzman (2003) explored three cultural myths that shape and inform the subjectivity of preservice and practicing teachers: (a) Everything depends on the teacher, (b) teacher-as-expert, and (c) teachers are self-made. According to Britzman, these myths are based on individualistic constructions of what good teachers should be like and on the dichotomous understanding that, if a teacher does not live up to these “standards,” then she is not a good teacher or meant to teach. Jones (1990) explored the historical power relations exercised in the construction of the urban teacher.

Through a genealogy of the teacher we can . . . trace a curious line of transformation of “moral technologies” (Foucault, 1981, p. 4). The teacher is a suspicious figure that requires continual examination with and examining technology—the school—which attempts to establish a disciplinary utopia based on a felicific calculus. Subsequently, the teacher through a process of self-examination is transformed into a moral exemplar to project an ethical verity into the unknown of the Victorian city. This transformative morality pictures the teacher as an ideal father, a good rational parent, and eventually, in an interesting reversal of gender, a good nurturing mother. (p. 75)

Further, preparing the student is the role of the teacher. In the corporate-driven mentality the teacher has been designated as the project manager, carefully designing and implementing material so that students can be successful. Teachers also assess students (read as clients) to determine their needs, much like in the business world. According to O’Farrell et al. (2000), the body of the teacher is not equipped to prepare these students to enter the corporate machine. Therefore, teachers must also engage in their own bodily controls in order to teach and model appropriate behaviors of the corporate world.

With the new corporate mentality model of schooling, teachers have subsumed a new role (McWilliam, 2000). That is, teachers are now seen as project managers leading, managing, organizing and regulating success in very corporate-like ways. McWilliam explained how many teachers and even academics are currently being asked to perform a different type of teaching. “More of their time must be spent in attending to commercial

operations, including the patenting and marketing of new educational materials and technology, contract consultancy . . . measurement and testing and project management” (p. 27). In my school we now develop and implement curricular and instructional strategies based solely on students’ tests scores and item analyses in order to raise scores and increase “learning.” With these new ideas and expectations, the unruly body of the teacher is not fit to lead or teach the future generations to adjust to the corporation or the test.

Glasser (1990) called teachers “lead-managers” who perform needs assessments on their students (read as clients) in order to ensure the best possible individualized services for the students (clients). These services would optimize their performance on state-mandated examinations, also known as “success.” Teachers as lead-managers are trained to predict disruptions for the sake of the learner-as-client. Teachers are no longer required to use the “whip” or force; they are now counselors who are equipped to handle escalating situations. Therapeutic and reflexive conversations with the learners-as-clients allow the students and the teacher to self-regulate. After all, self-regulated and initiated learning and behaviors are the “end all and be all” of education (Smith, Polloway, Patton, & Dowdy, 2001).

At the same time, Foucault (1974) contended that learning must be made “rebarbative if you want to restrict the number of people who have access to knowledge” (as cited in McWilliam, 2000, p. 27). Thus, as teaching becomes more of a managed, ordered type of profession, the less attractive on multiple levels it becomes for the learner and the teacher. McWilliam held that the concept of teacher-as-facilitator is one way to remove the pedagogical body from the center. Marginalizing the teacher’s body makes it easier to control it. Having a teacher-centered classroom is suspect because the teacher may unleash her unruly, frenzied body upon the students and the student/teacher

boundaries may become blurred (Phelan, 1997). As a facilitator, the teacher stands outside and can easily control the uncivilized bodies of students and her own.

McWilliam (2000) observed how feminine-associated characteristics are integrated into very masculine areas such as business and education. Hatcher (1997) argued that using “women’s ways” works to systematize passion to help businesses (education) be more productive and seamless. What was once seen as irrational feminine characteristics is now seen as a way to succeed in business. McWilliam contended that “soft-skilling” the corporation is a useful way of “rendering alien elements more amenable to order and thus more productive” (2000, p. 29). This could well mean that learning and students are more productive with “women’s ways” of managing and teaching. Therefore, the top-down approach in education and in businesses is frowned on, while the new stereotypical feminine styles are welcomed and encouraged.

Phelan (1997) explained that teachers control their bodies for the sake of classroom management. Bodies are kept from each other and taught to maintain space and distance. Bodies that are too close, especially to the teacher, are potentially dangerous; the strict line between what is student and teacher could be ruptured. Maintaining a tight control of the bodies of teachers and students assures that boundaries will not be crossed and that adults are different from children and vice versa.

According to Kelly (1997), McWilliam and Jones (1996), Phelan (1997), and Todd (1997), the mind/body rupture helps to eradicate the passions, desires, and eros of teachers from their pedagogies. For example, Phelan stated that the discourse of classroom management performs exactly that vivisection that must happen for “learning” to occur. Phelan posited that the overt and excessive concern with classroom orderliness is analogous to fear of the erotic. The discourse of classroom management serves to control the students’ and teacher’s desires, bodies, and pleasures. Desires,

bodies, and pleasures are irrational. The teacher must empty out and deny herself and her students in order to be an effective facilitator/teacher (McWilliam & Jones; Tobin, 1997). S/he must become rational. Her/his pedagogy is all about design and delivery negating the complexity and dynamics of what pedagogy does (McWilliam, 1996).

The effective classroom manager attempts to eliminate pleasures or disorders that may lead to moments of eroticism between students and their teacher. Phelan (1997) asserted that pleasures and erotic moments work to sever the neat and strict boundaries between child/adult worlds. This cannot happen because the child is the one who needs to learn to control and to grow out of the “base animal sexuality and their aggression” (Walkerdine, 1993, p. 207). If the lines are blurred and distinctions cannot be made between the child and adult, then, as Phelan suggested, moments of joy, pleasure, exuberance, and eroticism only disturb and break the “learning.” Further, eroticism that attempts to bring union and communion dissolves the individualistic sense of existence that is prevalent and insisted on in education (Bataille, 1986).

Even progressive educational research that addresses child-centered approaches has an underlying assumption: Order and self-directed and governed behavior is valued and expected. Walkerdine (1987) stated that those children who can keep a smooth running order and calmness in the classroom activities are labeled most cooperative. Even in child-centered discourse the language of classroom management attempts to control both students and teachers. Phelan (1997) pointed out that teachers succumb to the language of classroom management. Classroom management “manages” the desires and perhaps creates desires for teachers (Cannella, 1997). Students as well as teachers are manipulated to believe that order precedes learning.

R. Johnson (1997) examined how the discourse of child abuse can also impact the body of the teacher. The moral panic that started in the early 1980s created a need to

keep a close watch on early childhood educators. Adult bodies could not be too close to young bodies, alone for too long with young bodies; they must be accompanied by other adult bodies. For Richardson, as a male teacher in an early childhood setting, it created a desire within him to monitor his actions and body around those younger bodies. The discourse of child abuse in turn shaped his subjectivity to be suspect of his pleasure to be around young children or the pleasure that derives from feeling closeness with young children.

This discourse and awareness is in contradiction with the educational discourses that encourage closeness and affection with students. Care and love in the classroom (Noddings, 1992) could be a warning sign, a distrust that should be made aware (planted) in students and teachers. Here not only are teachers' bodies and students' bodies closely monitored to avoid child abuse; the body is placed as a sexual object. The body is no longer for feeling pain, passion, pleasure, and joy in education.

In fact, others, such as Cindy Cruz and Peter McLaren (2002), have contended that schools are production grounds for birthing capitalistic babies. These authors challenged current postmodern and poststructuralist accounts of the bodies because they negate the lived realities of capitalist social relations. In their reaction to performative theories, they wrote,

We must engage the body, not as a site of immanent desire, but as a site for the enfleshment of capitalist social relations as social relations of production metaphorized in the flesh, and as nondiscursive “products” through which ideological relations and concrete social practices are lived. (p. 191)

Elsewhere, McLaren (1991) problematized postmodern theories in education, contending that postmodernism has the tendency to lose site of the fact that we are dealing with “real” bodies—bodies that have embodied Black, White, brown, class, gender.

Bodies are sites of manipulation, surveillance, and control. Schools serve as institution where bodies are disciplined and civilized. Children's bodies are not the only ones affected; teachers' bodies also fall under the gaze and control. Docile bodies are the key to success, while bodies that resist are punished, pushed out, and labeled to be at risk. In the age of No Child Left Behind, the dialogue must continue to allow conversations and research to explore the possibilities for rethinking how education schools/disciplines children and teachers.

### **Summary**

The theoretical framework presented in this chapter serves to provide the theories and perspectives used to ground this project. I have chosen to use those theories that are closely associated with postmodernism. Poststructuralist concerns help to scrutinize the logic of dichotomous thinking and the hierarchy created from those categories. Feminism(s) is equally important because it allows me to politicize gender and gender relations and its effect on the body of teachers. Queer theory permits me to ask questions about normalizing discourses in education and their effect on the bodies of teachers. I also have incorporated "Third-World" perspectives such as Chicana feminism and postcolonial critique because they question Western constructions of theories and challenge the Euro-American-centric nature of postmodernism.

The review of literature addresses and explores the philosophical and theoretical base for centering the body in research. I have chosen to focus the review of literature on the work of Foucault, the sociology of the body, feminist(s) and the queer body, Chicana feminism, and the postcolonial body. By using a Foucauldian lens I can examine bodies as targets of constant regulation, control, and surveillance by a polyvalence of discourses that enter into webs and relations of power with the body. Influenced by poststructuralist ideas, the sociology of the body theorizes the body as an opportunity to deepen and

expand the intersections and explorations of race, class, and gender. The sociology of the body also contributes to the idea of the body as a social construction. Feminist(s) and queer theories problematize the notion that identities are fixed and determine who we are based on the socially constructed categories of sex and gender. For Chicana feminism, the body is already centered and is a tool utilized to theorize, thereby challenging the notion that mind and body are two separate entities. Postcolonial scholarship explores the concerns of the colonizer/colonized predicament in the work of teachers.

The review of literature also includes the epistemologies of the body in educational research. The epistemologies examine the ways in which the body has been constructed, monitored, controlled, and resisted in education. The regulation of the body is the primary focus of examination. Centering the body in educational research is important in three ways. First, it challenges scientific discourses and constructions of the child/teacher dichotomy. Second, it reveals how inextricably intertwined the body and pedagogy are in education. Third, the epistemologies investigate how power relations are created in and out of education through the regulation of the body.

I discussed how regulating the work of teachers serves to discipline their bodies. Teachers have faced strong control from the outside, allowing them little if any control over their work. Because teaching is largely identified as a female, “motherly” profession, it has been deskilled. Ideas of what the “good” teacher should be shape the subjectivities of teachers. Through state-mandated curricula, standards, and accountability measures, disciplinary powers are created. Teachers self-regulate and self-monitor themselves for the sake of “good” teaching.

Together, these theories and research on the body have informed and influenced this study. The review of literature is also a glimpse of the type of research methodology embodied in this project, described in chapter III.

### CHAPTER III

## EMBODYING RESEARCH

This chapter addresses the *metodologías* and methods of research employed in the study. The project-embodied perspectives closely linked with/to postmodernism. Postmodern/poststructuralist research allow us to see and experience the complexities of our world (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994). Research grounded in postmodern perspectives has an agenda quite different from Enlightenment and modernist ideals. “The rational/scientific project of the Enlightenment has ended, with the consequent fragmentation of a coherent notion of truth and knowledge into a series of dispersed, competing and conflicting discourses” (Shildrick, 1997, p. 6).

This study was not seeking “Truth” or answers but rather questions, possibilities, and *imágenes*. It was not attempting to rewrite history but rather to offer multiple stories of the body. Uncertainty and ambiguity are central in postmodern perspectives and challenges as well as in this project.

This project adds to the current conversations on bodies and education by specifically examining the historical implications of the feminization of teaching in relation to bodies. The feminization of teaching has played a particular role in the construction not only of the subjectivity of students but also of teachers. How the teacher has been constructed ultimately influences and serves as a technology to construct and discipline the body of students and teachers. Therefore, the HFT requires careful considerations and new possibilities for the body. Although this project is a deconstruction, the intention was not to debase the important contribution that the HFT texts have provided for the history of education. Rather, the goal of this project is to add to the HFT texts images of the teacher and to add a body to the HFT discourses by highlighting and centering the body. In a world where intellect, mind, and spirit have



been vivisected from the body, it is important to problematize such bifurcation and to show subjects as whole and complex. Through this project, I hope to have complicated the research on HFT by resurrecting *el cuerpo* and demonstrating how discourse and the body communicate and are inextricably linked.

Postmodern approaches to research are varied and interdisciplinary in nature (Cannella & Bailey, 1999; Saukko, 2003). For the purpose of this project I infused multiple methodologies that allowed me to critically examine how historical research impacts the body. Reinharz (1992) contended that multiple methods echo feminist concerns that “reflect intellectual, emotional and political commitment” as well as “the commitment to thoroughness, the desire to be open-ended, and take risks” (p. 197).

Because of the postmodern angle taken in this study, using various methods would not only facilitate a deeper critical engagement with the reading of historical texts but also reflect my understanding of the complexity of doing research and thereby staying committed to feminist concerns. I achieved this through a mixed methodology that combined deconstruction, genealogy, and carnal *metodologías* to analyze the HFT texts. Carnal *metodologías* is a term inspired by the works of Chicana feminists to describe the process by which my *cuerpo* engaged, interacted, and inevitably contributed to the analysis of data.

### **Deconstruction, Genealogy, and Carnal Metodologías**

This project drew from two established methodological camps: deconstruction and genealogy. Deconstruction helped to unveil images and meanings from texts—the first guiding question. Genealogy was used to connect the images to the interstices where discourse, power, and discipline collide with the body—the second guiding question. Carnal *metodologías* was the in(corp)oration and recognition of the speaking and analyzing body in research. Because this project attempted to center the *cuerpo*, it

was important also to listen to my *cuerpo* in that process. Below, I further describe and situate the methodologies used in the study.

### *Deconstruction*

According to Saukko (2003) deconstruction is a theoretical perspective, a methodology, and a method. Deconstructionism is closely associated with the work of Jacques Derrida. Derrida's work demonstrates a constant critical interrogation of texts. As Denzin (1994) examined, deconstruction "involves the attempt to take apart and expose the underlying meanings, biases, and preconceptions that structure the way a text conceptualizes its relation to what it describes" (p. 185). Deconstruction is a way of knowing through the analysis of texts (Denzin) and a method of reading and interpreting masked meanings, contradictions (Cannella, 1997), and, in this project, bodies.

Erica Burman's (1994) *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology* is one example of how hidden biases can be examined through deconstruction. She took the discourse of developmental psychology and traced how the field has conceptualized the White middle-class male child as the standard, normal developing child. Children from other ethnic and cultural groups are seen as inferior against this standard. Further, Burman illuminated not only how women and children (from all groups) have been positioned in the field of developmental psychology but how women and children are potentially controlled through the discourse of developmental psychology. However, her deconstruction is not outside the field of developmental psychology. Burman asserted that her work "comments upon rather than replaces mainstream accounts of developmental psychology . . . . I am using deconstruction here not as a formal analytical framework but rather to indicate a process of critique" (p. 1).

Likewise, I used deconstruction as a constructive criticism, a framework that facilitates conversations between the different forms of subjugation revealed by such

deconstruction (Saukko, 2003). I hope that my “findings” facilitate more conversations and dialogue about the work of teachers and the marginalization of the body in research. Because the site of investigation focused on cultural texts such as the HFT texts, deconstruction was especially helpful. Important in this project was to apply a deconstructive perspective to highlight rationalist insistence of ignoring bodies in research. I took the HFT texts and critically examined the presence and often absence of the body. Deconstruction was a useful tactic in constructing the images that were inadvertently hidden about the body of the teacher in the discourses of the HFT texts—mainly the image of teacher-as-bodyless. Ironically, I was able to achieve this through the use of other discourses: the epistemologies of the body.

#### *Genealogy*

This project is “historical” in nature, but I do not use traditional historical methodology. History is one of those systems of meaning that have been used by modernist to explain past events, demonstrate cause and effect, show linearity and notions of progress through time, and search for truths. Historical studies attempt to show history as descriptive, linear, and seeking origins (Prado, 2000). Showing a cohesive past is the task of the modernist historian. Instead, this project is influenced and informed by the style and methods employed by Michele Foucault, especially the methods that connect bodies to power relations.

One example is Foucault’s analysis of the history of the penal system. He demonstrated the complexity of looking at the relations of power that the body enters through the discourse of the humanization of the penal system, along with the knowledge of “man” (science). His analysis does not seek right or wrong, good or bad; instead, it offers a different way to examine the complex power relations that are

exercised by and enacted on our bodies. In *The History of Sexuality* Foucault (1978)

commented:

The purpose is . . . to show how deployments of power are . . . connected to the body—to bodies, functions, physiological processes, sensations, and pleasures; far from the body having to be effaced, what is needed is to make it visible through an analysis in which the biological and the historical are not consecutive to one another . . . with the development of the modern technologies of power that take life as their objective. . . . I do not envision a “history of mentalities” . . . but a “history of bodies” and the manner in which what is most material and most vital in them has been invested. (pp. 151-152)

Clearly, Foucault was examining how power relations are connected to bodies as well as the intricacy imbedded in those power relations. However, power was not Foucault’s sole purpose of study. Foucault argued that the goal of his work was not to analyze power but rather to “create a history of different modes by which . . . human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, 1986, p. 208). Further, Prado (2000) contended that Foucault’s genealogy illuminates the “tiny influences on bodies, that over time, produce subjects defined by what they take to be knowledge about themselves and their world” (p. 36). Genealogy exposes how subjects “come under the illusion that they are individually substantial, autonomous unities” (p. 36).

Saukko (2003) explained that genealogy as a method “helps to dismantle authoritative forms of knowledge and thereby clear a space for people to re-imagine themselves and their lives in new ways” (p. 116). In this project, to address the second guiding question, a genealogical analysis was used to unveil the potential discursive impacts of HFT images on the body and subjectivity of the teacher. If authoritative forms of knowledge (privileging mind over body in research) can be contested, then new images can be constructed, rendering new ways to see ourselves as teachers.

#### *Carnal Metodologías*

But this was not only a mental journey and process, for my *cuerpo* also began to analyze and interact with the data, utilizing what I call carnal *metodologías*. Intrinsic to

Chicana feminist epistemology is the listening to *el cuerpo*. As discussed in chapter II, Chicana feminist works have implications for theorizing about and through the body. In this project my *cuerpo* was a theorizing and methodological *herramienta* that allowed a venue for my body to speak and be heard.

For example, the work of Gloria Anzaldúa (1987, 1990) embodies theory to the point where carnality is felt. She braids mind and body together to create theory. By listening and acknowledging her *cuerpo*, she is able to produce theory. Similarly, the work of Cherrie Moraga (1983) allows *el cuerpo* to pierce through and speak. Moraga discussed how her chronic back pain and the pain that she felt from the pressures for speaking for others culminated in producing her works. In subtle and subversive ways, the works of Moraga and Anzaldúa are embodiments of carnal *metodologías*. In a way, it is one of the *metodologías* for their theory in the flesh (Moraga & Anzaldúa, 2002).

Although deconstruction and genealogical analysis were important methods that made remarkable contributions to this analysis, my *cuerpo*, perhaps, in the end, was the one that maneuvered how I embodied and conceptualized the other two methodologies. Thus, acknowledging the carnal knowing was an important part of this project, allowing it to be placed at the forefront and not become an afterthought. As Anzaldúa (2000) clearly stated, “Writing is a spiritual activity just as it’s a political activity and a bodily act (p. 252). *Metodologías* ultimately and inevitably reflect the flesh and carnal knowing.

### **Performing and (En)Fleshing the Research**

Due to the complexity of the study, the research embodied an emergent design, as discussed by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993). That is, I devised preliminary ideas as to how to begin the project. However, after the initial steps, I began to search for more appropriate methods that would reflect the kinds of analysis that I was constructing. For example, I began by using a

juxtaposition of the epistemologies of the body with the HFT. However, I realized that I needed methods that would help me not only construct and create images of the body but go beyond the “so what?” Therefore, as discussed above, I utilized deconstruction and genealogical analysis for a more in-depth examination and critical engagement. Further, I began to embody carnal *metodologías*. That is, I began to allow my *cuero* to speak or, at the very least, I began to pay attention and listen to my body as a methodological tool.

Below I describe the mechanics of performing and enfleshing the research. I used the metaphor of researcher-as-*bricoleur* to explain how I embodied and approached this research project. I discuss and justify the sites of investigation. I expand on how I used continuous and reflexive methodologies as well as how the body pierced through in this project or the enfleshment. I discuss how I used peer debriefing. Further, I elaborate on the actual gathering and analyzing of texts and what that process entailed. Finally, I offer an account of how I came up with the themes and categories integral in the retelling of the HFT as presented in chapter V.

### *Bricolage*

I used Kincheloe (2004) and Denzin and Lincoln’s (1994) perspectives of the researcher-as-*bricoleur* to describe how I embodied this research project. As I was trying to situate this project in a methodological camp, I realized that my project was more complex than I had at first anticipated. Realizing this brought me to the first task of the bricoleur: recognize complexity in educational research (Denzin & Lincoln; Kincheloe, 2004). Second, Kincheloe described how the *bricoleur* should be aware of the complexity of interpretations. In this project the images constructed were just that: images that can be interpreted in multiple ways. No right or wrong way to see or examine the body of the teacher was advocated.

Third, Kincheloe (2004) described how *bricoleurs* “view their knowledge production in light of numerous types and forms of discourse” (p. 27). Feedback loops, as he described, permit for new insights and thoughts to surface as new ideas are considered in light of new and different ways of making meaning. The images that I constructed in this project were the feedback loops that would allow for new ideas and images to be considered in the hope for different ways of making meaning and for existing as teachers. Fourth, *bricoleurs* seek out multiple epistemologies. In this project I sought out multiple epistemologies of the body to deconstruct the HFT texts. I did not want a monolithic perspective of the body. Therefore, I used the body as conceptualized and theorized by poststructuralists, feminists, queer theorists, Chicana feminists, and postcolonial scholars.

Fifth, the *bricoleur* is aware of the intertextuality of texts.

