

Copyright

by

James C. Jupp

2006

The Dissertation Committee for James Cropsey Jupp certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

**LIFE HISTORIES OF WHITE MALE TEACHERS OF DIVERSE STUDENTS:
INTERSECTIONS WITH WHITENESS, MASCULINITY, AND DIFFERENCE**

Committee:

Lisa J. Cary, Supervisor

Angela Valenzuela

Colleen M. Fairbanks

Shernaz B. García

Sherry L. Field

**LIFE HISTORIES OF WHITE MALE TEACHERS OF DIVERSE STUDENTS:
INTERSECTIONS WITH WHITENESS, MASCULINITY, AND DIFFERENCE**

by

James Cropsey Jupp, B.A., M.A.I.S.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2006

Dedicated to María Elvia, Tavo, and Poncho –

Les quiero mucho

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Getting a doctorate at, as anyone who has one knows, is an enormous ordeal. I have many, many people to thank. First, I love my wife, María Elvia, and my two boys, Tavo and Poncho, so much I can't even think of how to say it in a few sentences. I know all of this will make a better life for us with more time we can spend together when I only have one job to hold down instead of working full time and studying at the same time.

After my wife and boys, I have to thank my mom and dad. They listened a lot when I was needing an ear during the process. I thank them both for really understanding what I was up against at times.

I thank, enormously, Dr. Cary, my Committee Chair for putting up with my sizable ego and insisting on my best. What a wonderful, sincere, and brutally honest person! I also thank Dr. Valenzuela, Dr. Fairbanks, Dr. S. García, and Dr. Field for their input and support. Their direction and input greatly expanded my repertoire and required me to really learn life history methodology. Extra thanks to Dr. Cary and Dr. Valenzuela whose positive feedback toward the end really got my attention and energy level up.

I can't forget the participants. Thank you dearly for donating your time and collaborating with me on the last legs of this journey that has gone on for five and a half years. Your stories were amazing, inspiring, honest, enlightened.... I identified deeply with your shaping counter or alternative identities during the Reagan-Bush Era and into the conservative restoration, even though these identities get trampled with "accountability" and more top-down politics.

Peers, friends, and colleagues...there are too many to list. But thanks for the conversations and the support throughout the journey.

Lastly, I wanted to thank everyone in the Curriculum Studies Department for their insights, open-mindedness, and contributions. I did my best to learn from all of you, and I appreciate what you have shown me.

**LIFE HISTORIES OF WHITE MALE TEACHERS OF DIVERSE STUDENTS:
INTERSECTIONS WITH WHITENESS, MASCULINITY, AND DIFFERENCE**

Publication No. _____

James Crospey Jupp, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2006

Supervisor: Lisa J. Cary

This critical inquiry begins with the researcher's lived experiences as white male teacher of diverse students as motive and ethics. As researcher and fifteen-year educator of diverse students, the researcher takes on the role of researcher-participant along with five other white male teachers in the inquiry. The researcher poses the question: What are the life histories of white male teachers of diverse students, and how do intersections with whiteness, masculinity, and difference emerge in the stories? In answering this question, this critical inquiry receives impulse from Mill's (2000 [1959]) understanding of the sociological imagination that seeks to articulate lived experiences within historical and social structures.

Using life history methodology designed to reveal lived experiences as they intersect with historical and social structures (Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Middleton, 1992), this inquiry analyzes patterns and subpatterns in

participants' life histories as they intersect with historical and social structures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference. Emerging from the data, the researcher uncovers sub patterns that articulate a pattern of participants' counter or alternative lifestyles (Willis, 1993 [1995]; Willis, 1977; Hebdige, 1979). The above patterns regarding alternative lifestyles, continually contextualized and analyzed as "lived intersections" with historical and social structures, articulate participants' complex negotiations in, resistances to, and complicities with whiteness, masculinity, and difference. Lived intersections with whiteness articulate lived whitenesses, white visibility, and participants' re-shaping but not denying white identities. Lived intersections with masculinity articulate a rejection of instrumental hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995) for an experiential masculinity. Lived intersections with difference articulate a contradictory deficit thinking (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) *and* structural understandings of difference along with a practical (Schwab, 1978a, Schwab, 1983; Reid, 1984) difference pedagogy that resembles Cummins's (1986) work with minority students.