The notion that all narratives obtain meaning not merely by their relationship to material reality but from their connection to other narratives . . . bricoleurs are always aware that the researcher, the consumer/reader of the research, and the exterior research narratives always occupy points on intersecting intertextual axes . . . always influencing one another. (Kincheloe, 2004, pp. 27-28)

The intertextuality of texts is evident in this study. The HFT texts, epistemologies of the body, and my body connected, affecting and perhaps changing one another.

Sixth, the *bricoleur* is aware of the discursive constructions of research narratives. Exploring discursive constructions allows the *bricoleur* to uncover the hidden rules of what can be known, who can speak, and whose reality is true and important. In this project, deconstructing the images of the teacher in the HFT allowed me to examine how the body is a target of surveillance, a lesser component in the lives of teachers, and a silence knowing (Cannella, 1997). The body is not allowed to speak, to know.

Seventh, results and findings are fictive. The *bricoleur* is cognizant of the fictive elements to representations and narratives. In this study, readings of the HFT as well as

“findings” were acknowledged as possibilities, not truths. Keeping in line with postmodern approaches to research, this project demonstrates the ambiguity and fluidity of the research act and findings.

Perhaps the most important aspect of this project reflected the *bricoleur*'s understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge. “The ability to trace the footprints of power in the research domain is a central dimension in the bricoleur's efforts to understand complexity and knowledge production” (Kincheloe, 2004, p. 29). Through the genealogical analysis employed in this project I traced certain aspects of how power and knowledge interact with the (my) body.

#### *The Piercing Body: Carnal Metodologías*

Important in this study was the subtle and sometimes not-so-subtle ways that my *cuero* pierced through. As I sat in front of my laptop computer with my data and epistemological guide, it was clear that my *cuero* was speaking to and through me. In was not sufficient just to clear my mind and begin an analytical process of reading, analyzing, and sorting data. I realized, or my *cuero* reminded me of, the inorganic approach to data analysis. I sometimes refrained from listening to my body, thinking that it would be too personal an approach to use in research. I struggled throughout the entire data analysis process. However, I began to rethink the way in which educational research should be conducted and began to embody carnal *metodologías* that would allow my body to be heard first and foremost by me, as well as to acknowledge how *importante* is el *cuero* in research.

*Primero*, I began to relinquish the idea that research should not be personal. *Claro que es personal*. This project in many ways was an intimate reflection and clash between my *experiencias* as a *maestra* and researcher. *Mi cuerpo* kept reminding me that I began the research with my body, so what was so wrong about continuing with the



body throughout the research? *Después*, it became clearer that centering the body in the HFT was a mere manifestation of my body in the HFT and in the contemporary. In other words, whose body was being centered but my own? *Yo soy el cuerpo que siente y vive la historia y la rabia del pasado* [I'm the body that feels and embodies the history and the wrath of the past].

### *Continuous and Reflexive Methodologies*

Important during the collecting and analyzing phase of my project was to keep a continuous, reflexive methodological journal. The reflexive journal helped me to work through key ideas and document my reactions, concerns, questions, and “ideas for further refinement of data collection strategies” (Erlandson et al., 1993, p. 115). In the reflexive journal I wrote thoughts and concerns of the study and of my personal and professional life.

The journal for the project had been the same one that I had used to reflect on questions for my comprehensive exams. I considered the possibility that my dissertation would stem from one or more of the exam questions. Although that was not the case, in combination, the questions inadvertently illuminated key ideas that were later used in the dissertation. First, the types of exam questions reflected important understanding of critical theories such as Chicana feminists and constructivists perspectives. Reflections and critical reading of these two theoretical perspectives allowed me to globalize my understanding of research and methodology, an understanding that was clearly echoed in this project. Second, critically examining the work of Chicana feminists gave me an introduction to how the body is an integral part of their theorizing. The body is at the forefront of their writing as a natural existence, as opposed to a forced, interjected afterthought. Body, theory, and writing are blended to the point of ambiguity and uncertainty. In essence, there is no writing or theory without the body. The *cuerpo* in

Chicana feminist work gave me the theoretical license to begin thinking about my body in ways otherwise denied in Western thought.

Finally, one of the questions in the exams solicited a critical analysis of histories of childhood. A critical exploration of histories of childhood permitted me to examine (his)tory as just another story. Further, I began to acknowledge how androcentric historical accounts can be. Using feminist(s) epistemology as a methodology illuminated how histories have the potential to serve as contemporary (and possibly future) technologies for discipline and control. History then became an interesting venue for analysis in this project.

When I read my journal, I began to notice how criticalist theories, the body, and history had always been at the core of my thinking and body and are now echoed in this project. Even though journaling is a form of Western writing not very common in other cultures or societies, in this instance it proved to be very useful for me. My journal became a constant subconscious reminder, almost like a subliminal message ricocheting through my body “critical theory, the body and history.” Finally capturing the message, my ideas began to crystallize in the form and methods used in this project. Literally, then, this project has been under construction for about 4 years.

My reflexive journal also allowed me to write ideas and concerns that would arise as I read the histories of the feminization of teaching. I kept it with me at all times, not necessarily writing in it every day, but accessible for those fleeting and ambiguous ideas that would float and reverberate through my body. For example, on December 28, 2003, I began to take notice of how managing my third-grade students was also about regulating and controlling my own *cuerpo*. I wrote in my journal, “The management/regulation/discipline of students’ bodies through our own.” Reflections as the one above became a major concern not only for this project but for my personal and

professional space (body) as well. The bodily reflections in my journal were numerous to the point that I could no longer ignore my *cuerpo*. I began to realize that my *cuerpo* was also engaged in the process of knowing.

Moreover, my reflexive journal was an outlet for personal as well as professional frustrations. Although Western research is constructed as detached from the personal life of the researcher, the opposite was true in this project. On August 22, 2004, I wrote about my experiences at a new position that took me from third grade to pre-kindergarten.

I just started a new teaching job—pre-k. I have been so exhausted, physically drained. Teaching at this level has taken a toll on me. It's interesting that I want to exert more control than in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade I wanted them [students] to be loosened up, be more free. In pre-k they already are [freer] but I want to restrict them more.

Even though I was not focusing here on my dissertation, my whole outlook in my personal and professional life took the body of students and mine at the forefront, sometimes making it difficult to separate my dissertation from my personal life. Dr. Lincoln once told me, in one of our many conversations about research, that the researcher becomes so invested in her/his project that he/she literally never stops analyzing or working on it. The line between personal and professional becomes blurred. This was certainly evident and felt in this endeavor. More important, the line between mind and body also became fragmented as my body slowly pierced through in my analysis. The example also demonstrates how this project was an intimate journey of allowing the body to speak.

Allowing the body to speak is not a simple or straightforward task. In many instances I found it difficult to express *mi cuerpo* through language. Ironically, language seemed to impede the body to speak. Perhaps our ideas of language have been constructed as linear, inorganic, and rationalist to the point that it silences the body.

*Necesitamos un nuevo vocabulario.* A new vocabulary and language is needed in order to express fully the body. I often found that words took on different meanings in this process. I thought about the possibility that the body was inadvertently changing the language that I was using. Listening to the body may allow more possibilities for new mutations of meanings. *El cuerpo puede servir* as a subversive tool that could decolonize language and rip open new avenues for bodily expression.

### *Peer Debriefing*

I used peer debriefing as described and discussed by Erlandson et al. (1993) and Lincoln and Guba (1985). Peer debriefing allowed me to establish and build credibility. Further, it was a good way for a professional peer to listen to my ideas, concerns, and frustrations regarding the study. I chose a person outside the field of critical theory who was familiar with certain concepts and perspectives of critical theories. I wanted my peer debriefer not only to listen to my concerns but also to critique my reasoning and analysis. I thought that this would establish credibility.

We met about four times. The first time was to talk about my expectations and preconceived ideas. The second time we discussed how data analysis was proceeding. She reviewed what I had collected and we spent a significant amount of time discussing the field of teaching and how relevant the study was to the field today. She suggested that some of my analysis was redundant but that it was probably necessary to show how often an incident is exhibited in a small amount of text. In the third meeting she reviewed the whole set. She pointed out how difficult it must have been to engage in work that requires an extensive amount of attention and focus while teaching. Moreover, she began to see how the dissertation was very much tied to contemporary issues that she was facing with teachers. More important, she saw connections between my classroom teaching concerns and my project. In the fourth meeting we discussed my concerns over

one of the guiding questions (the second one). She thought that it might not be necessary. We discussed the possibility of revising or eliminating the question. For example, the second guiding question was “How is the body of the teacher an implicit component in the HFT texts?” After discussing the guiding question with the peer debriefer, I realized that the question was not that different from the first question. I began to reread the data and to reexamine what the analysis and interactions with the texts were telling me about the body. Thus, the second guiding question was changed to reflect a deeper engagement with the HFT, the epistemologies, and my body.

Peer debriefing was a useful technique for someone to critique my work. However, sometimes it felt bothersome to send so much data and have someone sift through it. I was always concerned about the peer debriefer’s professional and personal context and reality. Because this work was subjective and very much interpretive, it was sometimes difficult for me to trust her comments. Further, I felt that, when I analyzed a piece of information in a particular day and time and then reviewed it, I wondered why going back a new connection or rethinking occurred. In other words, the actual analyzing was fleeting and ambiguous at best. How can that be conveyed and transferred over from person to person?

### *Sites of Investigation*

The texts that I chose were secondary source historical texts that have contributed to the knowledge base about the HFT. Traditional (modernist) history is important because, without it the study would lack a counterpoint (Prado, 2000). Foucault contended that “traditional history is necessary to dispel the chimeras of the origins” (Foucault, 1971, p. 77, p. 40). The texts were those that attempted to explain how teaching became a feminized profession. Further, secondary sources in this study tend to be the constructions and discourses that surround what is “known” about the

feminization of teaching. It was important to me to analyze what has been already believed to be true about the history of teaching and how the body is an integral yet absent part of those stories.

The particular texts in this study centered women and gender—a perspective helpful, needed, and appropriate in understanding the feminization of teaching. Further, when we want to learn about the history of certain subjects, we do not sift through original records or primary sources; we first tend to examine what has been written about or put together—the cohesive history (secondary sources). Our constructions and images of subjects come (sometimes are even perpetuated) from the discourses that have been laid out by historians from any theoretical and philosophical branch. The HFT accounts and interpretations are important in contemporary constructions and images of teachers. Because secondary sources are the first impression of how people and events were in time, I decided to analyze the body in those texts. In other words, I wanted a space where a critical dialogue between the HFT texts and the body could ensue.

Once I chose secondary sources as the site of investigation, I wanted a variety of texts to gain a broad understanding of the HFT. Biklen (1995), Blount (2000), Clifford (1998), Grumet (1988), Oram (1989), Schmuck (1987a, 1987b), Sklar (1973), and Sugg (1978) had feminist concerns and questions regarding the feminization of teaching. Both Blount and Grumet offered somewhat different accounts that would be beneficial to the study. For example, Grumet intentionally provided and highlighted many incidents where the body of teachers was made invisible. Blount centered gender transgressors, a much-needed perspective in the HFT. Sklar's work is significantly referenced among many of the HFT and provided a good source for the social context of the time of the feminization of teaching through the life of Catherine Beecher. Donovan's (1974) work was important because it specifically (and traditionally) addressed "who was the

American teacher.” Richardson and Hatcher (1983) centered economics in their research. Because I had prior knowledge of how industrialization and urbanization were a major factor that facilitated the feminization of teaching, I needed text addressing this complicated economic phenomenon. Below are the authors and their titles.

1. Biklen (1995), *Schoolwork: Gender and the Cultural Construction of Teaching*
  2. Blount (2000), *Spinsters, Bachelors, and Other Gender Transgressors in School Employment, 1850-1990*
  3. Clifford (1998), *Daughters Into Teaching: Educational and Demographic Influences on the Transformation of Teaching Into Women’s Work in America*
  4. Cordier (1992), *School Women of the Prairies and Plains*
  5. Donovan (1974), *Schoolma’am*
  6. Grumet (1988), *Pedagogy for Patriarchy: The Feminization of Teaching*
  7. Oram (1989), *A Master Should Not Serve Under a Mistress: Women and Men Teachers 1900-1970*
  8. Richardson and Hatcher (1983), *The Feminization of Public School Teaching, 1870-1920*
  9. Schmuck (1987), *Women School Employees in the United States*
  10. Sklar (1973), *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity*
  11. Sugg (1978), *Motherteacher: The Feminization of American Education*
- Becoming Familiar With the Texts*

Before embarking on actual critical analyses of the texts, I made copies of them. I kept a separate journal for the pre-analysis of the HFT texts. Before I began the critical analysis of the body, I read the HFT text and took notes. Taking notes served two purposes: (a) It allowed me to become familiar with the HFT texts, and (b) I wanted to

gain an appreciation for the authors' work. Even though this project serves as a critical analysis of the HFT texts, I believe that the works of the scholars in this project are important and necessary. My work is a contribution and should not be considered outside of the historical education discourse.

I took short notes as I read interesting anecdotes, ideas, and possibilities for the project. For example, after having read about four of the histories, I began to see that industrialization was a major factor in the push for the feminization of the teaching work force. I wrote in the journal that capitalism would be an important influence on the body in the HFT. Reading the HFT before engaging in the critical analysis was a way to begin to think globally about issues of the body and teachers.

#### *Analyzing Data*

Once I became familiarized and read through the HFT, I began the critical analysis. Critical reading was facilitated by a guide that I devised to help me analyze and remain critical as well as focused on the epistemologies of the body (Figure 1). Further, I incorporated *mi cuerpo* as a tool of analysis. The literature review was critical in this study as it provided the theoretical framework and underpinnings to illuminate and exhume the body from the HFT texts. The guide was printed and used continuously as my critical lens.

#### **Critical Incidents**

As I read the HFT texts, I began to find “critical incidents” that reflected an absent body and sometimes an evident body. My understanding and interpretations of the epistemologies of the body helped me to depict and define critical incidents in this study. Moreover, listening to my *cuerpo* or my carnal *metodologías* were also *herramientas* in that interpretive process. I was cognizant of how my *cuerpo* felt and reacted to the HFT and the epistemological guide in the creation of the critical incidents.



---

### Foucauldian Body

Modern techniques in the form of self-surveillance and self improvements.

Body as target of schedules, habit formations, evaluations and diagnostics to control internally.

Control of bodies goes from overt to subvert techniques.

Multiple discourses attempt to manage the body.

### Sociology of the Body

Spatial organization of desirers, pleasures and bodies in relation to society and reason.

The body is not only transformed by society but it is helpful in understanding our society.

### Feminism(s) and the Queer Body

Gender and sex as performative discourse.

Physicality and materiality of bodies represented by social constructions of gender and sex.

Constructions of bodies having allegiance to cultural shifts in scientific and technological regimes of truth.

Attitudes about the body influencing the construction of women and men.

The body becomes real after social inscriptions through language, discourse as well as knowledge and power are imprinted on the body.

Moments defying static notions and definitions of subjectivity, identity and sexuality.

Cultural and historical representations constitute bodies and help reproduce them as real and material.

### Border and Postcolonial Bodies

Eurocentric and imperialistic.

Teacher's body as representing the nation.

Patriarchy, capitalism and homophobia chisel and pierce the body.

Binary thinking about the body.

### Research on the Body and Education

Controlling bodies through the management of time and space.

Body as generator of space or object in space.

Managing/regulating others through one's own regulation.

Fear of erotic, emotions and pleasures.

---

*Figure 1.* Epistemological guide.

I used different-colored highlighters to mark the critical incidents (Middleton, 1993). Each color highlighter represented a different epistemology from the literature of the body presented in chapter II (summarized in Figure 1). When I found critical incidents, I highlighted using the designated color to represent a particular epistemology. Then I used a word processor to type the color-coded quote. Below the color-coded quote I wrote my analysis and reflections. The analysis consisted of my construction of images and of possible discursive impacts. Further, it was guided by my carnal knowing.

In many instances, multiple epistemologies informed my critical analysis. That is, multiple perspectives were used, sometimes at the same time, to illuminate the critical incidents in the HFT texts. For example, certain critical incidents could have been read from multiple perspectives. Some of my analysis mirrored such mutation of perspectives.

More important, my construction of critical incidents mirrored my bodily interactions with the data, epistemological guide, deconstruction, and genealogical analysis. My *cuervo* maneuvered between the data, epistemological guide, and the methodologies utilized. Depending on how my *cuervo* felt each day, I could have a different interpretation of the data. For example, as I felt more pressure from administration and less control of what I can do with my students, the darker and gloomier my analysis became. On the other hand, when I got back from AERA 2005, I was energized with new ideas and my analysis reflected a much more positive reflection of teaching.

### **Themes and Categories**

After a period of about 9 months of collecting and analyzing the HFT texts, I read through my “raw data analysis” a few times to begin to formulate themes and categories. I had decided that, as a method of retelling the HFT, I would use the images

of the body of teachers that kept resurfacing through my interpretation and critical analysis of the HFT texts. After having written possible themes and categories, I printed all of the data that I had collected and began to cut them into units. A unit in this study consisted of a quote from the HFT texts followed by my critical analysis. Once I had unitized my data, I began to place them in manila folders that were labeled according to the categories that I had created.

Categories were a difficult and yet at the same time a powerful part of this study. Categorizing data is difficult, especially with the level of mixed perspectives used and the multiplicity of possibilities that could have been generated. However, in an attempt to make new images of the body surface, creating categories helped me to illuminate even more the absence of the body and how the body can be a subtext of discourse. Categories in this study were like the bold print in textbooks. In other words, categories served as bold statements signifying importance and alerting the reader.

All themes and categories stemmed in part from the literature review. The main themes were inspired by particular authors and their ideas. For example, “TEACHER’S BODY AS CONTAINER” was inspired by the work of Elizabeth Grosz (2001) and Luce Irigaray (1993). The idea that bodies can be seen as containers was striking to me; I identified with the metaphor. Many times I feel like a container being placed, moved, and tossed aside. Most of the categories were in some sense conceived by the epistemologies of the body, my bodily *experiencias* as a feminist teacher, and my critical analysis of the HFT texts.

The categories under the themes were created by critical incidents that kept resurfacing. For example, “Teacher (Mother) as Container for the Child” was created because of the many references and allusions in the HFT texts to the new idea of the child and how these ideas were shaping the nature of teaching and the teacher. Further,

my own experiences as a teacher confirmed this category. For example, teachers are told to accommodate, reflect, and assess their practices for the good of the children.

Therefore, sometimes the categories and themes were also about a personal (bodily) connection to the HFT texts and the critical analysis.

Fusing the themes with their categories was a fairly intuitive activity. This was the writing phase. The writing phase of this project became the assemblage of themes and placing the categories in their new spaces. During this phase, some categories became part of other categories that seemed to fit under a broader category within a larger theme. For example, I had initially created a category signifying moments in which the discourse of motherhood was equated with the teacher. However, when I created the theme of the “TEACHER’S BODY AS CONTAINER,” I began to imagine the body of a mother as a container for the child. Thus, the category “Teacher (Mother) as Container for the Child” was produced. I sometimes felt like my body was for the sole purpose of molding children to fit current sociopolitical conditions. We are the models for children, we are told. My body is supposed to usurp those behaviors that children need to replicate in order to be successful. Thus, creating themes and categories was an intuitive, personal, and creative/bodily endeavor.

### **Summary**

This chapter addressed the methodologies and methods employed in the research project. Postmodern approaches to research guided this project. I used methodologies closely linked to postmodern approaches to research (Cannella & Bailey, 1999): deconstruction and genealogy. Deconstruction helped to unveil the hidden images, while applying a genealogical analysis to the images was useful to illuminate the discursive impact of the images on the body of the teacher. I also used what I termed carnal *metodologías* in order to articulate how the body pierces through research.

I also discussed how performing this research project was similar to the important characteristics of what Denzin and Lincoln (1994) and Kincheloe (2004) described as the researcher-as-*bricoleur*. The *bricoleur* is cognizant of (a) the complexity of research, (b) the complexity of interpretations, (c) the existence and utility of feedback loops, (d) multiple epistemologies, (e) intertextuality, (f) discursive constructions, (g) research findings as fictive, and (h) the relationship between power and knowledge.

I discussed the piercing body, reflexive/methodological journal, peer debriefing and the sites of investigation. Important in this project was a pre-reading of the HFT texts before engaging in the critical analysis to become familiar with texts and to gain an appreciation of the HFT texts. I discussed how I analyzed and enflashed data by defining critical incidents and units in the study. I elaborated the construction of themes and categories as well as the writing phase of the project.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **CENTERING THE BODY IN HISTORICAL TEXTS**

This chapter serves as an introductory examination of how the body was centered and examined in the HFT texts in this project. I do this for three reasons: (a) to illuminate the rationalist insistence of marginalizing the body in most of the HFT texts examined in this study; (b) to dedicate time to the important work of Madeline Grumet, a pioneer in addressing bodies in the HFT; and (c) to delineate the broad spectrum of inquiry perspectives with regard to the HFT. To allow for a more critical engagement and examination of the HFT texts in this chapter and in chapter V, I applied the multiple epistemologies of the body presented in chapter II. The critical examination in this chapter functions as a stretching of that historical continuum (c, above) by unearthing the images of the body in historical discourse.

#### **The Absent Body in the History of the Feminization of Teaching**

This section is an attempt to illuminate the body of the teacher by making explicit connections to the epistemologies of the body presented in chapter II. In the process of exploring and analyzing the data, I noticed that very few historical accounts surveyed here actually centered the body. The body was, for the most part, hidden and glossed over. After endless reading and rereading, I came up empty. The body is absent. I could witness it because of my training in the various epistemologies of the body. Very few studies even hint at the body or how the body is affected and disciplined by history, discourse, and power in the process of the feminization of teaching.

In part this is due to Western dichotomous thinking. The bifurcation of the mind and body (Anzaldúa, 1987; Turner, 1996) is so engrained that we do not stop to consider the body as an important and central component in our lives, pedagogy, and research.

However, just like the mind, the body is influenced, shaped, and disciplined through discourses (Foucault, 1978; Grosz & Probyn, 1995; Shildrick, 1997; Turner, 1996). Below I offer a few examples of the absence present in the HFT texts—the body.

The *cuervo* was absent. It was through critical analysis that I was able to resurrect the body. For example, Schmuck (1987b) stated, “The specialization of subject matter is clearly sex segregated. Males predominate as teachers in science and math, classes, which also have a predominance of male students” (pp. 80-81). Using as a tool of analysis the sociology of the body, I extracted from this quote how the spatial organization of bodies in schooling was in relation to what society deemed appropriate and “natural,” based on the sex and gender of its subjects/participants (Turner, 1996).

Shilling (1993) described the body to be not only altered by society but helpful in understanding society. By excavating how the body is an implicit component, certain contingencies can be contemplated about society. For example, Turner (1996) contended that the female body is under constant surveillance and regulation. This assumption would have an impact on the body of the teacher (regardless of sex/gender), since the teacher was already constructed as a feminine body.

Sugg (1978) offered an example: “If one thought only of elementary education, the problem of professional qualification of woman as teacher seemed manageable; she would need little more than elementary education herself” (pp. 16- 17). The body of the teacher was not thought of as an intellectual *cuervo*; it was just a warm body that had little education and did not disturb the patriarchal and capitalistic order. Shilling’s (1993) contention that the body is not only transformed by society but is helpful in understanding society is evident here. Her/his body needed only to be little educated. A teacher’s body, especially in the lower grades, was not seen as intellectual.

“The stereotype of women’s work as caring for young children undoubtedly drives some men to work with older students. As in all Western countries, as one goes up the age-graded hierarchy of schooling, the proportion of men increases” (Schmuck, 1987b, p. 80). Queer and postmodern feminist perspectives of the body (Butler, 1990, 1993; Grosz, 1994) helped to unveil how gender and sex roles were performative discourse in the HFT. Female teachers were to be thought of as “better” and “natural” with young children; thus, more of them taught and sought out elementary education. Men, not wanting to risk being seen as effeminate, chose to be with the secondary-level students. Teaching was bifurcated: Women taught certain students (and were thought to be naturally suited to teach young children), while men, being the opposite of women, taught the older students. Further, adding a sociology of the body perspectives shows the connections to the spatial organization of bodies (Turner, 1996). Women’s bodies were placed physically (and through discourse) more with younger children; men were to be physically (and through discourse) located with older students.

Using Shilling’s (1993) concept of the body is helpful to highlight the tensions of society through the body.

Catharine collected evidence to confirm her belief that women were more often ill than well, and that chronic disabilities were widespread among the female population . . . her basic assumption was that female debility was a sign of some fundamental opposition between the needs of women and many of the conditions of American society. (Sklar, 1973, p. 205)

Even though Catharine Beecher and others worked hard to promote a uniquely feminine space like the domestic and educational spheres, women or the female body, according to Catharine Beecher, was aching. There were spaces created for the treatment of this aching body where women like Catharine found solace and support in many water-cure establishments that became popular in the 1840s. At the water-cure



establishments women talked openly about their bodies and experienced sensual pleasure.

Under the guise of restoring . . . health, women could indulge their otherwise forbidden desires for physical sensuality, and some descriptions of water-cure treatments seem to express covert sexual feelings . . . centers were therefore unique in providing a socially approved sensual experience for women. (Sklar, 1973, pp. 205-207)

Here, spatial organization of desires, pleasures, and bodies are in relation to society and reason (Turner, 1996). The body, a social taboo made to be split from the mind, had a space where it was free to feel, express, experience, and heal. Further, in this instance, the body also helped to explain society (Shilling, 1993). Sexual feelings and pleasures with the same sex were expressed in spaces created for that very reason. Even in Beecher's time, spaces had been available and opened to sexual experimentation.

As shown above, the body was absent. However, the body can be unearthed. Examining the HFT discourses by using the epistemologies of the body as a deconstructive tool was helpful in illuminating the body of the teacher. The body was a hidden subtext in the HFT texts.

### **Grumet's Teacher Body**

During the nineteenth century, teaching school changed from men's to women's work. The process of this change . . . provides a knot that ties Marxist and psychoanalytic threads of feminist inquiry together with the histories of our current notions of pedagogy and curriculum. (Madeline Grumet, 1988, pp. 32-33)

In part, my inspiration for examining historical texts came from the work of Madeline Grumet (1988). It was Grumet who first attempted to examine the HFT through different lenses. She complicated the HFT by weaving a Marxist and psychoanalytical critique that allowed her to explore class and gender in the process of the feminization of teaching. Grumet paved the way for others to reinterpret the past or, at the very least, to offer new possibilities for the past and, ultimately, the present.

According to Grumet (1988), the first women entering teaching “mirrored the issues in the development of their sense of their own womanhood” (p. 47). That is, women had dependency issues. Grumet asserted that, because identity for men and women are different and rooted in the oedipal stage, male children reject identification with their mothers but females extend this identification into adulthood. Males “achieve a sense of autonomy from their mothers . . . the females turn to their fathers to escape an identification with their mothers that is stifling and denies their own autonomy” (p. 47). Here Grumet turned to psychoanalytic theory to explain how female and male bodies form their identities. The mother-child relationship determines the extent to which an individual considers his or her identity as autonomous. It may be a possibility that bodies form autonomous identities at an early age, as suggested by psychoanalytic theory. However, bodies and subjectivities are also informed by a complex web of power relations (Foucault, 1978). How we perform our gender and sex is not as simple as the early identification with our mothers. For example, in our society teachers are seen and treated as mothers (Sugg, 1978). The teacher-as-mother is performed (Butler, 1990). After all, as Blount (2000) asserted, it was the more independent autonomous females who first went into teaching. The role of the teacher, however, was defined through patriarchal and capitalistic discourses that depicted the teacher as powerless and dependent on others (i.e. the child, headmaster) as well as cheaper. Treating the body as the psychoanalytic body is therefore problematic and potentially dangerous, as this identification may gloss over other discourses that construct and discipline individuals in certain ways.

However, Madeline Grumet (1988) is perhaps the only one in the HFT that is examined in this project who attempted to center the body as well as blur the lines

between past and present bodies. Grumet showed present bodies through the bodies of the past.

The sex/gender system that is expressed in our classrooms through contemporary forms of curriculum, classroom discourse, gestures, and theater, is an atavism that expresses church/state, school/family, social class, and sexual politics more appropriate to the 1820s than the 1980s. (p. 46)

The body of the teacher is represented by cultural and historical discourses that help to constitute it as real and material today, even though, as Grumet contended, those discourses are more appropriate to the 1820s. Not only did she illuminate the body but she examined how the body is historical (Zita, 1998) and how educators carry and transmit that history. This past/present disruption and fragmentation leads to understanding of how our bodies are sometimes not our own to control.

Further, Grumet explicitly examined how the sexed body was to be erased:

The teacher was expected to banish sensuality from the classroom and from her life. The repudiation of the body was a blight that fell upon the curriculum of the body's contributions to cognition, aesthetics, and community as realized through its capacity for sensuality, for movement, and for work. (Grumet, 1988, p. 53)

Removing sensuality and sexuality from the body of the teacher was a way to sever the body from the mind. This binary way of thinking about pedagogy and teaching interacted with the body of the teacher, making her/him almost bodyless. A way to control the mind of subjects is to first regulate the body, movements, and space (Smith, 1999). Further, as, early childhood scholars have argued, this is due to the fear of erotic bodies in education (Phelan, 1997; Tobin, 1997).

Grumet's (1988) version of the HFT acknowledges the body of the teacher as an integral part in the feminizing process of the field. Her work exemplifies the kind of research needed to challenge rationalist insistence of ignoring bodies in educational research. The other histories offered above vaguely, if at all, examined the body. This chapter presents the kind of critical analysis that was used for the retelling of the HFT in

chapter V. Furthermore, this chapter demonstrates the research spectrum on bodies, history, and education.

### **Summary**

This chapter illuminated the broad spectrum of analysis (from marginalizing the body to highlighting the body) in the HFT texts. Further, it elaborated on how most accounts surveyed in this study exhibited an absent body. Ironically, how can something absent be exhibited? My contention is that the body is an implicit message and integral component in the HFT. The body is hinted at, vaguely implied, and an absent present. No matter how hard it is ignored and marginalized, this project has shown that the body is there. Perhaps research should attempt to unearth the postmodern body.

I discussed in detail the influence of Grumet's (1988) work on this project. Grumet is perhaps one of the very few scholars who have centered the body in the HFT texts. Although she used psychoanalytic theory, a potentially deterministic theory of sexual and identity formation, to unmask the body, at the very least she centered and deconstructed the notions that mind and body are separate entities. She also fragmented the linear path so coveted by historians to explain history. Grumet invokes a feeling and sensation that the past is with us through our actions, pedagogy, and body. How teachers conduct themselves is filled with atavisms of a time that simulates a few centuries past.

In chapter V I attempt to unearth the postmodern body through the images that surfaced in my critical analysis of the HFT texts and I illuminate the potential discursive impacts of the images potentially have on the teacher's body.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **THE BODY IN THE HISTORY OF THE FEMINIZATION OF TEACHING**

“Bringing ‘the body’ into critical discussion is therefore potentially disruptive or subversive. That this is so is suggested by a long history of avoiding the body even in those academic studies that are predicated on it.” (Levy, 2000, p. 82). “We now understand how sex and gender lay, for the state, at the juncture of the disciplining of the body and the control of the population and are, therefore, constitutive of those very practices” (Alexander, 1997, p. 65).

This chapter highlights and exposes the body of the teacher in the discourse of the HFT and offers a retelling of the HFT texts through bodily images. As discussed in chapter II, the body in modern times has been ignored and suppressed. However, as Foucault (1978) contended, it is through the regulations and control of bodies that humans are made subjects. Bodies enter into power relations with discourse and knowledge and are molded, shaped, and constructed.

In education these issues are important and relevant because of the nature of the ritual called schooling (Grumet, 1988). Scholars such as Apple (1986), Grumet (1988), and McLaren (1994) have discussed the manner in which schools physically and mentally shape the future as well as the present and past. Bodies, therefore, cannot be ignored in education. Postcolonial scholars and queer theorists in education (Boldt, 2001; Cannella & Viruru, 2004) have argued how, through physical manipulation, students are mentally controlled and managed and vice versa. Teachers play a great part in the manipulation and regulation of students’ bodies. However, students are not the only ones regulated. Teachers are also objects of the same manipulation and control of the multiple discourses that interact with education.

This phase of the project attempts to unearth the images of the body of the teacher through the (re)reading of the HFT. The images of the body in this project are not presented as new truths but as another contingency or possibility. I hope to contribute to the conversations of the body and education by centering the absent body of the teacher in the HFT. The bodily images in this project were influenced by my readings and understandings of the epistemologies of the body that were presented in chapter II. Further, the images were influenced and impacted by my carnal voice (Anzaldúa, 1990). That is, I could not separate my lived experiences as an early childhood educator as I analyzed the HFT texts. I made connections from the epistemologies of the body to my own *cuerpo*. The process of reading and examining the HFT texts brought an internal bodily awareness of discourse, power, and discipline in my own pedagogy and research, allowing me to incorporate *el cuerpo* through what I have termed carnal *metodologías*. I hope to extend this awareness to the field of teaching and educational research in order to reconsider new possibilities as well as to highlight the complexity of teaching, learning, and research.

Several themes emerged as the HFT texts were analyzed using the epistemological guide (see chapter III). Depending on the historical, sociocultural, and political need and context, the definition of the teacher (and her/his body) was molded, shaped, and constructed to reflect the values, norms, and sometimes even the angst of society. The ideas presented in this chapter are not new truths, but the themes and categories could facilitate a (re)connection of pedagogy to the body and illuminate the discursive impacts. I realized that my space, movement, and *cuerpo* are very much tied (but not limited) to the discourses presented in the HFT. Moreover, there is a certain atavism that expresses a constructed world not my own in many moments of my teaching and pedagogy.

The following bodily images and subjectivities surfaced during critical analysis (deconstruction) of the HFT texts: (a) teacher's body as container, (b) spatial organization of teacher's body, (c) teacher's body as performative discourse, and (d) resisting bodies. Within these themes there were several subcategories that were important to mention and include. The complexity of and Western need to categorize ideas were evident in this study. Some themes seemed to seep into others and some subcategories were hard to sort. That is why Foucault's concept of power is very much a part of this study. That is, like power, my themes and categories are expressed through a complex web of relations.

Further, my themes and categories were (are) difficult to define in a straightforward manner. It is important to remember that, when using postmodern methods of research, ambiguity and uncertainty are central (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994). Although it may be tempting to read the bodily images presented as true and rigid, I hope that the opposite effect takes place. I want to show how flexible and fluid images can be. I hope this allows for moments in which images can be deconstructed and counterdiscourses can emerge.

Two central questions were part of this project: (a) the deconstruction: what are the (often) hidden images about the body of the teacher within the HFT? and (b) the genealogical analysis: from the images, what are the discursive impacts on the body of the teacher? I briefly discuss the results of the first guiding question. The following themes emerged: (a) teacher's body as container, (b) spatial organization of the teacher's body, (c) teacher's body as performative discourse, and (d) resisting bodies. Under the overarching themes I also provide detailed images. Below I list them respectively of the themes: (a) teacher as nation body and teacher (mother) as container for the child; (b) spatial organization of the patriarchal body, spatial organization of the dangerous female

body, and spatial organization of capitalistic body; (c) performing the heterosexist body and performing the patriarchal body; and (d) shifting and challenging boundaries and bodies that defy.

To answer the second guiding question I provide separate sections that specifically discuss the possible discursive impacts of the images. It was possible to read the images in it of themselves as discursive impacts. However, by offering separate and distinct sections, the discursive impacts can be discussed explicitly. What follows are the new bodily stories generated through my biased lens and *cuerpo*.

### **Teacher's Body as Container**

“She functions as a container, as envelope, as that which surrounds and marks the limit of man’s identity” (Grosz, 2001, p. 159). An overarching theme that surfaced as I extracted the body of the teacher in HFT text is that of the teacher’s body as a container. The teacher as container was conceived from my reading of and bodily interaction with the works of Luce Irigaray’s (1993) and Elizabeth Grosz (2001). Women, according to Grosz, have been the container for men. Irigaray described how the female is an empty container that holds ideas, discourse, and constructions that have been defined for her/him. Because teaching has been defined as women’s work, the metaphor can transfer easily to the teacher. After all, s/he is supposed to hold/contain those characteristics that make the work of capitalism and patriarchy possible. S/he is the container that holds the responsibility of maintaining social norms and perpetuating the notion of the good mother, daughter, and wife in the confinements of the school. I find my *maestra cuerpo* adhering to this idea. *Siempre pense* that it was my own character not to defy rules and be quiet and not speak out. But is it? Or has the *cuerpo* of the *maestra* been constructed and created as container that certain bodies like mine easily adjust to the container image?



Within the theme of teacher-as-container body, two more images emerged: (a) teacher as nation body, and (b) teacher as container for the child. Postcolonial feminist scholar Radhika Mohanran (1999) contended that the body of women represents the nation. A nation with its borders and jurisdiction can be envisioned as a container. The teacher's body as a container is thought of and designated the one responsible for advancing through his/her body society and society's needs. Through her "nation body" progress can be achieved. S/he is also the container for the future of man and the nation: the child. Constructions of the child inadvertently helped to create and shape the teacher's body (Sugg, 1978). S/he was necessary to foster normal growth of the "developing" child, the future and "our most precious natural resource."

#### *Teacher as Nation Body*

According to Mohanran (1999), women's bodies are not only racial, cultural, social, and historically encoded but spatially encoded as well. She posited that woman ultimately represents the nation space. The teacher could well be imagined as the nation space. Ultimately, the teacher is the one who will produce students who are law-abiding and contributing citizens. Is this not the purpose that drove mass education and still drives it? I am constantly reminding my students not to get in trouble *para que no metan a sus papas en problemas*. My *cuero* conforms, why should not they?

One discourse that drove the feminization of teaching was fear of bodies and the need to normalize those bodies for the nation. As Schmuck (1987b) explained, "Many new social forces were at work in the mid-nineteenth century . . . urban schools were growing rapidly with the press for "common schools," and there was an influx of both rural Americans and non-English speaking immigrants into urban centers" (pp. 75-76). The bodies of teachers are not mentioned, but the nation body is implicit. We can extract the body and examine how the fear of a diversity of bodies permitted females to be a

cheap option for creating a common language and body for the nation. Disciplined female bodies would “tame” the strange and savage (perhaps even erotic) bodies of students who were filling the urban centers. The body of the teacher represented the nation (Mohanran, 1999) as s/he manages, nurtures, and controls national citizens’ bodies. Through her body a common school and body (of students) was possible. Through my *cuerpo* I will help students to do better.

“The special esteem in which American women [teachers] were held meant that their united actions would have a nationwide effect” (Sklar, 1973, p. 174). Not only was the teacher’s body implicitly represented as the nation but s/he was also responsible for the nation’s well-being, moral growth, cohesiveness and unity—responsible for the making of one body, one mind (Mohanran, 1999). Sometimes I feel caught between wanting my students to question everything and at the same time *quiero que prosperen en este país*. A rebellious body may not prosper in this country.

One of the major proponents of the female teacher was Catherine Beecher.

Catharine suggested women should donate their services to the cause of education. Although they might still be poor, their economic sacrifice would transcend class lines and benefit the whole nation instead of a self-interested class of businessmen [meaning not work in factory]. (Sklar, 1973, pp. 172-173)

Beecher, along with others in her time (and present), imagined women/teachers as representing the nation. All can come and be comforted through her body. Through her body children were educated and molded. The civilization of the West was possible through her body. In present times it is through her body that students will succeed and pass standardized tests so that the United States will remain number one militarily, economically, and politically. Her nation-body-as-container achieved all that (Irigaray, 1993; Monhanram, 1999). *Yes cierto*, because I drill and kill, my students were able to pass these obnoxious tests. My body modeled those behavior that are considered proper and successful.

It was easy to imagine this new body of the teacher. There was already a model in mind. As Cordier (1992, p. 27) explained, “The need for teachers expanded the sphere of womanhood beyond the confines of the home through the gainful employment of women to assure the welfare and education of children in the district schools.” Through a postcolonial lens the body can be revisualized as representing the nation (Mohanran, 1999). The idea that a nation nurtures its young for survival became important. The child’s well-being and education was crucial. Teachers were the *cuerpos* who nurtured the young and taught them the skills necessary to carry on with the nation’s goals. Further, it was interesting to note that the sphere or boundaries of womanhood can vary depending on the economic need of the country. Therefore, gender and everything constructed around it was not static. The *cuerpo* of the *maestra* could be any “body” as long as the societal need (economic in this sense) superseded already-established norms. The employment of (certain bodies) female teachers was allowed because of economic need. Teaching as a “woman’s sphere” became real and distinct after social inscriptions through language, discourse, and knowledge/power were (are) imprinted on the body (Butler, 1993; Grosz, 1994; Shildrick, 1997).

Capitalistic needs collided with patriarchal attitudes of women’s sphere to define it as a nation body. Did capitalism completely construct the new body and space of the teacher? Only in so far as it opened another space for employing women. Capitalism provided a new public space for women; patriarchy helped to define it as a feminine “domestic” space.

However, because the teacher represented this “feminine” nation body, s/he became under constant surveillance and male control. After all, s/he represented the nation. S/he needed to represent the nation body in gender-appropriate ways; if not, the teacher’s body was scrutinized for not following normal progressions of gender roles.

Blount (2000) explicitly highlighted the body of the teacher. Perhaps the body is explicitly highlighted in this moment because gender transgression was a cause for alarm, especially when it dealt with female sexuality.

By the early 1900s . . . many women teachers remained single. . . . Theodore Roosevelt complained that the tendency of educated young White women to pursue professions while avoiding marriage and motherhood constituted “race suicide” or the demise of the White middle-class. (p. 88)

Patriarchal and racist attitudes (Anzaldúa, 1987, 1990) helped to foster a sense of *pánico* concerning the possibility that single White *maestras* might prefer a single life over a married life with multiple White babies. However, the single female teacher’s *cuerpo* demonstrated a space for subversion and rejection of traditional gender roles (Butler, 1993; Grosz & Probyn, 1995).

Therefore, the subversive body endured new control oriented discourses.

In an era of rapidly increasing social diversity, the social hygiene movement emerged in the early 1900s and saw as its role the proper direction of sexuality toward the advancement of the White race. School and college hygiene classes assisted young White men and women . . . in finding worthy spouses who could best assure fit offspring and therefore the improvement of the race. (Blount, 2000, p. 88)

Blount quoted Averill (1939) to demonstrate how the discourse of mental hygiene was used as a technology (Foucault, 1978) to foster an image of the single teacher as a sexually frustrated body in need of finding ways to channel that frustration.

Mental hygiene is interested in the adjustment which the woman teacher who does not marry eventually makes to the thwarted love life. Witness the tremendous amount of running away from reality . . . retrogression . . . evasions of issues . . . recoil. (Blount, 2000, p. 89)

Bodies were seen as deviant/dirty if not following gender-appropriate behaviors. *Cuerpos* should simulate appropriate behaviors, such as the desire to procreate similar bodies—in this instance, White bodies. *El cuerpo de la maestra* became this idea of a “clean White” reproducing birthing (the nation) body after social inscriptions through language, discourse, knowledge, and power were imprinted on the body (Butler, 1993;

Grosz, 1994; Shildrick, 1997). My body as *maestra* reflects this White body as if my color is stripped as I enter the classroom.

Blount demonstrated how the body of the teacher was slowly being targeted for rejecting traditional bodily roles. Single bodies were accepted until it was time to resume with traditional gender and sexual roles. If the single female body rejected its destiny, then there were foreseeable consequences. The body became a target of diagnostics to control internally (Foucault, 1978). Moreover, attitudes about the body influenced the construction of teachers (Spelman, 1982). If their bodies were seen as rejecting traditional roles, then teachers were constructed as frustrated. The body of the teacher as a sexually frustrated body became real after social constructions were imprinted on the body (Butler, 1993; Grosz, 1994; Shildrick, 1997).