As an act of sociological imagination, this critical inquiry articulates an unspoken and problematic "rejection" of participants' privileges that, over the course of a lifetime, appears as practical difference pedagogy as part of the story. As this inquiry represents, very personally, the researcher's lived experience he reveals, contradictorily, a sense of hope and impotency before the findings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Dedication..... | iv |
| Acknowledgements..... | v |
| Abstract..... | vii |

Chapters:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Reconceptualizing Victory Narratives..... | 1 |
| 1.1 The Research Question..... | 1 |
| 1.2 From Personal Troubles..... | 1 |
| 1.3 Toward Public Issues..... | 5 |
| 1.4 An Act of Sociological Imagination..... | 7 |
| 1.5 Private Lives...Public Conversations..... | 13 |
| 1.6 Overview of Chapters..... | 15 |
| 2. Relevant Literatures..... | 17 |
| 2.1 Introduction..... | 17 |
| 2.2 Literatures on Life History..... | 18 |
| 2.2.1 The Constructivist Paradigm..... | 18 |
| 2.2.2 Narrative Knowing..... | 20 |
| 2.2.3 Narrative Inquiry..... | 22 |
| 2.2.4 Life History..... | 24 |
| 2.2.5 Issues in Life History..... | 25 |
| 2.2 Life History in Education: Teachers' Lives in Context..... | 29 |
| 2.2.1 Influence of Pinar..... | 29 |
| 2.2.2 Teacher thinking and knowledge..... | 30 |
| 2.2.3 Authentic personal-professional development..... | 32 |
| 2.2.4 Analyses of historical, social, and political structures..... | 35 |
| 2.3 Approaching Critical Literatures..... | 38 |
| 2.3.1 Critical paradigm..... | 38 |
| 2.3.2 Hegemony..... | 39 |
| 2.3.3 Intersectionality..... | 42 |
| 2.4 Literatures on Whiteness..... | 45 |
| 2.4.1 Whiteness..... | 45 |
| 2.4.2 Social construction of race..... | 46 |
| 2.4.3 Invisible privilege before the white gaze..... | 49 |
| 2.5 Whiteness in Educational Institutions..... | 51 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 2.5.1 | Whiteness as epistemological..... | 51 |
| 2.5.2 | Whiteness as normative-hierarchical..... | 53 |
| 2.5.3 | White teachers and preservice teachers..... | 55 |
| 2.6 | Literatures on Masculinity..... | 59 |
| 2.6.1 | Hegemonic masculinity..... | 59 |
| 2.6.2 | Social construction of gender..... | 61 |
| 2.6.3 | “The personal is political”..... | 63 |
| 2.6.4 | Masculinities..... | 64 |
| 2.7 | Masculinities in Educational Institutions..... | 67 |
| 2.7.1 | Masculine epistemological assumptions..... | 67 |
| 2.7.2 | Masculine languages of reform and divisions of labor..... | 68 |
| 2.7.3 | Normalizing masculine practices..... | 70 |
| 2.8 | Teachers’ masculinities..... | 73 |
| 2.9 | Literatures on Difference..... | 74 |
| 2.9.1 | Hegemonic center and margins..... | 75 |
| 2.9.2 | Resistance at the margins..... | 75 |
| 2.9.3 | Social constructions of “the other”..... | 77 |
| 2.10 | Difference in Educational Institutions..... | 79 |
| 2.10.1 | Exclusion-inequality..... | 79 |
| 2.10.2 | Deficit-subtraction..... | 82 |
| 2.10.3 | Disjunction..... | 74 |
| 2.10.4 | Absence..... | 89 |
| 2.11 | Difference and Equity Pedagogy..... | 91 |
| 2.11.1 | Reflexivity..... | 91 |
| 2.11.2 | Synthesis..... | 92 |
| 2.11.3 | Dialogue..... | 93 |
| 2.11.4 | Caring..... | 94 |
| 2.11.5 | Critical engagement..... | 95 |
| 2.12 | Specific equity pedagogies..... | 96 |
| 2.12.1 | Inclusive pedagogy..... | 96 |
| 2.12.2 | Critical pedagogy..... | 97 |
| 2.12.3 | Feminist pedagogy..... | 98 |