Blount (2000) also discussed how the single teacher's body was seen as pathological in the 1880s and 1900s through a series of intellectual developments:

First, the medical profession grew intensely interested in the broad field of human sexuality. The subject became a matter of heightened concern, and much of the research conducted was heavily influenced by religious beliefs. Any deviations from conventional procreative male-female relationships came under increased scrutiny and eventually were regarded as pathological (Bullogh, 1974, as cited in Blount, p. 88)

Patriarchal and homophobic medicine, coupled with religious beliefs, attempted to exercise control *sobre el cuerpo de las mujeres*, chiseling their bodies and transforming them as deviant bodies (Anzaldúa, 1987, 1990; Chabram, 1993).

Perhaps this notion of teacher as deviant helped to create the illusion of the absence of sensuality from pedagogy. Grumet (1988) illuminated how the body can be an explicit component in the HFT:

The teacher was expected to banish sensuality from the classroom and from her life. The repudiation of the body was a blight that fell upon the curriculum of the body's contributions to cognition, aesthetics, and community as realized through its capacity for sensuality, for movement, and for work. (p. 53)

Removing sensuality and sexuality from the body of the teacher was a way to sever the body from the mind. The binary way of thinking about pedagogy and teaching interacted with the body of the teacher, making her/him almost *sin cuerpo* (Boldt, 2001; Macrine, 2002; Nespor, 1997; Phelan, 1997). A way to control the minds of subjects is to first regulate the body, movement, and space (Smith, 1999). This also demonstrated a fear of the erotic bodies in education (Phelan; Tobin, 1997). It was more palpable to see teachers as sexless.

The sexless ideal body and image of the teacher not only explains how the body was transformed by society but is helpful in understanding society (Shilling, 1993). The teacher as nation-body can inform about society.

Sentimentalism . . . served to mute this culture's acknowledgement of the bargains it had with expansion and industrialization. . . . The feminization of teaching became a form of denial as the female teachers in the common schools demanded order in the name of sweetness, compelled moral rectitude in the name of recitation, citizenship in the name of silence, and asexuality in the name of manners. (Grumet, 1988, p. 44)

Grumet's observation illuminates the implicit relationship between the body and society. The discourse of the ideal body of the teacher interacted with the discourse of sentimentalism (Douglas, A., 1977) as an outlet for a society that was experiencing and enduring changes at its very core. The angst of society was being expressed through the discourse of the new teacher. S/he was the container that represented and held what was important for the nation, such as values, but also the receptacle for the nation's turmoil and change.

But Grumet (1988) returned to the present and examined how the body of the teacher today is perhaps not that different:

Although many of the economic and social conditions that accompanied the feminization of teaching no longer obtain, pedagogy and curriculum still bear the character of this era, and we carry in our bodies, in our smiles, our spasms, our dreams, responses to a world that is no longer ours. (p. 47)

Grumet was highlighting how bodies are historical (Zita, 1998) and how economic and social conditions can be imprinted and chiseled on bodies. Bodies carry historical discourse, even in the most mundane aspects (Tuchman, 1994). *El cuerpo de la maestra* carried history and discourses like a container to assist in the perpetuation of patriarchy, homophobia, and capitalism for the nation.

*Teacher (Mother) as Container for the Child*

Many instances in the HFT exhibited how the body of the teacher was inextricably tied to discourses of the emergent idea of the child. Not only was her/his body tied, but it was constructed *for* the child. Schmuck (1987b) explained that, “at the time the United States was formally constituted in 1776, it was not considered appropriate or desirable to hire women as teachers except for the very youngest children” (p. 75). Schmuck’s study highlighted how women’s bodies were closely associated with younger children (Bailey, 1998), even before teaching was reconstructed as a feminized space. Thus, cultural and historical representations constituted bodies and helped to reproduce them as real and material (Grosz, 1994). Bodies of women have been culturally and historically associated with motherhood, making them the “natural” *maestra* and more apt to deal with younger children (Bailey). S/he was the container for the young developing child, which in return afforded her a low status in the hierarchical structures of society.

Changing ideas of the child also constructed the container-body of the teacher.

The fireside education movement rested on a belief that the child is naturally wholesome and that it reaches wholesome maturity. Both father and mother were charged with teaching functions, but the main responsibility was assigned to the mother . . . and nowhere was it more decisive than in the schools throughout the redefinition of the teacher (Sugg, 1978, pp. 20-21)

Beliefs and attitudes about the child stemming from religion implicitly helped to construct the body of the teacher. The language and discourses promoting women’s

interests, based on the idea of the wholesome child and maternal instincts, constructed the body of the teacher.

The functions of the teacher were taken from the new ideas of the child:

The qualities . . . thought proper for the teacher are derived fundamentally from convictions as to the character, capacities, and needs of the child in relation to socialization and, beyond that, to a cosmology. . . . The idea of the child as father to the man perfectly implied superiority in the child and presumptuousness in the man who dealt with the child authoritatively. (Sugg, 1978, pp. 133-134)

New emerging discourses about the child influenced and interacted with the *cuerpo* of the teacher. The body of the *maestra* could not be male because a male body was thought of as too authoritative. The female body was ideal for its “gentleness.” The new focus on the child constructed and disciplined the teacher as the “good mother.” “In religion, and then in due course in education, the improving status of woman-as-mother or mother-teacher was a function of the new focus on the child, regarded more and more explicitly as incarnating the divine” (Sugg, 1978, p. 27). Religion and the new concept and focus on the child were implicit components that constructed the body of the teacher as *madre*. S/he was his container (cradle).

Sugg (1978) explained how society’s changing views of religion and its influence on the child helped to cultivate a space for the female body as teacher:

The readiness of Americans in the first half of the nineteenth century to credit woman with a sex-specific gift as educator must be understood in the light of the change from theocentric piety of Calvinist Christianity to anthropocentric moralism with a tendency to mere individualism and egocentricity. (p. 18)

Multiple discourses attempted to manage the body of the teacher (Foucault, 1978). Movements in religion, philosophy, and science created and managed the language and images that bonded the teacher (mother) and child. This new body of the teacher became real (as maternal and nurturer) after social inscriptions through language, discourse, knowledge, and power related to science, religion, and philosophy were imprinted on the body (Butler, 1993; Grosz, 1994; Shildrick, 1997).



Using particular discourses, a new, gentler, and perhaps more feminine teacher was needed for the sake, glory, and salvation of the child. It was this gentler body that constructed the teacher.

If the child . . . was rather, as people increasingly believed, a seed, of virtue all compact, requiring only sympathetic cultivation, might not the teacher be expected to represent female nurturance rather than male discipline? If authority, whether political, economic, religious, or intellectual, was not wanted in the classroom, the gentler sex, disfranchised and conformist, could seem preferable in a teacher. (Sugg, 1978, p. 16)

Sugg was highlighting how the body can be an explicit component of the HFT and how multiple discourses constructed the body of the teacher (Foucault, 1978). The child as innocent (Cannella, 1997) and the mother/child natural bond (Burman, 1994) were discourses that constructed the ideal teacher as woman, but most important, as mother. Inscribed as the gentler sex, women were characterized as the bodies that cared for the innocent. This also played into how the language, knowledge, and power were imprinted on body (Shildrick, 1997) and helped to construct the feminine and motherly body of the teacher as real and material as well as necessary.

A new body emerged in a form already familiar in society: the mother. “Behind the new female teacher was to stand the example, rather than the authority, of the mother, of whom nineteenth century came to think as “the minister of the home” (Sugg, 1978, p. 27). Now the boundary between teacher and mother was blurred. Teaching, then, can be seen as a performative discourse; the teacher performed the role of the mother (Butler, 1990). Teaching became seen as good practice for future mothers. As Schmuck (1987b) explained, “School teaching became a good exercise for the young and unmarried female because it provided excellent training for the care of children, thus preparing her for her “natural” destiny of wife and mother” (p. 76). The teaching body implicitly reinscribed certain gender and sex roles to maintain order and stability (or the illusion of both). Even though *mujeres* were going to be allowed to enter the teaching

work force, teaching had to be thought of as part of their natural abilities and inclinations: those of wife and mother. The teaching body, especially for women, was to be performed as “training” for mother and wife. The idea of teacher became like notions of sex and gender, a performative discourse (Butler, 1990) and, in this instance, performed like the “ideal” mother.

Sugg (1978) also commented that by the time Horace Mann advocated the feminization of teaching

American society had been accustomed for at least a quarter of a century to the identification of the idea of the mother with that of teacher “the wonderful proportions of maternity” had been powerfully asserted . . . and . . . interpreted as the primary credentials of a feminized pedagogy which did not seem in conflict with the attitudes of a patriarchal society. (p. 37)

The body became real after social inscriptions through language, discourse, knowledge, and power were imprinted on the body (Butler, 1993; Grosz, 1994; Shildrick, 1997). In this instance, imagining/constructing the teacher as a motherly body became real after religion, domestic education, common school movement, and the new concept of the child interacted to create a teacher that would reflect the ideal mother.

Thought of as the church of childhood, home took on that special unctuous tone the word still carries; and it was the home so imagined that the educational reformers meant to enlarge by annexing the school, where the female teacher might officiate as the mother did at home . . . the child was to be dealt with as a child, that is, as a person specially valuable because of his youth. (Sugg, 1978, p. 28)

Multiple discourses attempted to manage the body of the teacher (Foucault, 1978). The discourse of Christianity, along with the new concept/discourse of the child, constructed the “motherteacher” (Sugg, 1978). The space of the home was now extended on to the school. The school became and was made a familiar space for the female body.

Once the teacher’s body had been defined as mother, was it easier to control and be under surveillance? In current times we constantly regulate the child through the mother and vice versa (Cannella, 1997; Saavedra & Demas, 2001). “It can readily be

seen that the mental health of the teacher is an important factor in maintaining the mental health of the pupils” (Donovan, 1974, p. 111). Attitudes about the body influenced the construction of the teacher (Spelman, 1982). Because the teacher had a female body, she was regarded as having a symbiotic relationship with her pupils similar to what was expected of mother and child. The child was dependent on the well-being of the mother. The mother was considered to be the most important relationship that a child could have. Further, if the teacher was able to regulate her emotions and mental state, then she was able to regulate that of her students (Phelan, 1997). My *cuervo* is not for showing emotions. I often find it easier to hide my feelings than to share with my students. But it is because emotions and pleasures have been deemed inappropriate in education.

Blount (2000) also observes:

In 1934 David Peters released his detailed study . . . which concluded that while single and married women teachers were similar in their effectiveness, “the measured mental growth of the pupil is taught by the married women teachers exceeded the measured mental growth of the pupils taught by the married women teachers (p. 87)

The body of the teacher became a target of evaluations and diagnostics (Foucault, 1977). Language started to shift to implore a separation of mind from body. The mental growth of pupils was measured against the body of the teacher. Now the married body of the teacher (not her abilities, mental and physical) was to be the example for the normal growth and development of the students. The single body, on the other hand, hindered and slowed the mental growth of students. It was this new body of the teacher as container that was easier to move and get organized in hierarchies that stem from constructions of gender and sex. Now there were special spaces and places for this new feminine body.

### *Discursive Impacts of the Teacher's Body as Container*

This section addresses the second guiding question of the project with respect to the discursive impacts of the teacher's body as container. In this section I discuss the possible discursive impacts that the images presented have on the body of the teacher. What are the discursive impacts of the image of the teacher as nation body and for the teacher (mother) as container for the child?

#### **Teacher as Nation Body**

The image of the teacher's body as the nation could potentially seep into the subjectivities of teachers and possibly construct their bodies as sacrificial beings that must render their lives for the good of "mankind." A good example of this burden is reflected in the writings and metaphors created by Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa (2002) in *This Bridge Called My Back*. Women's bodies ache as they are positioned and constructed in society as the containers and receptacles to advance the nation through the raising and teaching of children. Not only do they manage and control students' bodies; in the process they mold and shape their bodies as well. Cordier (1992) provided an example:

Although they were practical in their day-to-day concerns of earning a living and managing their schoolhouses, they were inspired by an idealistic belief in universal public education as the means of improvement for children, for themselves, and for the community at large. (p. 39)

This is one example of how the discourse of universal public education acted as a discursive impact. The body of the teacher internalized and performed these discursive practices as the means of improvement and advancement of children, herself/himself, and the community at large. The body of the teacher was the nation representing the "betterment" of the nation (Mohanran, 1999), and s/he believed in this idea. As well as being constructed and pierced by patriarchal notions that *mujeres* are the backbone that must carry most of the burden (Anzaldúa, 1987; Moraga, 1983; Moraga & Anzaldúa,

2002), teachers (read as mother) feel and internalize a certain sense of duty to (raise) teach children the (illusory) necessary skills to be successful in society. In the process of teaching, the teacher's body and subjectivity was disciplined into believing that s/he must ignore her body and become the container body for everyone else, much like the unconventional love of a mother. My body as a *maestra* feels a certain duty to make sure that my students learn the skills that will help them out of poverty. One way is to use my *cuero* to model the behaviors and skills that I think necessary for their success.

### **Teacher (Mother) as Container for the Child**

Foucault (1978) stated that behaviors are taken from the bodies of people in order to control those bodies through the careful management of discourse. With regard to the teacher (mother) container for the child, the behaviors of mother as nurturer and sole care person for the child was used and applied to the teacher. Perhaps it was not that the time was right to favor a gentler, more feminine body to instruct students; rather, it was a way to control teaching through the discourse of “teacher as mother” (a category that was already established, inscribed with only mind power).

The contradiction implicit . . . of the ideal woman and ideal mother were extended into the training and work of the ideal teacher. The intimacy, spirituality, and innocence that teachers and students were to inherit from the mother/child bond—the prototype of their relationship—collapsed into strategies for control. The ideal teacher was one who could control the children and be controlled by her superiors. (Grumet, 1988, p. 43)

The body of the teacher was equated with that of mother and what it meant to be a woman. The discourse of the cult of “true womanhood” (Welter, 1966) was a technology for managing bodies in schools. Teachers regulated students as they regulated themselves (Phelan, 1997). The idea that the female teacher would recapitulate the same socially constructed relationship between mother and child invented the teacher as mother. The discourse of bond and intimacy became technologies for controlling

students, teachers, curriculum, and pedagogy. A contemporary example of how that has continued is the numerous times that I have heard teachers say, “I do it for my kids.” What kind of mother (teacher) would not sacrifice for her children? Further, the fact that teachers were to perform as mothers demonstrates how the discourse of teacher is performative (Butler, 1990). In this case, the teacher must act/perform like a mother, placing discursive impacts on the body of the teacher.

### **Conclusion**

The teacher’s body as container has potential discursive impacts to contemplate for the past and present conditions for teachers. The body of the teacher interacts with multiple discourses that shape and mold it into a container. However, questions and challenges should be acknowledged. Who has power and voice to mold and shape the container? How is this body as container a necessary technology for the silencing and/or validating of certain voices? Are there counterdiscourses that can disintegrate the container, and what would that look like?

### **Spatial Organization of the Teacher’s Body**

“Little wonder, then, that in this more ordered pedagogical space, the material body of the teacher (like the priests, counselors and Boy Scouts leaders) is under heightened scrutiny” (McWilliam, 2000, p. 31).

In this section I drew from the work of Bryan Turner (1996) to examine how bodies, along with pleasures and desires, are spatially organized according to reason. According to Turner (1996), spatial organization of bodies helps to discipline and control bodies. The body of the female teacher was one body that became object (container) and thus easier to move and discipline according to patriarchal, misogynistic, homophobic, and capitalistic needs.

The home during the 1840s was a space that reflected society. According to Sklar (1973), the home exemplified the Victorian repugnance for unfilled spaces.

Based on a design that was widely disseminated as early as the 1840s by works such as Catharine Beecher's *Treatise on Domestic Economy* . . . the house exemplifies a new set of social boundaries constructed . . . by nineteenth-century Americans . . . a new kind of space within which they forged their identities and . . . organized their social and political interaction . . . applicable outside as well as inside the home. (pp. xi-xii)

Sklar was describing the context from which the concept of mass education was imbedded. Everything had a defined space and every question an answer. The search for certainty was well defined and could be evidenced within and outside the home. Spatial organization of desires, pleasures, and bodies seemed to have been a central tenet as well as an implicit component in the feminization of teaching. Education and schooling, an extension of the home, must have followed, if not reinforced, this (re)organization. Because education was seen as a natural extension of the home, the discourse of patriarchy acted on the *cuervo* of teachers. Further, misogynistic attitudes toward the "dangerous" female body made the teacher's container-body easy to organize and position for management and control. Capitalism also played a role in the fragmentation of spaces within the school and in the placement of bodies.

#### *Spatial Organization of the Patriarchal Body*

The ideology of patriarchy played a major role in the construction of the teacher's body. More important, however, patriarchy seemed to act as a hegemonic discourse that attempted to control and discipline not only *cuervos* but the placement of those bodies. During the time of the common school movement, many proponents of mass education and the feminization of teaching romanticized and normalized domesticity: a patriarchal technology.

The common school movement and the feminization of teaching colluded in support of a program of centralized education that exploited the status and

integrity of the family to strip it of its authority and deliver its children to the state. (Grumet, 1988, p. 39)

The body that would birth children and deliver them to the state was the female teacher. Spatial organization of bodies in relation to society and reason is evident here (Turner, 1996). Women's bodies were to be placed alongside the bodies of children, inadvertently creating a space where both women and children could be easier to manage and control. Schooling became an extension of the home, yet a home controlled by the state. This extension again created women as the bodies that can be moved according to the interest of the nation/state (Mohanran, 1999).

Women's duties in society also reinforced men's advantage:

The divided responsibilities of married women teachers were expounded and emphasized by legislators and male colleagues, a process which had negative effects on the status and prospects of all women teachers. Thus ideology served to sustain state policy and guarantee to men the advantages of higher pay and status, a greater chance of a headship and housekeeping services in the home. (Oram, 1989, p. 30)

The traditional gender role assigned to women was easily transferred to the teaching position. Female teachers worked under men in subordinate and domestic type duties. Spatial organization of the female and male bodies (Turner, 1996) in school began to emerge. Females managed the young in homes as in schools. Men would dictate how to manage children in the schools (read as homes) through accepted norms backed by state policy.

Sklar (1973) demonstrated this spatial organization of bodies that directly impacted the body of the teacher:

Catharine [Beecher] took the traditional submissive role of women and turned it into a sign of superior moral sensibility. In suggestion that the nation turn away from the turbulence of political democracy and emphasize the stabilizing influence of peaceable womankind and the home, Catharine joined a growing American tendency to glorify domesticity. (p. 136)

Here the mind/body of the woman belonged in *el hogar* (home). Men's bodies belonged in the public realm, women in the domestic and private realm. Schools usurped



this domestic definition because of the feminization of teaching. As Sklar (1973) also noted, “Yet while Catharine seemed to be arguing on behalf of the traditional view that limited women to their homes, her discussion on closer view was more subtle. For it politicized the traditional female sphere of the home” (p. 135).

Spatial organization of desires, pleasures, and bodies in relation to society and reason was at work here (Turner, 1996). During a time of social and cultural upheaval, women took the domestic sphere as battle ground to exert influence and authority in a nation that left them with limited power because of their sex/gender. Reorganizing and/or reaffirming their domestic sphere and authority gave women a sense (or illusion) of power and influence. Under these conditions, the body of the teacher was molded and shaped by romantic and normalizing ideas of domesticity.

Catharine Beecher explained . . . that women were restricted to the domestic sphere as a political expedient necessary to the maintenance of democracy in America . . . in a democracy agitated and tension-filled as the United States in the 1840s, some form of hierarchy was needed to avoid a war against all . . . she led her readers to conclude that removing half the population from the arena of competition and making it subservient to the other half, the amount of antagonism the society had to bear would be reduced to a tolerable limit. (Sklar, 1973, p. 156)

Spatial organization of bodies was evident here in relation to society and reason (Turner, 1996). The social upheaval in which Beecher found herself contributed to her attempt to create and foster a space where women, already denied power, could have and exert power. What better way than in the home, where women were already thought to belong? Important was how the vision and illusion of having power in the home was translated to the school, making school a domestic space. Female bodies were relegated to the sphere of education and home with the illusion of exerting power.

But Catherine Beecher was not the only influence.

Several forces converged in the 1830s and the 1840s to form a matrix of support for Catharine Beecher’s ideas. These were the creation of a leisured middle class of women, the institution of tax supported common schools, the expansion of

population in the West and its need for new schools, and her glorification of the female qualities of nurture throughout the United States. (Sklar, 1973, pp. 96-97)

Did the glorification of women's qualities coincide with the creation of a leisured middle class of women? Was the placing of female bodies in public institutions a reaction to the thought of a "bunch of women" with nothing to do? What happens when bodies have leisured time? Is it dangerous for society's order and structure? This was a way to (re)organize and structure bodies based on pleasures and desires in relation to society and reason. A growing middle class of women with leisure time as well as a growing ethnic immigrant population played an important part in the placement of both of those potentially "dangerous" bodies (populations).

#### *Spatial Organization of the Dangerous Female Body*

Perhaps patriarchal attitudes toward *mujeres*, teachers, and schooling open the way for homophobic and misogynistic discourses to infiltrate and chisel the *cuero* of the teacher. Patriarchy infused teaching and schools with normal gender/sex roles; when bodies did not conform, they were seen as pathological, homosexual, perhaps even dangerous.

As the larger teaching profession became feminized both demographically and functionally, male educators struggled to redefine themselves in masculine terms . . . a more important means of making schoolwork appealing to men involved the creation of male-identified niches such as administration, coaching, vocational education, other manual trades, and certain high school subjects such as science and mathematics. ("Male Teachers Needed," 1908, as cited in Blount, 2000, p. 86)

Spatial organization of bodies (Turner, 1996) helped to create a "masculine"-identified space in an "all-too-feminine" teaching profession. Society, not wanting to risk men having a feminine-associated body, created spaces within the school organization where male educators comfortably took jobs in teaching that reinforced their macho *cueros* along with their patriarchal attitudes.

Dangerous bodies could simply be identified through perceived gender transgressions in the schools.

Since persons who crossed their gender appropriate bounds had come to be regarded as homosexual and therefore as undesirable for school employment, Cold War era schools around the country wholeheartedly embraced their newly added mission to eliminate gender transgression among employees. (Blount, 2000, p. 92)

Teaching was regarded as a space for those *cuerpos* who abided by traditional gender and sex roles. Spatial organization of bodies (Turner, 1996) contributed to the desire to position bodies in certain localities. Any potentially dangerous body was not a body for the realm of schooling and education. Heterosexual, “normal,” and safe bodies belonged and were encouraged as role models in the schools. The discourse of heterosexuality and misogynistic attitudes created a need to control the bodies of females, especially the single female *cuerpos*.

The fear of dangerous bodies (single female, homosexual, or any gender transgressor) brought with it a new desire and *cuerpo* not wanted before: the female married body. “As public consciousness of same-sex desired among single women teacher increased, education leaders campaigned for the rights of women teachers to marry and retain their teaching positions” (Blount, 2000, p. 90). Whereas it had been desired that female teachers’ bodies be single so as to not compete with the womanly duties and responsibilities of the home, the potential that single teachers might turn into lesbian bodies, thus pathological bodies, became alarming and problematic. The sexuality of the single female body had to be controlled. A cultural shift (Martin, E., 1987) occurred in society. Married female bodies began to be seen as the ideal teachers to instruct and be with children. In this way, the married body of the female teacher could be a good gender/sex role model for future generations of bodies. The married body was considered a “safe” body, as compared to the dangerous single body. Perhaps,

the married body was seen as already disciplined and domesticated. The married body was ready and willing to continue with her domestic duties in the classroom and as a role model for normal heterosexuality. Further, natural and normal bodies needed to be restored in order to reproduce and birth heteronormative bodies (students).

Gender-appropriate behavior could be achieved only by segregating to the extent of polarizing positions in the schools.

After WWII . . . positions within educational employment essentially became ever-more gender polarized: not only had administration become a more narrowly defined masculine realm, but teaching had become more rigidly associated with women. While niches for “manly” men were reinforced . . . the association of women with . . . areas [such as] elementary instruction and home economics deepened. (Blount, 2000, p. 92)

Spatial organization of bodies (Turner, 1996) as described above was essential in order to reinforce gender and sex roles. *Mujeres* were kept in close proximity not only with young children but also to academic subjects that reinforced their gender. Men were positioned in spaces close to older pupils and in spaces that reflected, reproduced, and reaffirmed masculine gender.

Female bodies were not the only ones affected by the growing alarm about dangerous bodies. Perceived femininity in men also endured a misogynistic gaze on their bodies.

Because homosexual men were thought to be particularly drawn to professions such as teaching, because conventional wisdom held that homosexual men could be identified by effeminate characteristics, and because one important role teachers were required to fulfill was to provide correct gender modeling for the children they taught, the 1950s and 1960s brought national campaigns to find . . . seemingly heterosexual men. (p. 92).

However, . . . it continued to be difficult to attract large numbers of such men to classroom teaching . . . many school districts recruited desirable men to teaching by assuring . . . rapid promotions to the more manly realm of school administration, especially the superintendency. (Barter, 1959, p. 40)

In the first part of the quote, attitudes about the *cuervo* influenced the constructions of the teacher (Spelman, 1982). “Effeminate” male bodies were suspect

and thought to be easily identifiable and labeled as homosexual. The second half of the quote shows how spatial organization of bodies was linked in relation to society and reason (Turner, 1996). Masculine men did not belong in the classroom because it potentially made them effeminate and closely associated to/with the “dangerous” female body. Removing them from the potentially hazardous and contagious feminine space and creating a masculine space for men was appropriate for males. A space where men could (and should) lead was needed to provide students with male role models.

### *Spatial Organization of the Capitalistic Body*

Attitudes about the body of *mujeres* (Spelman, 1982) increased the economical desirability of employing them. Because the female body was already seen as the second sex (Beauvoir, 1952), her body had a cheaper price tag. Industrialization and urbanization were social and economic events that led to the need to hire *más mujeres*. Already “possessing” clear and distinct qualities, women were designated to advance the goals of mass education at a much lower cost. Disciplined bodies of females who would labor for less in turn increased their employability. Further, placing disciplined female bodies in schools was a way to regulate and control the new foreign and savage *cuerpos* coming into the schools: the immigrants. Females’ employability also, in certain ways, informed their bodies. At least during the feminization of teaching, women were seen as wage earners in a legitimate profession. Although the profession had been already defined for the most part, teaching provided new, unfound *oportunidades* that had not existed for women. Women were then literally absorbed by education (Grumet, 1988).

But the body of the teacher, besides being thought of as economical and cheaper, collided with other discourses that made her a commodity and especially a woman.

A deliberate system of propaganda was inaugurated to persuade women to take up teaching. In sermons delivered from pulpits, and in articles printed in both newspapers and magazines, women were told that they had the superior technique, the enduring patience, and the high moral character for the task. What the

preachers of sermons and writers of articles really meant was that women teachers would cost less. (Donovan, 1974, p. 3)

Patriarchal and capitalistic attitudes were at work to chisel and pierce the *cuervo* of the *maestra* (Anzaldúa, 1987; Cruz & McLaren, 2002). Patriarchal discourses positioning *mujeres* as better suited to teach because they were more patient, moral, and so forth, along with the inexpensive price tag attached to their bodies, created a desire to see the woman as the ideal teacher.

Previously, it had been men who taught (Blount, 2000). However, once the idea of the body of the teacher as female became more common, along with that idea came the social constructions surrounding the female body. “Women were a cheap and available labor force which displaced the more expansive male teaching ranks” (Richardson & Hatcher, 1983, p. 82). The social construction of women as inferior to men rendered them more likely to be seen as cheap labor. Women’s physical and material *cuervos* were constructed as being worth less than men, making female bodies justifiably cheaper. However, it was not so simple to accept the new body of the teacher until a price tag was attached to the *neuvo cuerpo*. With all of the demands *que me hacen*, I, too, feel the weight of capitalist relations upon my *cuervo*. The emotional and intellectual demands to perform teaching are unleashed on the body. My *cuervo* is disciplined into believing the low status given to teachers and it performs accordingly.

But the capitalistic body of the teacher would be needed only if it filled a need to contribute to normal gender roles and other social conventions. Clifford (1998) explained that four social rules governed the employability of women. Women could contribute to the economy

by working in and for the family corporation: the family farm, trade, or business. . . . in work perceivable as traditional women’s work, as useful preparation for their ultimate domestic careers . . . until marriage or pregnancy . . . woman’s labour-force participation, even after marriage and child-bearing, may be legitimated by its material contributions to family welfare and cohesion. (p. 117)

Clifford's examinations of the four conventions demonstrate how sex and gender constructions acted as performative discourse (Butler, 1990). Women's *cuerpos* were useful and needed so long as they contributed to the *familia* or the nation. The female's participation in family and in the labor force revolved around those activities that were considered part of the women's sphere. Women's participation was also needed or appropriate until it interfered with duties of wife and/or mother. As long as her body fulfilled one of the above mentioned conventions, her employability was desired and encouraged; when s/he challenged traditional gender roles, the body endured constant surveillance.

### *Discursive Impacts of the Spatial*

#### *Organization of the Body*

This section addresses the second guiding question of the project with respect to the discursive impacts of the spatial organization of the body. I discuss the possible discursive impacts that the images presented above have on the *cuerpo* of the teacher. The discursive impacts in this section were more subtle than those in the previous section. However, the organization of spaces and spaces themselves were filled with discourses. Spaces, like bodies, are influenced by discourse and have discursive impacts on bodies.

#### **Patriarchal Body**

Controlling teachers' bodies took the form of spatial (re)organization of the school (Turner, 1996). The locality of where a specific male or female body was placed was organized by society's reasoning of what "female" and "male" roles should be. Female bodies were placed next to younger bodies (those whom we call children) because it was deemed more "natural" for females to be with children. Men were placed in positions of power because society had reasoned that men were heads of households;

consequently, men were heads of organizations. This reorganization was a covert technique (Foucault, 1977) to control where bodies of teachers were placed in schools. I often think about this as my *cuervo* is 98% surrounded by other female bodies in my elementary school. Further, established roles and gender assignment of bodies led to performative discourses (Butler, 1990). Men felt and performed leadership roles; women felt and performed to support men.

The reorganization of the primary school system has also affected women's position in teaching, although more indirectly . . . these structural changes only affected women teachers' position because of the deeply embedded familiar ideology of the school: the man as head of the family, supported by women teachers, who were supposed to be particular suited to the education of younger children. (Oram, 1989, p.29)

The space of education had discursive impacts for the *cuervo* of the teacher. The body entered into discursive practices that reinforced the patriarchal space of the home, whether or not the body intended to do so. The hierarchal structures of the school positioned *mujeres* as contributing members for the advancement and perpetuation of patriarchy.

### **The Dangerous Female Body**

The fear and hatred toward females' "dangerous bodies" had discursive impacts on the spatial organization of the school. Men and young male students (as well as society) were to be suspect of the female body. The body of the *maestra* began to be seen as dangerous and potentially harmful.

By the 1880s, the statistical presence of women in the teaching profession had begun to receive new forms of attention. This second phase, extending largely to 1920, now turned critical and alarmist . . . concern mounted over what adverse socialization effects female teachers would have on male pupils. (Richardson & Hatcher, 1983, pp. 87-88)

Female teachers were also thought to impede the "natural" inclination of older male students (Richardson & Hatcher, 1983). Control of *cuervos* through time and space was implicit here (Nespor, 1994, 1997). Older pupils (bodies) were relegated to interact



with and be taught by male instructors. Younger pupils (bodies) would be with female teachers. Bodies were placed in spaces deemed appropriate and thus easier to control. When the time was right, bodies were spatially reorganized. To this day, *cuando uno entra una escuela, los cuerpos de las mujeres* are with young children.

Also interesting was the fear of the erotic, emotions, and pleasures (Phelan, 1997; Tobin, 1997) that may have been present when older male pupils were in proximity to “erotic” female bodies. Further, older boys’ natural inclinations were constructed to be the aggressive macho who lead. Being taught by a female body emasculated young males, bringing out a softer, more nurturing form of functioning. This was based on social constructions of what the female teacher’s body was and how it was to be managed, regulated, and perhaps even feared. Misogynistic attitudes toward the female body contributed to the physical reorganization of the structures of the school. Males were to avoid the “dangerous” female body, to the point where more fragmentation and isolation occurred in the structure of the school.

### **Capitalistic Body**

Men dominated the work of school teaching through the mid-nineteenth century. The common school movement, however, brought a pressing demand for a huge supply of relatively inexpensive teachers. Despite deep-seated resistance to women’s public employment, communities around the country recognized the simple economic advantage of hiring female teachers to satisfy this need. (Blount, 2000, p. 85)

A cultural shift occurred that allowed the *cuerpo* of the *maestra* to go from masculine to feminine. In an implicit manner, economic need created the desire and acceptance of the teacher’s body as a female one. Women in education became a site for the enfleshment of capitalistic relation (Cruz & McLaren, 2002). In education, the female body had a cheap price. The discursive impact of the spatial organization of the capitalistic rendered female bodies employable. The discourse of cheap labor interacted

with the female body. The new emphasis on her body as cheap labor reinforced regulation and control over her body.

### **Conclusion**

The spatial organization of the teacher's body contributed to the discourse of patriarchy, the repudiation of the female body (misogyny), and the confinements and fragmentations of labor (capitalism). The discursive impacts of the spatial organization of the teacher's body normalized and crystallized her domestic duties in the school. S/he reproduced the patriarchal relations with her superiors and with her students. Relegating her body to specific confined spaces highlighted her body and brought her under the misogynistic gaze and surveillance. Finally, this newly organized space became a site for the embodiment of capitalistic relations. Her body as cheap labor was a capitalistic need. In turn, her cheap labor status devalued her work, intelligence, and body.

### **Teacher's Body as Performative**

The body has always been of paramount importance to the theories and practices of performance . . . performance practitioners and theorists have critically engaged with the position of the body within the performance epistemology and with the body's social, cultural, and political positions and ramifications. (Becky, 2000, p. 57)

This section explores how the idea of the teacher was caught at the interstices of discursive practices (Foucault, 1977) that attempt to discipline the *cuero*. Society saw the teacher in a particular way through multiple discourses (Foucault, 1978). Inadvertently, the teacher's body was caught in a web of power relations among multiple discourses. Butler's (1990) notion of performative discourse is also central in this section. I came across instances in the HFT that exhibited moments that demonstrated the enactment of performative discourses. That is, the teacher (male or female) acted out (performed) a set of learned behaviors that were internalized. As individuals embodied the subjectivity (Butler, 1990) of the teacher, discourses were internalized and the

teacher performed the role through her/his body. Of course, there were moments in HFT in which the teacher's body defied and resisted. My aim is not to center a weak *cuerpo* with little agency. My goal is to show how pervasive and persistent discourse tends to be on the body and how the teacher's body (*mi cuerpo*) seems to perform in certain heterosexist and patriarchal ways. In this section I discuss moments where the teacher's body performs heterosexist and patriarchal discourses through her/his body.

### *Performing the Heterosexist Body*

Many instances in the HFT exhibit moments of heterosexist inscriptions on the body of the teacher. Heterosexist inscriptions needed to be witnessed on the body. The discourse of morality aided bodies to exhibit heteronormative behavior. As Sklar (1973) noted:

The transition from piety to morality as the basic system of belief . . . was congruent with an increasing democratic and individualized ethos . . . the emphasis on moral behavior created new distinctions between men and women not previously inherent in a system based on piety . . . Sexually differentiated definitions of morality were thereby heightened. . . . Thus what might be deemed virtuous modesty in a woman could be unhealthy self-doubt in a man. (p. 83)

The discourse of morality became a modern technique of self-surveillance (Foucault, 1978). Not only did an individual have to think that s/he was pious and moral, s/he had to physically demonstrate that morality *con el cuerpo*. The body was a target of a new discourse—morality—and straying from that morality was deemed unnatural and not normal.

Virtually all who remained in education learned that to be above reproach, rigid adherence to a narrow range of gender appropriate behaviors . . . . Besides gender appropriate behavior (and fashion), then marriage had come to represent evidence of one's heterosexuality, and therefore fitness for service to education. (Blount, 2000, p. 95)

Homophobia, misogyny, and patriarchy explicitly chiseled and pierced the *cuerpo* of the *maestra* (Anzaldúa, 1987), making the body an object and target of constant surveillance. Similar to the constant surveillance and policing of brown people

(Cruz, 2001), gender transgressors underwent surveillance and regulation. Gender transgressors were treated as so potentially harmful that even the once ideal spinster *maestra* became an abomination.

Many were seen as deviant, pathological, or downright dangerous for working with children. In time, spinsterhood even became conflated with lesbianism, then an unspeakable social transgression. Since school teaching had come to be known as the profession of single women, accusations of their possible lesbianism could not be far behind. (Blount, 2000, p. 89)

The body of the teacher became a homosexual body after social inscriptions through language and discourse (in this illustration of a perceived sexual pathology) were imprinted on the *cuerpo* (Shildrick, 1997). Then it became knowledge (and truth) that spinster teachers were lesbians and therefore suspect and objects of constant surveillance.

To counter the single dangerous body, marriage became normalized as the ideal condition and goal for teacher's body. Marriage became evidence of one's heterosexuality *y normalidad*.

If the schoolma'am of tomorrow does marry she will not be asked to renounce her profession. On the contrary progressive school officials of the future will encourage her to marry and to have children . . . They will realize that a woman who is satisfied emotionally in a normal relationship that includes husband, home, and children will be more successful in creative effort than one who has been compelled, against her will, to forego them. (Donovan, 1974, p. 350)

*El cuerpo de la maestra* was molded by patriarchy, misogyny, and homophobia (Anzaldúa, 1987). Fear and hatred of the single female body created a discourse of "happily ever after." The teacher's destiny was to be "happily heterosexually married" with children. The discourse of marriage in this instance became an influence on the body of the teacher.

Further, scientific research, followed by popular culture, supported the idea that spinster teachers were lesbians. Social activist and sex researcher Katherine Bement Davis (1929) conducted research with single female teachers and

concluded that almost half of the single women educators reported having experienced either intense emotional relationships with other women or homosexual relationships . . . studies such as Davis's contributed to a larger social trend toward naming homosexual desires. At first, mainly medical researchers, psychologist, and social scientists cataloging the supposed characteristics of homosexual controlled the discourse. However, artists joined the public discussion by creating works depicting same-sex relationships. (Blount, 2000, p. 89-90)

The gaze turned overtly to the *cuervo* of the teacher to attempt to create a language to understand and therefore to control. The body of the teacher became a target of evaluation and diagnostics (Foucault, 1977). As Grosz (1994) argued, cultural representations constitute bodies and help to reproduce them as real and material.

But men were not exempt from this type of surveillance:

Essentially, then as teaching shifted from men's work to women's work, men who continued in school work either needed to move to newly-created male niches or risk being regarded as "sissies" or feminine men. Since few men were willing to endure the latter fate, the number of male classroom teachers decreased to negligible levels. (Blount, 2000, p. 86)

Covert techniques in the form of self-surveillance emerged to control *cuervos* and reinforce gender norms (Foucault, 1977). Men, monitoring themselves to avoid the label of feminine, moved to more macho identified niches. Thus, it did not matter how masculine a male teacher was, he was seen as a homosexual by default. Clearly, males leaving the field would only reinforce and perpetuate the feminine characteristics attached to female *cuervos* that remained in the classrooms.

Homophobia also helped to control men's bodies. For example, marriage was the ideal for men as well, because bachelor men were also suspected of being homosexual. "A bachelor is considered 'odd' or 'peculiar,' vain and selfish, and even a delinquent member of society" (Zeliff, 1947, p. 86). "At the time, the terms 'odd' and 'peculiar' (especially when wrapped by quotation marks) were sometimes used as code words for 'homosexual' in polite conversation" (Blount, p. 92).

Homophobia chiseled the *cuervo* of the educator (Anzaldúa, 1987). Homophobia constructed the homosexual and delinquent body. *Si el cuerpo* did not match up to

traditional notions and performance of a “man,” he was suspect. Blount (2000) also commented on how the men’s bodies were targets of surveillance.

To be selected as superintendent . . . male candidates . . . needed to demonstrate superior masculine qualities. A writer for the *American School Journal* in 1946 described the characteristics that made one successful superintendent candidate so desirable: “The man selected could not be labeled as an effeminate being. He was a former collegiate athletic hero . . . comparable to any of the mythical Greek gods . . . the ultimate in manliness . . . was married.” (Leonard, 1946, pp. 21-22, as cited in Blount, p. 92)

Foucault (1978) is helpful here to show how bodies tend to be controlled, in this instance, through the discourses of masculinity and marriage. A certain type of *cuero* was required in order to look and perform the part of a superintendent. The *cuero* was a direct target for management and control. Deviations were not accepted. “Any deviation from gender norms was considered a sexual abnormality—and the two were popularly conflated. Effeminate men were thought to be homosexual just as single or masculine women increasingly were suspected of being lesbians” (Blount, 2000, p. 92).

The physicality and materiality of teachers’ bodies were represented by social constructions of gender and sex (Butler, 1993), creating the deviant/abnormal body of the teacher. *El cuerpo de la maestra/o* as homosexual was labeled and identified through “real” characteristics constructed through a heterosexist lens, mind and society.

Persecution of deviant bodies was also a technique used to control *cueros*. “In 1963, Florida’s congress launched the Legislative Investigation Committee to uncover evidence of homosexuals serving in various state-supported agencies . . . . Similarly, California launched its own investigation into the presence of homosexual teachers in the classroom” (Blount, 2000, pp. 93-94). This is an example of controlling bodies by using overt techniques (Foucault, 1977). Policies and authorized investigations were technologies used to police and monitor whatever had been constructed as “abnormal” behaviors that were suspected of being sexually deviant and pathological.

*Performing the Patriarchal Body*

One way to reinforce heterosexist behavior was through patriarchal discourse. This was not a linear trajectory where patriarchy drove heterosexist behavior; rather, they influenced each other. Patriarchy can be expressed in multiple ways. Making schooling an extension of the domestic sphere was one method. Marriage, patriarchy's biggest institution (Millet, 1970), was another. Further, demarcating clear and distinct characteristics through the discourse of the cult of true womanhood (Welter, 1966) was a way to exert patriarchal rule and domination over the body of the teacher.

Domesticity was influential in the making of the ideal *maestra*. As Sklar (1973) remarked, Catharine Beecher's book *Treatise on Domestic Economy*

for the first time was a text that standardized American domestic practices . . . Beecher could enter . . . any community in the . . . and expect to be received as the heroine who had simplified and made understandable the mysterious arts of household maintenance, child rearing . . . doctoring, and the . . . other responsibilities middle class women assumed to keep their children and husbands alive and well. (p. 152)

Schooling took this definition because it involved *mujeres*. The discourse of domesticity attempted to control the *cuerpo* of the *maestra*. In this case it was through the advice given to *mujeres* that teaching (fast becoming an exclusive female occupation) was also molded and became the backdrop as well as one of the driving forces for the feminization of teaching.

Catharine saw the home as an integral part of a national system, reflecting and promoting mainstream American values . . . . As a society in miniature, the family could therefore be used as a model for the extension of such relationship elsewhere in society. (Sklar, 1973, p. 163)

That extension was evident in the schools: the principal/administration (*en el nombre del padre*) the teacher (sacrificing/submissive *cuerpo de la madre*) and the students (the immature and developing *cuerpo* of the child). Bodies were reproduced in

society, home, and school, and *cuerpos* were modeled after traditional gender norms through the *cuerpo* of the *maestra*.

The employment of women as teachers was advocated by the domestic reformers, so respectable by contrast to the radical feminists, their argument being that teaching was a maternal function and the school properly an extension of the home rather than the first precinct of civil life. (Sugg, 1978, p. 18)

Cultural representations constituted bodies and helped to reproduce them as real (Grosz, 1994). In this instance, the cultural representations of woman and her duties were helpful and influential in constructing the body of the teacher. The discourse of domesticity interacted with the body of teacher, making her a domestic body. Thus, as Sugg explained, teaching was performed as a domestic role for women.

Considered as a terminal educational institution un beholden to the logical and academic requirements of secondary schools and colleges, the public common school was a theater in which woman's traditional domestic role might conceivably be played on a stage only slightly extended. (Sugg, 1978, p. 17)

The quote also exemplifies how the *mente* and *cuerpo* were considered split (Anzaldúa, 1987). The bodies of *mujeres* were thought to be not as intellectually demanding as men and thus suited for elementary education. Elementary education was a space where the female body could practice and perform womanly female duties, her housekeeping. Schools became an extension of the patriarchal home. In turn, the space of schooling shaped the views of the body of the teacher.

But perhaps this new definition of the domestic body of the teacher came from the functions already constructed for the bodies of *mujeres*. As Foucault (1978) suggested, behaviors are actually taken from "people's bodies and from their pleasures . . . [Behaviors are] solidified in them [and are] revealed, isolated, intensified by multifarious power devices" (p. 48). Thus, the teacher's body and her function in the classroom were drawn out from the female body's perceived functions as domestic and natural care taker. Consequently, the *cuerpo* of the teacher and her behaviors were



isolated and made *más fácil* to control and manage through multiple discourses. For example, “As a career, teaching was supposed to hold different attractions for girls and boys. It was frequently assumed to appeal to girls because of their ‘natural’ maternal instincts and other feminine qualities” (Oram, 1989, p.22). Teaching was equated with maternal and feminine qualities. Teaching reinscribed social constructions of being “feminine” (maternal and domestic) and vice versa. Cordier (1992, p. 26) reiterated the idea: “Teaching, even with its low salaries, was viewed as an honorable, prestigious occupation for women because nurturing the young was an appropriate, traditional concern for women and girls.”

I drew from the works of feminists and queer theorists to re-imagine this passage centering the body (Butler, 1990). Because teaching was constructed as a feminine space, women and girls were seen as appropriate for the job. The classroom was a space where “female” constructed characteristics were enacted and performed. Teaching was performed as a “feminized” space due to its close association to the female *cuerpo* and appropriation of that body for teaching. Dominant ideas about female and male identities were imposed on the body of the individual after they had been constructed and imagined by society. Teaching tends to be performed as are other socially constructed “feminine” associated activities, such as nursing, mothering, and housekeeping.

Not only would the female *cuerpo* perform “feminine” activities; the performance would be practiced to perfect her duties at home.

Catharine also insisted that women’s employment as teachers . . . was only temporary, and . . . prepare them to be better wives and mothers. . . . since the profession had lower pay and status . . . since the economics of education called for even lower pay in the 1830s and 1840s . . . both public sentiment and economic facts supported Catharine Beecher’s efforts to redefine the gender of the American teacher. (Sklar, 1973, p. 182)

The *cuerpo* of the teacher became real (as *cuerpo femenino*) after social inscriptions through language, discourse, and knowledge/power were imprinted on the

body (Shildrick, 1997). The discourse of cheap labor, women's place, domesticity, national unity, and moral responsibility helped to shape the *cuerpo* of the *maestra* as female, young, and waiting for marriage and motherhood.

Donovan (1974) observed how teaching was seen as practice for women's duties:

But there are several reasons why a schoolma'am ought to prove an exceptionally capable wife and mother. Her training in psychology should have given her an insight into human behavior that would be most useful in solving the problems that arise from that most delicately balanced of all human relationships—love and marriage. (p. 67)

Cultural representations constituted bodies and helped to reproduce them as real and material (Grosz, 1994). Representing the female teacher as “the good candidate for marriage” (re)produced a focus on gender roles. Her proximity to children made her a capable wife and mother. The female teacher was none other than a good daughter, wife, and mother. So why should she not be married? *Matrimonio* is thought to be one of the few “good” honorable professions for *mujeres* (Anzaldúa, 1987).

Patriarchal discourse extended the moral duties of *el hogar* (home) onto the school.

Catharine Beecher became increasingly conscious of women and their special roles . . . . Beecher not only wanted to save the nation, she wanted women to save it . . . . “The cultivation and development of the immortal mind shall be presented to woman as her especial and delightful duty” (Beecher, 1829 p. 46) . . . . By 1830 Catharine had become convinced that women could indeed effect such a power and that they could best do so as teachers. (Sklar, 1973, pp. 96-97)

Further, the physicality and materiality of the body of the teacher became synonymous with that of the moral *mujer* after social inscriptions through language, discourse, knowledge, and power were imprinted on the body (Shildrick, 1997). The teacher was also the moral enforcer, a duty that been given to women and now was extended to teachers. In this new vision of the teacher as female and domestic the female body was reinscribed as opposite of men.

Catharine countered that the influence of women should be asserted differently from that of men, and that their influence should be as different in kind as it was different in method . . . Catharine wanted to restore hierarchical authority and give women a place within that hierarchy. (Sklar, 1973, p. 34)

Butler (1990) is helpful in this reinterpretation of the teaching body. Men and women influenced and had authority in different ways based on their gender and sex. Beecher wanted power for women and it did not matter how, so long as they could secure power in an unequal society and in its hierarchical structures. However, *la ilusión* of creating power for *mujeres* potentially reinscribed patriarchy even more.

The NEA in the 1930s and 1940s encouraged school systems to hire married women teachers by arguing that “marriage and parenthood are likely to enrich a teacher’s understanding of childhood and family life and thus will help her to be a better teacher. (Blount, 2000, p. 90)

In other words, a patriarchal institution like marriage (between *hombre* and *mujer*) was a better environment to simulate in the schools. Patriarchal attitudes about the *cuero* (Anzaldúa, 1987) influenced and persuaded schools to reform their policies regarding single and married teachers. Female teachers were “better” teachers if they were married. Anzaldúa’s (1987) analysis of attitudes toward *mujeres* can be applied here: Women can be thought of in only three ways: as married, prostitute, or nun; all three are in the service of men.

Patriarchal discourse, coupled with the construction of the cult of true womanhood (Welter, 1966), almost guaranteed the construction of a submissive and self-sacrificing *cuero de la maestra*.

Self-denial was built into the very identity Catharine Beecher defined for women. Submission to the will and needs of others was, Catharine believed, automatically required of American women. Therefore their own personal promptings of the heart were necessarily related to their behavior since sacrifice was by definition an act that linked selflessness of the heart with an external deed. (Sklar, 1973, p. 164)

Multiple discourses attempted to manage the body of *mujeres* (Foucault, 1978), which, at this moment, correlated with the mass employment of them as teachers. To

show self-denial and submission, the teacher had to demonstrate it through her *cuerpo*. The teacher sacrificed for the child, administrator, school system, and country. It was during Beecher's time that self-denial became an important attribute, if not *the* attribute, of women (for further discussion on the cult of true womanhood see Welter, 1966, and Douglas, A., 1977).

Much of the ideology of domesticity is still with us. Perhaps the most powerful tenet supporting it today is the principle of female self-sacrifice . . . . As American culture developed new forms of self-realization in the nineteenth century (exemplified in the image of the frontiersman and the writings of Emerson), it attached a male label to these experiences and called women selfish and unnatural if they wanted the same set of personal goals. For them another set applied: devotion and service to others, selflessness, sacrifice. (Sklar, 1973, p. xiv)

The body of *mujeres* as self-sacrificing became real after social inscriptions through language, discourse, knowledge, and power were imprinted on the body (Shildrick, 1997). In this instance, the discourse of the cult of true womanhood imprinted on the body of women and ultimately on teachers. Self-sacrifice became a justifiable and gender-appropriate characteristic to acquire and reaffirm. Further, dualistic thinking about *mujeres y hombres* was exemplified in this instance (Anzaldúa, 1987). Men were the frontiersman and individual; women lived and sacrificed for others (read as men and children).

However, Sklar (1973) also noted how the ideology of the self-sacrificing woman was a way to gain, however misguided, some access to power:

Whereas Francis Wayland [a leading moral philosopher of Beecher's time] argued that the submissive behavior of women removed them from the mainstream of American and denoted their dependent status, Catharine Beecher described female qualities of submission, purity, and domesticity as traits that placed women closer to the source of moral authority and hence establish their social centrality. (p. 83)

Physicality and materiality of bodies were represented by social constructions of gender and sex (Butler, 1993). Eventually, *maestras* were constructed as bodies that

were submissive, pure, and self-sacrificing, based on gender expectations of women (Welter, 1966). These were not traits that were expected of men when they occupied most of the teaching profession. In fact, men were expected to leave; teaching was a transient occupation (Blount, 2000). Men were to move on to find better pay and more prestigious careers, careers that reflected their masculine traits. Men's bodies were more free to move about, whereas women had limited choices: home or school. Their bodies were confined and destined to be ruled by the husband, father, brother, or headmaster. During this time, women's presence became central in the American home and school. Public political life was for *hombres*. In a sense, this was the disenfranchisement of the *cuervo* of the teacher.

In the 1950's a new archetype emerged of the mature married woman teacher and increasing number of married women were encouraged to come back into the teaching profession (as in other occupations). Yet this change was framed against the background of the ideal for women of single-minded motherhood and domesticity. (Oram, 1989, p. 30)

The enticing opportunity for *mujeres casadas* to join the work force served as a discourse to lure cheap labor. However, the discourse of domesticity and the cult of true womanhood reinscribed and reaffirmed female bodies as subordinate to men, with specific roles such as the domestic, self-sacrificing good mother. The teaching *cuervo* absorbed the definition of the submissive *mujer*. Grumet (1988) eloquently captured the moment:

Teaching had become the shelter of the educated woman. It was a refuge both familiar and alien, a boardinghouse where she didn't make the rules and didn't even have her own key. From those early days of industrialization when the first women took a turn at a day school or summer school session to their majority in the teaching corps today, women have been weighted down by this attribution of passivity and self-abnegation. (p. 44)

Thus, the discourse of the cult of true womanhood constructed the teacher as a passive and self-sacrificing body. The attributes given to *maestras* acted as performative

discourses (Butler, 1990). It was her space, although it was a space defined for her (Irigaray, 1993).

### *Discursive Impacts of the Teacher's Body as Performative*

This section explores the second guiding question with respect to the discursive impacts of the teacher's body as performative. This section presents the possible discursive impacts of the images presented above on the *cuervo* of *la maestra*.

### **The Heterosexual Body**

The feminine *cuervo* of the teacher had to perform in socially acceptable norms or be suspect.

Often merely the rumor of one's homosexuality was deemed sufficient cause for dismissal . . . Other school workers struggled to hide parts of their lives that suddenly could cause them to lose their jobs. . . . One lesbian physical education teacher was fired when she confided in a friend about her sexuality. She then found another teaching job, but this time she married a gay man, brought him to parties and made everyone address her as "Mrs." She also radically changed her fashion to include dresses, high heels, and hosiery. (Blount, 2000, p. 95)

Modern techniques in the form of self-surveillance are evident in this passage (Foucault, 1978). Teachers concealed and were mindful of their behaviors in order *not* to look or be suspected of being gay. Therefore, the role of the teacher had to be explicitly performed as a normal heterosexual body, creating discursive impacts over the *cuervo* of the teacher.

### **The Patriarchal Body**

*Cuerpos* of teachers were objects of subversive techniques of control (Foucault, 1977). Where once single *maestras* had been ideal, married teachers became the preferred choice because married bodies would reinforce gender norms. Blount (2000) quotes:

The NEA also contended that to abolish the celibacy rule would do much over a period of years to remove the "old-maid school teacher" cliché which is so distasteful to many teachers and so injurious to the morale of many of the

younger members of the profession. (“Marriage as Related to Eligibility,” 1942, p. 61)

Attitudes about the *cuero* influenced the construction of *maestras* (Spelman, 1982). Bodies were controlled through the addition and subtraction of policies such as the celibacy rule. In this case, if the celibacy rule was removed, then perhaps *mujeres* who entered teaching still had hopes to marry and follow traditional gender roles. Encouraging sexual relations through policy would somehow guarantee that educators would be more likely to follow “normal” and “healthy” gender and sex roles. Although policies such as the celibacy rule are not common today, the ideas are reinforced in other ways. In my school getting married, having a baby, or experiencing the death of a spouse calls for especial attentions via flowers and showers. However, for a single *mujer* whose parent or sibling does gets a card, at best. My body’s relations to the world do not count unless I am *casada* or expecting: the real duties of *mujeres*.

### **Conclusion**

Controlling and regulating the *cuero* of the teacher served to discipline the *cuero* to perform in gender-appropriate ways and follow traditional norms. The discursive impacts on bodies ranged from subtle to overt. A subtle discursive impact was how the teacher began to self-monitor her body in order to behave, act, and physically demonstrate “healthy” gender and sex norms and conventions through dress, mannerisms, and, most important, marriage. An overt discursive impact was evident in policies that attempted to control the body of the teacher through the encouragement or discouragement of marriage.

### **Resisting Bodies**

Women’s sexual agency, our sexual and our erotic autonomy have always been troublesome for the state. They pose a challenge to the ideological anchor of an originary nuclear family, a source of legitimation for the state, which perpetuates the fiction that the family is the cornerstone of society. Erotic autonomy signals a danger to the heterosexual family and to the nation. (Alexander, 1997, p. 64)

“The problem for academic discussion is that the body is actively sexual or at least sensual” (Levy, 2000, p. 83).

At the same time, the newly redefined space for teachers allowed a space for *cuerpos* to resist and defy static notions of gender and sex. This section explores how teaching also had shifting boundaries. It allowed female teachers to experience independence on multiple levels (sexual, economic, and intellectual/bodily). Teaching had the potential to challenge traditional gender/sex roles.

### *Shifting and Challenging Boundaries*

Teaching was not always thought of as a feminine space, which meant that it had the potential to change and transform *cuerpos* and vice versa.

Many of the inequalities facing women teachers for most of the century were overtly and unabashedly written in to the system. State policy at both local and national levels intentionally discriminated against women teachers and favoured men’s position in the profession. (Oram, 1989, p. 27)

Control of bodies in society can be carried out using overt techniques (Foucault, 1977). Policies directed at female teachers helped to justify the construction of a lower-status profession for females and further reinscribed teachers’ *cuerpos* as less than those of men and in need of order and legislation. However, because teaching was not always deemed “natural,” this is an example in the HFT of the defiance of static notions and definitions of subjectivity and identity (Butler, 1990; Grosz & Probyn, 1995).

In New York, one of the earliest states to shift to women teachers, the state board of regents in 1838 still assumed that teachers should be male, and they failed to approve the governor’s request that normal schools be attached to female academies because they concluded that men, rather than women, needed the normal training. Therefore it was far from obvious to the American public that teaching was a woman’s profession. (Sklar, 1973, pp. 180-181)

If *hombres* at some point were thought to be “the” *maestros*, then the role of teachers as womanly and strictly domestic can be challenged.

When men prevailed in the classroom, some of the first teachers were thought masculine, independent, or otherwise lacking feminine qualities. By contrast, the



work had become so thoroughly female-identified by the early 1900s that men who taught young children sometimes were widely regarded as effeminate and submissive. (Blount, 2000, p. 85)

The teacher became identified as feminine or masculine depending on which “gender” was employed or desired at the time and how that gender was classified during a particular moment in time. Here, too, the *cuervo* of the teacher became feminine and submissive after social inscriptions through language, discourse, knowledge, and power were imprinted on the body (Shildrick, 1997). What made a man effeminate was the language and discourse that was used to address, manage, and discipline the body.

### *Bodies That Defy*

The natural feminine, domestic, and submissive characteristics associated with the teacher’s *cuervo* were also challenged.

It is possible to speculate that young women entering teaching in the antebellum period were not rushing to the classrooms in an excess of passion for the young. It is probable that they were trying to escape the passivity and dependency that the feminine ideal and the cult of motherhood conferred upon its daughters—or they may have been seeking the world of work in order to escape child-care demands of a large family of siblings. (Grumet, 1988, p. 48)

Here was a moment that resisted social constructions of subjectivity, identity, and sexuality (Butler, 1990; Grosz & Probyn, 1995). Teaching provided a space for a woman’s body to escape traditional gender and sexual expectations. Although this was the expected social norm, Oram (1989) also mentioned that it was lower middle-class females who desired to be teachers. Rather than being the motherly type, it was the more academic-type female who sought out teaching. The teacher, in this instance, had the potential to reject traditional gender-associated desires. Teaching was a similar desire for both male and females. Just because teaching was being constructed to attract *mujeres* and then thought and constructed as a motherly “feminine” space, it had the potential for being a space where one’s gender desires were not necessarily the same as those

expected in society. Gender desires and boundaries, in this instance, were blurred (Butler, 1990; Grosz & Probyn).

Independence was an enticing reward for female teachers. “Independence was an important reward of teaching for those who wanted it. Some women did not want to marry, but neither did they want to remain dependent on and beholden to family members for their livelihoods” (Biklen, 1995, p. 60). Although teaching had managing and controlling powers, it also afforded teachers different degrees of independence. It was possible that teaching had the potential to change attitudes about what a woman should and could do. *El cuerpo de la mujer* was not only for being mother and wife; economic and personal independence were possibilities.

Teaching, then, was a space that was paradoxical. As Oram (1989) observed,

The image of the woman teacher has always held contradictions . . . undeniably feminine linked to women’s role as mothers and nurturers of children . . . on the other hand teaching has offered...women economic independence . . . responsibility . . . and status. (p. 31).

The feminization of teaching was a complex web of power relations (Foucault, 1978) that had labeled and named teaching as a feminine space, even if positions (especially in the lower grades) were held by men. Teaching was (re)conceived as a feminine space where gender roles were to be reinscribed. However, teaching, with all of its socially constructed ideas of *mujeres*, also offered them opportunities to become independent wage earners and thereby resist social norms.

Even the discourse of domesticity was challenged during this time. “Far from instilling obedience, the ideology of domesticity could, for example, lead to women to repudiate both heterosexuality and their familial responsibilities” (Sklar, 1973, p. xiv). As Foucault (1978) contended, discourse and power are not all consuming; they interact with bodies, and resistance is possible. This is an example of how dominant discourse was challenged and resisted by *cuerpos*.

Blount (2000) also observed:

Even as schools have regulated the gender norms of students and schoolworkers, they also have created conditions fostering new or alternative gender identities . . . . Though early women teachers were expected to exhibit properly feminine demeanors and to teach as preparation for marriage and motherhood, they also were among the first women in the country to taste economic and social independence. Many of them actively chose to live celibate, independent lives, a choice that in itself presented a gender challenge to some communities. (p. 85)

Here, gender was a social construction (Butler, 1990; Haraway, 1991) and therefore not a static *concepto*. Gender, sexuality, and *el cuerpo* were fluid and able to be deconstructed and reconstructed. Schools had the potential to become sites where gender could be redefined. Even Beecher saw the potential teaching could provide for women.

Teaching was important to Catharine also because it provided women with a respectable alternative to marriage. The single woman need no longer become merely a spinster aunt who was dependent upon her relatives for support . . . . Catharine hoped she could use traditional values to her own advantage, but, if not, she was fully able to redefine these traditional “boundaries” when they interfered with her plan. (Sklar, 1973, p. 97)

Here is a moment that defied static notions and definitions of subjectivity, identity, and sexuality (Butler, 1990; Grosz & Probyn, 1995). Bodies resisted traditional roles and teaching became an outlet. In fact to be a *maestra* was equated with a single woman.

Spinster teachers were hired so frequently in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that they eventually became an important part of the cultural landscape. They appeared in novels, cartoons, short stories, and press accounts, in the process of becoming such regular community characters that the word “schoolteacher” came to connote a single woman. (Blount, 2000, p. 87)

Cultural representations (through multiple texts) constituted bodies and helped to reproduce them as real and material (Grosz, 1994). The body of the teacher was written, constructed, and imagined as a single woman. However, constructed as a single woman’s occupation, teaching became a new avenue for gender and sexual bending.

Teaching, long the exclusive province of males, shifted dramatically in the mid-1800s to become primarily female-identified work . . . these women teachers largely refrained from marriage sometimes from conventional heterosexuality altogether, thus challenging not only prevailing notions of gender, but of sexuality as well. (Blount, 2000, p. 83)

The public space of teaching had the potential to disrupt traditional gender roles and create a space for women teachers to resist traditional gender norms (Butler, 1990; Grosz & Probyn, 1995).

### *Discursive Impacts of Resisting Bodies*

This section addresses the second guiding question of the project with respect to the discursive impacts of resisting *cuerpos* through a discussion of possible discursive impacts of the presented images on the body of the *maestra*.

#### **Shifting/Challenging Body Boundaries**

The discourse of economic need inadvertently challenged the tradition that *mujeres* could not get paid for their labor as teachers.

The only population that fit that social need (creating literate English speakers) was women; thus what was once inappropriate became socially desirable . . . . What was once the province of men and inappropriate for women became, within only a few years, women's second-highest calling. (Schmuck, 1987b, p. 76)

The construction of the teacher's body was dependent on the cultural shift (Martin, J. R., 1982) that occurred during this time. The female *cuervo* became an economic necessity. Economic necessity (commodity) had discursive impacts on the body of the teacher; she began to be viewed as a body who could labor outside the home.

#### **Bodies That Defy**

When *cuervos* defy expected gender desires, they have the potential to create other possibilities for existing. Oram (1989) observed that "the potential teacher was the bright, more academic type of girl, with expectations of teaching as a career which probably not very different from the expectations of boys; she looked for security, status, and a reasonable salary (p. 22). Even though the discourse of domesticity was being used

to attract the motherly type, female bodies responded and interacted with multiple other discourses that intentionally or nonintentionally produced resistance. Schooling was considered a space where *cuerpos* of teachers followed the norms of the home; however, having limited choices in the labor industry, female bodies saw the economic and even intellectual/bodily potential teaching offered. Domesticity also inadvertently became a counter discursive impact in the form of economic, social, and intellectual independence and possibility for the *cuerpo* of *la maestra*. However, even bodies that resisted entered into webs of power that influenced and even disciplined bodies in certain ways. For example, even though it was the more academic and driven females who first joined teaching, they were in certain regards contributing to the discourse of salvation of souls, taming the savages, and advancing the nation. Catherine Beecher, a minister's daughter and an "academic" type woman, exemplified such desires.

Catharine Beecher became increasingly conscious of women and their special roles . . . Catharine Beecher not only wanted to save the nation, she wanted women to save it . . . . "The cultivation and development of the immortal mind shall be presented to woman as her especial and delightful duty" (Beecher, 1829 p. 46). (Sklar, 1973, p. 97)

Equating the desires of male and females challenges the notion that desires are gender driven. However, the desire for economic independence to escape dependence was potentially a function of capitalism as discursive impact. Capitalism dichotomizes the work and worth of individuals. Perhaps, desiring the status of men was due to the low status and compensation for being relegated to homemaker status. In capitalist societies the worth of an individual is in relation to his/her product or exchange (Mohanran, 1999). As Cruz and McLaren (2002) asserted "Capitalist social relations punish bodies, forcing them into brute conditions of abstraction and conditions of alienation linked to their reduction to relations of exchange" (p. 191).

## Conclusion

Because *cuerpos* performed in particular discursive ways, it was difficult to imagine them in other ways. However, *el cuerpo de la maestra* had the potential to challenge gender norms, expectations, and desires. If once the male teacher had been regarded as “the teacher” and then, within a matter of few a decades, became the profession of “the female,” the body of the teacher had no real “gender/sex.” Butler (1990) argued that gender and sex act as performative discourse and thus are not inherently natural characteristics or traits. Similarly, the *cuerpo* of the *maestra* in the study was shown to be performative. If subjectivity/body is performative, then the subjectivity/body is able to be challenged and transformed.

## Summary

Teachers were constantly bombarded with multiple discourses that attempted to manage and discipline their subjectivities and bodies. The *cuerpo* of the teacher in this study reflected how society had defined and circumscribed her/him. S/he was not a static entity but, at the same time, s/he was under constant surveillance and *regulación*. Centering the *cuerpo* in HFT allowed me to examine critically how teaching had been constructed and how it was a space filled with constant contradiction and possibility. Further, my mixed *metodologías* allowed me to illuminate the impact that discourse potentially had on bodies.

I have explored how the teacher’s *cuerpo* was metaphorically a container. S/he was not only ready to be filled but s/he was ready to carry and transmit (old and new) dominant discourses of gender and sex. Further, the teacher was disciplined to embrace those characteristics that made the work of capitalism and patriarchy possible. S/he was the container that embodied the responsibility of maintaining social norms and perpetuating the notion of the good mother, daughter, and wife in the confinements of

the schools. Further, the teacher as container-body was filled with constructions and attitudes of the emergent focus on the child that collided with the feminization of teaching.

Another important argument in this study was how the body was spatially organized. Once the *cuero* of the teacher was defined and accepted, perhaps filled, it was easier to organize and move the container-body in society. In the feminization of teaching, management and surveillance of the body was made easier when bodies were organized according to the needs of patriarchy, capitalism, and misogynistic attitudes. Gender and sex roles were then easier to reinforce and reinscribe on “unruly” bodies.

I have discussed how teaching was potentially a performative discourse. The *cuero of la maestra* was informed by multiple discourses and was performed accordingly. The teacher (male or female) acted out a set of learned behaviors that were internalized. The teacher performed the role through her *cuero*. Patriarchal and homophobic attitudes were key components of the feminization of teaching that constructed the body and subjectivities of teachers. Adhering to normal sexual/gender standards conveyed a constant self-surveillance on the body. Gender bending and transgression were highly discouraged and even endured harsh consequences. The body of the teacher was to be performed as heterosexual and patriarchal.

I also illuminated moments in the HFT in which bodies defied and rebelled against dominant discourse. Teaching, as many scholars in the HFT have discussed, was a space that allowed women a certain freedom and economic independence (Blount, 2000; Grumet, 1988; Sklar, 1973). Exploring resistance is especially important in critical examinations of education because the ambiguities as well as the permeability of dominant discourses and ideologies are illuminated. Examining new moments and

possibilities for subjects is important and necessary to aid in the deconstruction and reconstruction of bodies and subjectivities.



## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS AND REFLECTIONS

Trained in . . . Western metaphysical dualisms, many of us have accepted the notion that there is a split between the body and the mind. Believing this, individuals enter the classroom to teach as though only the mind is present, and not the body. (hooks, 1994, p. 191)

The purpose . . . is . . . to show how deployments of power are directly connected to the body—to bodies, functions . . . sensations . . . pleasures . . . what is needed is to make the it visible through an analysis in which the biological and the historical are not consecutive to one another . . . bound together . . . with the development of modern technologies of power that take life as their objective. (Foucault, 1978, pp. 151-152)

Culture and architecture are part of the field on which power relations play themselves out . . . the sphere of cultural production, within which architecture must be located, is not neutral . . . the more congealed, formulaic, predictable, and recognizable the cultural and architectural forms, the more they aim at conserving the past and reducing the future to a form of repetition. (Grosz, 2001, p. 103)

“It is not easy to name our pain, to theorize from that location” (hooks, 1997, p. 74).

This chapter is the culmination of the project. Because this project is unlike traditional research, the “results,” or reflections as I have chosen to call them, are not *respuestas* but only contingencies. I hope to dispel and complicate the need to see findings as “real” and “true.” Rather, I would like the opposite. I want this research to be read as ambiguous, uncertain, and unfinished, providing room for further discussion, deconstruction, and reconstruction. I look forward to continued critical dialogues concerning *el cuerpo de la maestra* and students as well as conversations that address how research methods can reinvent the body or, at the very least, illuminate it.

#### **Reflections: Present/Future Possibilities**

In reading my methodological journal I noticed that my guiding questions in this study had been in the works for about years. It has been a trying and challenging process, both professionally and personally. My rationalist upbringing and education

have bifurcated what I feel from what I think. But it was in and through challenging my rationalist thinking that I began to see how complicated and convoluted the lines between theory/practice, mind/body, and conclusions/beginnings really are in and out of the classroom. Sometimes, we search intensely and passionately for answers or even other possibilities in an intellectual, data-driven, modernist sense (in a purpose, design, data collection, analysis, interpretation sense). Hence, we conceptualize through various forms of “mind”-oriented legitimation without realizing that incorporations of “embodied” realities can provide different stories to contemplate.

My reading of Chicana feminists’ works (Anzaldúa, 1987; Moraga, 1983; Trujillo, 1998) certainly played a great part in the formulation of my guiding questions. Chicana critical writings (Anzaldúa, 1987; Moraga) helped me to unleash my carnal voice and give attention to my carnal intuition. My *cuervo* led this project. As a Latina teacher, I am deeply concerned with the ways in which my *cuervo* enacts power. Am I the incarnation of a docile body that imposes docility on my students? How is my body already infused with power that ultimately reproduces colonizing relationships? How are these embodiments actively connected to the HFT? How is it that my *cuervo* becomes a container—ready to transmit patriarchal, capitalistic, and heteronormative ideals?

In rereading the HFT I found a (White) body of a teacher who is docile, a body ready to tackle the job of transmitting cultural norms such as patriarchy, capitalistic ideals, and even misogynistic attitudes. How can we re-image the container-body of the teacher? How can the language and physical structures of the school and education begin to incorporate a female and decolonial imaginary (Pérez, 1998, 1999) a feminist architecture (Anzaldúa, 1987)? Is there a third space for the body of the teacher? How can the teacher be thought of as a critical cultural worker who can be integral in the

critical transformation of the androcentric and capitalistic structures, *mentes*, and *cueros* that occupy the social reproduction machine called *schooling*?

If teaching were not reflective and/or performative of gender and sex, would schooling and education have a different feel? In this study I have unearthed a body filled with atavisms of a time/space not our own. Moreover, the body of the teacher was and is constantly being saturated with gender, sex, capitalism, and patriarchy, even White-ness. It seems almost impossible to escape. However, if using Foucault's concept of power as caught in a complex web of relations, then knowledge and power over the teacher's *cuero* can be contested or, at the very least, possibly bent. I am not suggesting a teacher who will stand outside gender/sex, patriarchy, and capitalism; however, perhaps it is worth seeking and seizing moments and images in education (past or present) where the body of the teacher demonstrates transgressions and transformative pedagogies (Elenes, 2002), thereby enabling a different way of being, acting for the teacher, not to stand as a model for what to do but to stand as a model for what is possible.

*Breaking the Container Through a  
Revolutionary Teacher Education*

With the aid and critical examination of the HFT texts, I imagined the body of the teacher as a container who was ready to be filled with multiple androcentric discourses that attempted to manage her/his subjectivity and body. Once filled, the container body was spatially organized and moved in spaces where s/he carried, perpetuated, and performed patriarchy and capitalism and embodied misogynistic attitudes. Perhaps it was inescapable to be filled with discourses; however, some *cueros* seemed to be objectified (made container like) more than others (such as White males). Because most of the bodies of teachers were female (and are associated as such), then

her fe/male body inadvertently became a container. A container signifies emptiness of mind/body. The image of a container can be carried, filled, and moved without much resistance. In this study I unearthed and discussed a container body that was carried, filled, and moved to reaffirm, perpetuate, and perform patriarchy, misogyny, and capitalism. Even though the teacher's body was often ignored, at the same time the body was objectified, disciplined, and controlled.

Perhaps it is in how we treat and approach the work (and body) of teachers and their mission and goal that we can repudiate the container body and embrace different images for the body of the teacher. Many moments in the HFT texts exhibited a body different from the typical "good mother/daughter." Some women saw teaching as an intellectual field that fulfilled their lives in ways not related to the practice of being wife and mother. Teaching was actually a subversive act that allowed some women to reject traditional sex and gender roles altogether (Blount, 2000). Examining these resisting bodies allowed me to begin to see a different role for myself and for teacher education.

Therefore, I contend that the realization of the teacher as container body has implications for teacher education, a field that is integral in training and producing the majority of the teaching work force. The manner in which preservice teachers are taught, presented, and introduced to the field could examine deep philosophical and epistemological questions of the body, role, and purpose of education. Instead, most teacher education programs focus on methods and developmental theories that serve to reinscribe and perpetuate an anti-intellectual, body-less, container role.

Rethinking teacher education necessitates that education be reconceptualized as unfinished, complicated, and transformative. How we teach and treat preservice educators is indicative of what society and academia eventually think of their abilities, bodies, and purpose/role in education. Freire's (1970) concept of the banking method of

education is pervasive in teacher education. Teacher educators see themselves as knowledge bearers and see their students as empty containers ready to be filled with theory and knowledge. Our role/body as teacher educators *debe de cambiar*. We must reject the student/teacher dichotomy that is instrumental in most teacher education programs that serves to perpetuate the container-body of teachers.

By facilitating philosophical, historical, and political courses and discussions, preservice teachers can begin to reinvent themselves and the role of the teacher in new ways. Preservice teachers could begin to see themselves as intellectual *cuerpos* who can construct new ideas for teaching and learning. They can begin to imagine their bodies as other than containers ready and willing to be filled. Perhaps education students can reinvent themselves to envision multiple possibilities and counterdiscourses for teaching, learning, and being with children as well as for working with/for their communities.

*(Re)Defining Educational Spaces*

I have discussed and elaborated on the spatially organization of bodies in schools. Through the (re)organization of bodies and spaces, bodies were inadvertently reinscribed with patriarchy, misogyny, and capitalism. Schooling provided a space where bodies of students and teachers were (are) constantly saturated with “normal” and “healthy” sex/gender and labor roles and infused with patriarchal and capitalistic discourses. Furthermore, within the space of schooling, spaces were polarized to the point of the bifurcation of labor solely based on gender and sex and fear of the “dangerous” body. Women were regarded as the best equipped to teach young children. This has left a legacy where, in recent times, women have tended to enter and teach young children and men have tended to enter and teach older students and/or assume administrative positions. Of course, this is not just the invention of schooling. Schooling is a reflection of a larger symptom in patriarchal society that has defined the role/space

of women as “mothers” and therefore equipped (if not equipped, then trained) them for the care of young children. Further, capitalistic ideals of divisions of labor were applied, based on gender/sex and because of the threat of the “dangerous” body. Women received lower wages than men and were seen as cheap labor. Within the architectural structures of the school, bodies were (are) shaped to mirror patriarchal and capitalistic relations.

Elizabeth Grosz (2001) grappled with the question of architecture and the body. Her explorations examined how the body occupies and moves through space. She incorporated Luce Irigaray’s (1993) claim that space and time have been constructed as oppositional forms. Space is feminine and time is masculine. This conceptualization of space and time render space as the external

and extended positions and connections, and time as the field of internal and subjective positions and connections [and it is] already set up in such a way that space is defined as smooth, continuous, homogeneous, passive, and neutral, as that which has no folds, no complexity, no interiority or intensity of its own. It is already set up such that it morphologically reproduces the passive attributes of femininity. (Grosz, 2001, pp. 158-159)

Education is a feminine-associated field that has “real” concerns for those who are found in it, women and children, but whose bodies are defined and limited by the Western White male prerogative, constructions, and architecture. Education is a metaphorical as well as real architectural space for the colonization and regulation of the *cuerpos* of women and children. But perhaps it is through the reconstruction of how the bodies of teachers and students can use and move through space and time differently that we can illuminate resistance and challenge the male prerogative and his existence at the expense of the bodies of women and children: patriarchy.

Grosz’s (2001) concerns were echoed in this study. We need critical feminist voices in the creation and construction of spaces, both architectural and metaphorical. Perhaps we need to move beyond the confinement of the four walls and the school building. The school building and the classroom inadvertently necessitate order,

structure, and tamed bodies to function and survive. The daily schedule and lesson plans restrict creativity and limit possibilities for teaching and learning. A complete reconceptualization of schooling and its architecture, schedules, and agenda might allow new possibilities for teachers and students to claim and become subjects. For example, education might be held at the local homeless and women's shelter on some days. On other days, teachers and students might congregate at a political rally. More field trips across the community and into other communities might open more possibilities for teaching and learning. Perhaps we need to move beyond the idea that teaching and learning happen in structured, orderly, and organized spaces.

### *Unleashing Dangerous Bodies*

However, in order to reconceptualize the schooling space, perhaps we need to unleash the “dangerous fe/male body” that is kept under constant surveillance and made container in and out of education. I contend that the underlying justification and implicit image of the container body is a result of the potential threat that the female body poses to the androcentric structures of society. The teacher's body was spatially organized in education to lessen the threat of her/his body. She was placed with others who were similarly regulated and objectified: young children.

The regulation of the fe/male body reflects the fear of eroticism in and out of education. During the feminization of teaching, eroticism was (and still is) potentially dangerous to the order and structures of learning and teaching. Therefore, the body (whether female or male) most closely associated with eroticism came under surveillance and was constantly regulated. The realization that the fe/male *cuerpo* poses a danger to the order and structures of society has implications for education.

Current pedagogies are structured, orderly, and void of pleasures, desires, and passions. The fe/male body could be a subversive body that transforms misogynistic

pedagogies. For example, with my third grade Latino students I used to hold mini lectures on the effects and unfortunate legacy of colonization. The mini lectures on colonization were a result of witnessing how my students had a disdain for their brown skin color and their wishing to be blond and blue-eyed. Contrary to “rigorous” educational research that espouses that teacher methods and pedagogies must be “hands on” and “teacher as facilitator,” my mini lectures became the highlight of the day. My passion, pleasure, and enthusiasm were reflected in my body and lectures as well as in their new-found eagerness to hear more; students would walk in and ask, “Are we doing social studies today?” My unleashed body, passion, desires, and pleasures superseded any “research-based” method for teaching young children. The notion that young children are not intellectual enough to comprehend complex sociohistorical and political problems was challenged. Students became interested in my personal life and often asked about my days “outside” the confinement of the classroom. Soon I began to see how the line between teacher and student was beginning to be blurred for both myself and my students. Their reactions to my passionate body in turn fueled my enthusiasm even more. Thus, unleashing my unruly body became a subversive act of pleasures and desires in the classroom.

It is this subversive unruly *cuervo* that needs to be unleashed. Foucault (1974) contended that education has to be void of eroticism in order to restrict the number of people who have access to knowledge. Perhaps the dangerous fe/male body has the potential to deconstruct and reconstruct current understanding of teaching and learning in and out of the confinements of the school.



### **Concerns: Disciplining and Reinscribing the Body and Methods**

As this study has attempted to examine, bodies matter (Butler, 1993). We live in constant contradiction of ignoring but at the same time regulating and disciplining the body. Although this was not an autobiographical study, *mi cuerpo*, through the critical historical readings as well as the epistemologies of the body, was impacted. Moreover, my body entered into a web of relations with the stories generated through my critical analysis. I gained further understanding of the field of teaching but, more important, I became aware of my body as a *maestra* and a *mujer*. I became cognizant of how my body and subjectivity are influenced by atavisms of another time.

My *metodología* in this project was therefore very much influenced by my reaction and interaction with the various texts. This study was by no means a detached or an objective endeavor. In fact, as I engaged in the act of inquiry, I often asked myself how I saw my body in the historical accounts. Sometimes, my carnal voice would just surface (Anzaldúa, 1987). I would question how *my* teacher-body-as-container— contributes, rejects, and interacts with the multiple discourses that were integral in this study. Thus, an implicit bodily subtext ensued alongside this study.

For example, during my year-long study, I was physically exhausted after having been with 4-year-olds all day long. I had little energy to engage in study, much less to develop and create lesson plans that were radical and critical. Further, my body was physically confined to the school and I missed important protests that I could have attended in the city, such as war vigils and protests. Teachers' bodies are subjected to rigid schedules that prohibit them from certain political activities; even attending an international conference on education was given no consideration as professional development. My *cuerpo* had to adhere to what the district deemed “appropriate”

professional development. As a teacher, I am not free to choose how to use and manage my time as well as how to advance my career.

Furthermore, I began to see that my *cuerpo* was not only a major part of the *metodología*, but inadvertently an embodiment and reflection of Whiteness. The HFT texts inadvertently demonstrated the construction of a teaching field that is White, body-less, capitalist, and patriarchal. Other than my bilingual/multicultural concerns in education, teaching is a White profession that was birthed and continues to be constructed from a Euro-American perspective. Missionary goals have shifted only slightly. Instead of salvation of souls, we advocate similar tactics in order to rescue students from poverty and change them to adhere and succeed in our economic and political machine. Our theories of children, curriculum, and learning stem from positivistic uncritical educational research that presumes universality, linearity, and progress—colonizing technologies. If my body and research are not questioning fundamental conceptions of children, curriculum theory, and learning/teaching, then my attempts to change and transform are futile at best.

Another important issue to consider is how the methods employed in this project of reading and analyzing the HFT texts not only brought an internal bodily consciousness of discourse, power, and discipline but, in certain ways, it reinscribed these in my research. As Butler (1990) questioned, how does this type of research inadvertently reinscribe the subject of woman? That is, the notion that women can be wholly represented only acts as a normative discourse that attempts to restrict all possibilities for being a woman (or teacher). In this project, my methods bordered on this. Although I was examining how the body tends to be regarded in the texts, this illumination also limited both the body and my interpretation of that body.

The notion of history was challenged as a “study of the past.” Exploring historical accounts of the feminizing process of teaching in this project blurred the boundaries between past and present. That is, the line between past and present was ambiguous. As I read the HFT, I unintentionally read present conditions of teaching. Of course, this is due to the type of analysis that I employed in this study. Because this study asked unconventional questions, the postmodern methods and inquiry embodied offered unconventional stories and contingencies. My study adds to projects that consider history as subjective and as another (his)tory (Saavedra & Demas, 2001). Our attempts to understand, examine and challenge that history are subjective endeavors as well.

#### **Further Research: Extending/Centering the Body**

This study has raised many issues and areas for further research. My scope was limited to the texts that provided cohesive historical accounts of the feminization of teaching. My project actively sought to disrupt the notion that teachers are body-less entities. Bodies of teachers were disciplined by the multiple discourses that interact with education. I see my study as a starting point for a deeper and more thorough genealogy of the teacher, critical and hybrid examinations that center the body and history in current contexts, and inquiry that illuminates the inter/intra relationship of the body and research.

A genealogy of the teacher is still a project that should be pursued. Shildrick (1997) contended that genealogies are important as bodies are always changing and are known by “environmental processes and by power, but given to us only in our texts” (p. 15). Shildrick argued that the different body texts can be read or examined through a genealogy of the body. Therefore, a genealogy of the teacher has the potential to problematize present educational discourses such as accountability, best practices, child-

centered, and cooperative learning, to name a few. Problematizations of current practices can examine the discursive impact that present educational discourse has on the body and subjectivity of the teacher.

A genealogy can offer investigations that potentially shatter the notion that teachers “teach” and students “learn.” We have taken for granted teaching and learning as universal truths across all cultures, societies, and civilizations. A genealogy can unearth new perspectives and possibilities for “teaching” and “learning.” Perhaps a reconceptualization of teaching and learning can lead to new and unimagined ways to approach or undo teaching, learning, and education as a whole.

Examinations of how history and the body are inextricably tied in current contexts through hybrid methodologies that center the body would certainly generate more discussion about the [im]possibility to carry out liberatory and radical projects in education. This study focused on teaching as a White, middle-class field. Research addressing racialized bodies (imagined or real) of teachers would add to the conversation and complexities of the field. In a time when the brown, queer, and ethnic body is overtly under constant surveillance (Cruz, 2001; McLaren, 1997b), research that critically examines the educational involvement in the colonization and criminalization of those bodies is important and needed. Likewise, research that illuminates how teachers (and their bodies) are caught in the interstices of those projects should be part of the critical dialogue. A critical ethnography has the potential to highlight the collision of bodies and educational discourse in the present.

But our research gaze not only has the potential to illuminate the body. Our bodies are informed, shaped, maybe even disciplined as we engage in the act of inquiry with texts, discourse, and subjects. Therefore, educational research should also explore the ways in which research impacts and/or is impacted by the body. Research that

highlights inter/intra relationships with the body might provide multiple possibilities to consider regarding education, pedagogy, learning, and even research itself.

For example in this project, historical accounts were used to highlight and center the body of the teacher. At the same time, discursive practices surfaced. But it was not just a study of “texts” because my body felt and embodied multiple texts in the course of this project. My body and subjectivity as a teacher and woman mirrored the body of the 19th-century teacher. If my body, through this research, reflected atavisms of another time, how is other current “present” educational research just a reflection of the past? Are there any “new” findings? Does research advance knowledge and lead toward educational progress? How does educational research have the (dangerous) potential to illuminate the past masked as the present?

Teachers are a bodily reflection of a time not their own. Disrupting and fragmenting education with the dangerous body might help to look beyond the container body, organized spaces, and teaching as performative of gender and sex and more toward (or back to) a resisting, radical, and unruly body and possibilities.

### **Summary**

This chapter addressed the implications and concerns of the study as well as areas for further research. I discussed the possible implications of the study for teacher education, spaces, and the dangerous body. Dispelling the container body in teacher education is important in order to reconceptualize the role of the body of the teacher. Redefining educational spaces both at the metaphorical and architectural levels might provide new and unfound possibilities for teaching and learning. Further, the image of the dangerous body has the potential to be a subversive act of multiple possibilities in and out of the classroom.

This chapter also addressed the concerns of the study. My body was at the junction where educational research and discourse collided. Research was described as potentially reinscribing my *cuerpo* and the project with the very constructs and discourses that I illuminated. Further, teaching as a fundamentally White profession was discussed and problematized. History as a study of the past was contested. Areas for further research were discussed to broaden, deepen, and extend this project: (a) a genealogical analysis of teaching and the teacher, (b) hybrid methodologies and examinations that center the body and history in current contexts, and (c) examinations of how research impacts and is impacted by the body.

## REFERENCES

- Acker, S. (1983). Women and teaching: A semi-detached sociology of a semi-detached profession. In S. Walker & L. Barton (Eds.), *Gender, class, and education* (pp. 123-139). Barcombe, Sussex, UK: Falmer.
- Acker, S. (1994). *Gendered education: Sociological reflections on women, teaching and feminism*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Acker, S. (1999). *The realities of teachers' work: Never a dull moment*. London: Cassell.
- Acker, S. (Ed.). (1989). *Teachers, gender and careers*. New York: Falmer.
- Aidoo, A. A. (1991). That capacious topic: Gender politics. In P. Mariani (Ed.), *Critical fictions* (pp. 151-154). Seattle: Bay Press.
- Alexander, J. M. (1997). Erotic autonomy as a politics of decolonization. In M. J. Alexander & C. T. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies and democratic futures* (pp. 63-100). New York: Routledge.
- Alphonso, D. R. (2000). Introduction to Helene Cixous. In K. Oliver (Ed.), *French feminism reader* (pp. 253-256). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Anzaldúa, G. (Ed.). (1990). *Haciendo caras, making face, making soul*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2000). Toward a Mestiza rhetoric. In A. L. Keating (Ed.), *Gloria Anzaldúa: Interview/entrevistas* (pp. 251-280). New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Averill, L. A. (1939). *Mental hygiene for the classroom teacher*. New York: Pitman.
- Bailey, C. (1998). *Excess, intimacy and discipline: Curriculum of the body in the early childhood classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Barter, A. S. (1959). The status of women in school administration. *Education Digest*, 25(2), 40-41.
- Bataille, G. (1986). *Eroticism*. San Francisco: City Lights.
- Beauvoir, S. (1952). *The second sex*. (Translated by H. M. Parshley). Cleveland: Knopf.
- Becky, C. (2000). Wicked bodies: Towards a critical pedagogy of corporeal differences for performance. In C. O'Farrell, D. Meadmore, E. McWilliam, & C. Symes (Eds.), *Taught bodies* (pp. 57-80). New York: Peter Lang.

- Bhabba, H. (1996). The other question. In P. Mongia (Ed.), *Contemporary postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 71-89). London, UK: Arnold.
- Biklen, S. K. (1995). *School work: Gender and the cultural construction of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blount, J. (2000). Spinsters, bachelors, and other gender transgressors in school employment, 1850-1990. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), 83-101.
- Boldt, G. (1997). Sexists and heterosexist response to gender bending. In J. Tobin (Ed.), *Making place for pleasure in early childhood* (pp. 188-202). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Boldt, G. (2001). Failing bodies: Discipline and power in elementary classrooms. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 17(4), 91-104.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Britzman, D. (1995). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or stop reading straight. *Educational Theory*, 45(2), 151-165.
- Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Burman, E. (1994). *Deconstructing developmental psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. & MacGrogan, M. (1992). *Erotic welfare: Sexual theory and politics in the age of epidemic*. New York: Routledge.
- Cahan, E., Mechling, J., Sutton-Smith, B., & White, S. H. (1993). The elusive historical child: Ways of knowing the child history and psychology. In G. H. Elder, J. Model, & R. D. Parke (Eds.), *Children in time and place: Development and historical insights* (pp. 192-223). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cannella, G. S. (1997). *Deconstructing early childhood education: social justice and revolution*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Cannella, G. S., & Bailey, C. (1999). Postmodern research in early childhood education. In S. Reifel (Ed.), *Advances in early education and day care* (Vol. 10, pp. 3-39). Oxford, UK: Elsevier/JAI Press.
- Cannella, G. S., & Viruru, R. (2004). *Childhood and postcolonization: Power, education and contemporary practice*. New York: Routledge.



- Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chabram, A. (1993). And, yes . . . The earth did part: On splitting of Chicana/o subjectivity. In A. de la Torre & B. Pesquera (Eds.), *Building with our hands: New directions in Chicana Studies* (pp. 34-56). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clifford, G. (1998). Daughters into teachers: Education and demographic influences on the transformation of teaching into women's work in America. In A. Prentice & M. R. Theobald (Eds.), *Women who taught: Perspectives on the history of women and teaching* (pp. 115-135). Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Collins, P. H. (1998). *Fighting words: Black women and the search for justice*. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cordier, M. H. (1992). *School women of the prairies and plains*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press.
- Cruz, C. (2001). Towards an epistemology of the brown body. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14, 657-669.
- Cruz, C., & McLaren, P. (2002). Queer bodies and configurations: Towards a critical pedagogy of the body. In S. B Shapiro & S. Shapiro (Eds.), *Body movements: Pedagogy, politics and social change* (pp. 187-207). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Curtis, C. A., & Rasool, J. A. (1997). Motivating future educators through empowerment: A special case. *Educational Forum*, 61, 307-313.
- Danylewycz, M., & Prentice, A. (1984). Teachers, gender, and bureaucratizing school systems in 19th century Montreal and Toronto. *History of Education Quarterly*, 24, 75-100.
- Davis, K. B. (1929). *Factors in the sex life of twenty-two hundred women*. New York: Arno Press and the *New York Times*.
- De Alva, J. J. K. (1995). The postcolonization of (Latin) American experience: A reconsideration of "colonialism", "postcolonialism" and "mestizaje". In G. Prakash (Ed.), *After colonialism: Imperial histories and postcolonial displacements* (pp. 241-278). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- de la Torre, A., & Pesquera, B. (1993). *Building with our hands: New directions in Chicana studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Delphy, C. (2000). Rethinking sex and gender. In K. Oliver (Ed.), *French feminism reader* (pp. 63-76). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Demas, E., & Saavedra, C. M. (1999). *Education majors at risk: Towards critical multicultural teacher education*. Paper presented at the JCT Annual Conference, Dayton, Ohio.

- Denzin, N. K. (1994). Postmodernism and deconstruction. In D. R. Dickens & A. Fontana (Eds.), *Postmodern and social inquiry* (pp. 1-17). New York: Guilford.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Donovan, F. R. (1974). *Schoolma'am*. New York: Arno.
- Douglas, A. (1977). *The feminization of American culture*. New York: Knopf.
- Douglas, M. (1970). *Natural symbols: Explorations in cosmology*. New York: Pantheon.
- Donaldson, L. E., & Pui-lan, K. (2002). *Postcolonialism, feminism and religious discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Dube, M. (2002). Postcoloniality, feminist spaces and religion. In L. E. Donaldson & K. Pui-lan (Eds.), *Postcolonialism, feminism and religious discourse* (pp. 100-122). New York: Routledge.
- Elenes, C.A. (2002). Border/transformational pedagogies at the end of the millennium: Chicana/o cultural studies and education. In A. Aladama & N. Quiñonez (Eds.), *Decolonial voices: Chicana and Chicano cultural studies in the 21st century* (pp. 245-261). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Ellias, N. (1978). *The civilizing process, vol. 1: The history of manners*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ellias, N. (1982). *The civilizing process, vol. 2: State formation and civilization*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Engvall, R. P. (1997). *The professionalization of teaching: Is it truly much ado about nothing?* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.
- Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fine, M. (1993). Sexuality, schooling, and adolescent females: The missing discourse of desire. In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.), *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools* (pp. 75-100). New York: SUNY Press.
- Fiske, J. (1989). *Understanding pop culture*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Foucault, M. (1971). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 76-100). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1974, February). Interview on national French radio. *Impulse*, 52.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality* (Vol. 1-3). New York: Pantheon.

- Foucault, M. (1986). *The use of pleasure*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage.
- Frankfort, R. (1977) *Collegiate women: Domesticity and career in turn of the century America*. New York: New York University Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1996). Is there a place for cultural studies in colleges of education? In H. Giroux., C. Lankshear, P. McLaren, & M. Peters (Eds.), *Counternarratives: Cultural studies and critical pedagogies in postmodern spaces* (pp. 41-58). New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 213-238.
- Glasser, W. (1990). *The quality school: Managing students without coercion*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Behaviour in public places: Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. New York: Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (1969). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Grosz, E. (1995). *Space, time, and perversion: Essays on the politics of bodies*. New York: Routledge.
- Grosz, E. (1999). *Becomings: Explorations in time, memory, and futures*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Grosz, E. (2001). *Architecture from the outside: Essays on virtual and real space*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Grosz, E., & Probyn, E. (1995). *Sexy bodies: The strange carnalities of feminism*. London: Routledge.
- Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Guillaumin, C. (1982). The question of difference. *Feminist Issues*, 2(1), 33-52.
- Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women*. New York: Routledge.

- Hatcher, C. (1997). *The making of the enterprising manager in Australia: A genealogy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Cultural and Policy Studies, Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology.
- Hewett, K. A. (1996). *Eh, no act! The power of being on the margin*. Paper presented at the Reconceptualization Early Childhood Education: Research, Theory, and Practice Sixth Interdisciplinary Conference, Madison, WI.
- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory from margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1997). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Irigaray, L. (1993). *An ethics of sexual difference*. (Trans. C. Burke & G. C. Gill). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Irigaray, L. (2000). An ethic of sexual difference. In K. Oliver (Ed.), *French feminism Reader* (pp. 226-236). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Johnson, J. E., Christie, J. F., & Yawkey, T. D. (1999). *Play and early childhood development*. New York: Longman.
- Johnson, R. (1997). The no touch policy. In J. Tobin (Ed.), *Making place for pleasure in early childhood education* (pp. 101-118). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jordonava, L. (1989). *Sexual visions: Images of gender in science and medicine between the eighteenth and twentieth century*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kanpol, B. (1997). *Issues and trends in critical pedagogy*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Kelly, U. A. (1997). *Schooling desire: Literacy, cultural politics and pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (1993). *Towards a critical politics of teacher thinking: Mapping the postmodern*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2004). Redefining rigour and complexity in research. In J. L. Kincheloe & K. S. Berry (Eds.), *Rigour and complexity in educational research* (pp. 1-22). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (1994). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 138-157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Kristeva, J. (1987). *Tales of love*. (Trans. by Leon Roudiez). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1991). *Stranger to ourselves*. (Trans. by Leon S. Roudiez). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lafeber, W. (1963). *The new empire*. New York: Norton.
- Lafeber, W. (1993). *Inevitable revolutions: The United States in Central America*. New York: Norton.
- Laqueur, T. (1987). Orgasm, generation, and the politics of reproductive biology. In C. Gallagher & T. Laqueur (Eds.), *The making of the modern body: Sexuality and society in the nineteenth century* (pp. 1-41). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Laqueur, T. (1990). *Making sex: Body and gender from Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Larkin, J. M., & Sleeter, C. E. (Eds.) (1995). *Developing multicultural teacher education curricula*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Leavitt, R. (1991). *Power and emotion in infant-toddler day care*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Leavitt, R., & Power, M. (1997). Civilizing bodies: Children in day care. In J. Tobin (Ed.), *Making a place for pleasure in early childhood education* (pp. 39-75). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Levy, B. (2000). Pedagogy: Incomplete, unrequited. In C. O'Farrell, D. Meadmore, E. McWilliam, & C. Symes (Eds.), *Taught bodies* (pp. 81-90). New York: Peter Lang.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Liston, D. P., & Zeichner, K. M. (1996). *Culture and teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Loomba, A. (1998). *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Macrine, S. L. (2002). Pedagogical bondage: Body bound and gagged in a technological world. In S. Shapiro & S. Shapiro (Eds.), *Body movements: Pedagogy, politics and social change* (133-145). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Marriage as related to eligibility. (1942, March). *NEA Research Bulletin*, 20, p. 61.
- Marshall, B. (1992). *Teaching the postmodern: Fiction and theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Martin, E. (1987). *The woman in the body: A cultural analysis of reproduction*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Martin, J. R. (1982). Excluding women from the educational realm. *Harvard Educational Review*, 52(2), 133-148.
- Martin, R. J. (1995). *Practice what we teach: Confronting diversity in teacher education*. Albany: State University of New York Press
- McLaren, P. (1991). Schooling the postmodern body. In H. Giroux (Ed.), *Postmodernism, feminism, and cultural politics: Redrawing educational boundaries* (p. 147). Albany: SUNY Press.
- McLaren, P. (1994). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.
- McLaren, P. (1997a). Preface. In S. B. Shapiro (Ed.), *Pedagogy and the politics of the body: A critical praxis* (pp. ix- xiii). New York: Garland.
- McLaren, P. (1997b). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- McNay, L. (1992). *Foucault and feminism: Power, gender and the self*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- McWilliam, E. (1996). Introduction. In E. McWilliam & P. Taylor (Eds.), *Pedagogy, technology and the body* (pp. v- x). New York: Peter Lang.
- McWilliam, E. (2000). Stuck in the missionary position? Pedagogy and desire in new times. In C. O'Farrell, D. Meadmore, E. McWilliam, & C. Symes (Eds.), *Taught bodies* (pp. 27-38). New York: Peter Lang.
- McWilliam, E., & Jones, A. (1996). Eros and pedagogical bodies: The state of (non)affairs. In E. McWilliam & P. Taylor (Eds.), *Pedagogy, technology and the body* (pp. 127-136). New York: Peter Lang.
- Moraga, C. (1983). *Loving in the war years: Lo que nunca paso por sus labios*. Boston: South End Press.
- Millet, K. (1970). *Sexual politics*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mohanran, R. (1999). *Black body: Women, colonialism, and space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Moi, T. (Ed.). (1987). *French feminist thought*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Mongia, P. (1996). *Contemporary postcolonial theory: A reader*. London: Arnold.
- Moraga, C. (1983). *Loving in the war years: Lo que nunca paso por sus labios*. Boston: South End Press.
- Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds.). (2002). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

- Moore, G. (1987). The physical environment and cognitive development in child-care. In C. Weinstein & T. David (Eds.), *Spaces for children: The built environment and child development* (pp. 41-72). New York: Plenum.
- Moya, P. M. (1997). Postmodernism, "realism," and the politics of identity: Cherrie Moraga and Chicana feminism. In M. J. Alexander & C. T. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies and democratic futures* (pp. 125-150). New York: Routledge.
- Nerleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception*. (C. Smith, Trans.). New York: Humanities Press.
- Nespor, J. (1994). *Knowledge in motion: Space, time and curriculum in undergraduate physics and management*. Washington, DC: Falmer.
- Nespor, J. (1997). *Tangled up in school: Politics, space, bodies and signs in the educational process*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Neumann, S., & Roskos, K. (1993). *Language and learning in the early years: An integrated approach*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Oliver, K. (2000). *French feminism reader*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Oram, A. (1989). A master should not serve under a mistress: Women and men teachers 1900-1970. In S. Acker (Ed.), *Teachers, gender and careers* (pp. 21-34). New York: Falmer.
- O'Farrell, C., Meadmore, D., McWilliam, E., & Symes, C. (2000). *Taught bodies*. New York: Peter Lang.
- O'Neill, J. (1985). *Five bodies: The human shape of modern society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Perez, E. (1998). Irigaray's female symbolic in the making of Chicana lesbian sitios y lenguas (sites and discourse). In C. Trujillo (Ed.), *Living Chicana theory* (pp. 87-101). Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.
- Perez, E. (1999). *The decolonial imaginary: Writing Chicanas into history*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Phelan, A. (1997). Classroom management and the erasure of teacher desire. In J. Tobin (Ed.), *Making a place for pleasure in early childhood education* (pp. 76-100). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1996). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Prado, C. G. (2000). *Starting with Foucault* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, J., & Hatcher, W. B. (1983). The feminization of public school teaching 1870-1920. *Work and Occupation, 10*, 81-89.
- Riley, D. (1988). *Am I that name: Feminism and the category of women in history*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Saavedra, C. M., & Demas, E. (2001). (His)torical representations of the child. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 17*, 81-91.
- Said, E. (1996). Orientalism. In P. Mongia (Ed.), *Contemporary postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 205-225). London: Arnold.
- Saldívar-Hull, S. (2000). *Feminism on the border: Chicana gender, politics and literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sartre, J. P. (1956). *Being and nothingness: An essay in phenomenological ontology*. (Trans. by Hazel E. Barnes). New York: Citadel Press
- Saukko, P. (2003). *Doing research in cultural studies*. London: Sage.
- Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, power and the body*. New York: Routledge.
- Schmuck, P. A. (Ed.). (1987a). *Women educators: Employees of schools in western countries*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Schmuck, P. A. (1987b). Women school employees in the United States. In P. A. Schmuck (Ed.), *Women educators: Employees of schools in western countries* (pp. 75-97). New York: SUNY Press.
- Shapiro, S. B. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of the body: A critical praxis*. New York: Garland.
- Shapiro, S. B. (1999). *Pedagogy and the politics of the body: A critical praxis* (2nd ed.). New York: Garland.
- Shildrick, M. (1997). *Leaky bodies and boundaries: Feminism, postmoderism and (bio)ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Shilling, C. (1993). *The body and social theory*. London: Sage.
- Silin, J. G. (1995). *Sex, death, and the education of children: Our passion for ignorance in the age of AIDS*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Silin, J. G. (1997). The pervert in the classroom. In J. Tobin (Ed.), *Making a place for pleasure in early childhood education* (pp. 214-234). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.



- Singer, L. (1992). Disciplining pleasures. In J. Butler & M. MacGrogan (Eds.), *Erotic welfare* (pp. 62-82). New York: Routledge.
- Sklar, K. K. (1973). *Catherine Beecher: A study in American domesticity*. New York: Norton.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Smith, T. E. C., Followay, E. A., Patton, J. R., & Dowdy, C. A. (2001). *Teaching students with special needs in inclusive settings* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smyth, J. (2001). *Critical politics of teachers' work*. New York: Peter Lang
- Spelman, E. V. (1982). Woman as body: Ancient and contemporary views. *Feminist Studies*, 8(1), 108-130.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1996). Poststructuralism, marginality, postcoloniality, and value. In P. Mongia (Ed.), *Contemporary postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 198-223). London, UK: Arnold.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Spring, J. (1997). *The American school: 1642-1996*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sugg, R. S., Jr. (1978). *Motherteacher: The feminization of American education*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Synnott, A. (1993). *The body social: Symbolism, self and society*. London: Routledge.
- Thirugnanam, J. (1996). *Pointed noses and yellow hair: Deconstructing children's writing on race and ethnicity in Hawaii*. Paper presented at the Reconceptualizing Early Childhood Education: Research, Theory and Practice Sixth Interdisciplinary Conference, Madison, WI.
- Tobin, J. (Ed.). (1997). *Making place for pleasure in early childhood education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Todd, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Learning desire: Perspectives on pedagogy, culture, and the unsaid*. New York: Routledge.
- Tom, A. R. (1997). *Redesigning teacher education*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Trujillo, C. (Ed.). (1998). *Living Chicana theory*. Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

- Tuchman, G. (1994). Historical social science: Methodologies, methods and meaning. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 306-323). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Turner, B. S. (1983). *Religion and social theory: A materialist perspective*. London: Heinemann.
- Turner, B. S. (1984). *The body and society: Explorations in social theory*. New York: Blackwell.
- Turner, B. S. (1992). *Regulating bodies: Essays in medical sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Turner, B. S. (1996). *The body and society*. London: Sage.
- U.S. Congress. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001: Conference report to accompany H.R. 1*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Viruru, R., & Cannella, G. S. (2000). *Teaching methods and materialism: Thoughts from postcolonial scholarship*. Paper presented at the JCT Conference, Dayton, Ohio.
- Walkerdine, V. (1987). Femininity as performance. *Oxford Review of Education*, 15(3), 267-279.
- Walkerdine, V. (1993). Sex, power, and pedagogy. In M. Alvarado, E. Buscombe, & R. Collins (Eds.), *The screen education reader: Cinema, television, culture* (pp. 207-221). New York: Macmillan.
- Weinstein, C., & Mignano, A. (1993). *Elementary classroom management*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Welter, B. (1966). The cult of true womanhood: 1820-1860. *American Quarterly*, 18, 150-174.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wittig, M. (1982). The category of sex. *Feminist Issues*, 2(2), 63-68.
- Yeatman, A. (1994). *Postmodern revisionings of the political*. New York: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K. M., Melnick, S., & Gomez, M. L. (1996). *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zeliff, L. A. (1947). Bachelor or married man as small-town superintendent? *American School Board Journal*, 53, 86.
- Zita, J. (1998). *Body talk*. New York: Columbia University Press.

## VITA

Cintha M. Saavedra  
107 #B S. Edgefield Ave.  
Dallas, TX 75208

### Education

- 2006 Ph.D. Education, Curriculum and Instruction  
Texas A& M University, College Station
- 1998 M.Ed. Education, Curriculum and Instruction  
Texas A& M University, College Station
- 1996 B.A. Spanish  
Texas A& M University, College Station

### Professional Experience

- 2006 University of Texas, Arlington  
Adjunct Faculty
- 2004-2006 Duncanville ISD  
Bilingual Pre-K Teacher
- 2002-2004 Austin ISD  
Bilingual Third Grade Teacher
- 1999-2002 Texas A&M University, College Station  
Research/teaching Assistant; Program Coordinator