| 2.12.4 | Culturally relevant pedagogy..... | 98 |
| 3. | A Critical Use of Life History..... | 100 |
| 3.1 | Introduction..... | 100 |
| 3.2 | Researcher Positionality..... | 100 |
| 3.2 | Critical Use of Life History..... | 103 |
| 3.3 | Participants and Setting..... | 105 |
| 3.3.1 | Working as white male teacher of diverse students..... | 106 |
| 3.3.2 | Choosing to work with diverse students..... | 106 |
| 3.3.3 | Having worked for at least four years..... | 107 |
| 3.4 | Data Gathering..... | 109 |
| 3.4.1 | Interviews..... | 109 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 3.4.2 | Focus Group Meeting..... | 110 |
| 3.4.3 | Peer Debriefings..... | 110 |
| 3.4.4 | Researcher Journal..... | 111 |
| 3.5 | Data Analysis and Validity | |
| 3.5.1 | Data as text..... | 111 |
| 3.5.2 | Analysis..... | 111 |
| 3.5.3 | Validity..... | 114 |
| 3.5.4 | Limits of critical life history..... | 115 |
| 4. | Alternative Lives: Lived Intersections with Whiteness, Masculinity, and Difference..... | 116 |
| 4.1 | Introduction..... | 117 |
| 4.2 | Life History Profiles – Alternative lives..... | 117 |
| 4.2.1 | Jake Baynes – It all boils down to helping myself..... | 118 |
| 4.2.2 | Rudy Smith – Experience...a type of education..... | 123 |
| 4.2.3 | Jim Jupp – Border crossings..... | 127 |
| 4.2.4 | Gene Johanson – Away from the big easy..... | 132 |
| 4.2.5 | Benet Ferris – An activist step I’m taking..... | 137 |
| 4.2.6 | Jack Springman – Not completely beholden..... | 140 |
| 4.2.7 | Emerging lived Intersections..... | 144 |
| 4.3 | Collective Life History..... | 145 |
| 4.3.1 | Growing up White Pt. 1..... | 146 |
| 4.3.1.1 | School successes..... | 149 |
| 4.3.1.2 | Reshaping whiteness..... | 151 |
| 4.3.1.3 | Lived whitenesses..... | 155 |
| 4.3.2 | Growing up White Pt. 2..... | 156 |
| 4.3.2.1 | The University..... | 156 |
| 4.3.2.2 | Radical Politics..... | 157 |
| 4.3.2.3 | Illegal Drugs..... | 159 |
| 4.3.2.4 | Alternative Media..... | 161 |
| 4.3.2.5 | Cult of Experience..... | 163 |
| 4.3.2.6 | Reshaping whiteness, and Experiential Masculinity..... | 164 |
| 4.3.3 | Grown Up: Working with Diverse Students..... | 165 |
| 4.3.3.1 | Transition Stories..... | 165 |
| 4.3.3.2 | White visibility..... | 166 |
| 4.3.3.3 | Deficit Thinking <i>and</i> Structures..... | 168 |
| 4.3.3.4 | Difference Pedagogy..... | 170 |
| 4.3.3.5 | White visibility, pathologies <i>and</i> structures, plurality of consciousnesses..... | 174 |
| 4.4 | Overview of lived intersections..... | 176 |
| 4.4.1 | Whitenesses..... | 176 |
| 4.4.2 | White Visibility..... | 178 |
| 4.4.3 | Reshaping Whiteness..... | 179 |

| | | |
|-------|---|------------|
| 4.4.4 | Experiential Masculinity..... | 180 |
| 4.4.5 | Pathology <i>and</i> Structures..... | 181 |
| 4.4.6 | Difference Pedagogy..... | 183 |
| 5 | Summary of Findings, Public Conversations, Implications, and Personal Reflections..... | 175 |
| 5.1 | Introduction..... | 185 |
| 5.2 | Summary of Findings..... | 185 |
| 5.3 | Public Conversations: Literatures..... | 189 |
| 5.4 | Implications for Teacher Training and Education..... | 193 |
| 5.5 | Reflecting on the Research..... | 196 |
| 5.6 | Exit path..... | 199 |
| | Notes..... | 201 |
| | Appendix A: Consent Form..... | 203 |
| | Appendix B: Interviewing Round One..... | 204 |
| | Appendix C: Interviewing Round Two..... | 205 |
| | Appendix D: Agenda for Focus Group Meeting..... | 206 |
| | Appendix E: Agenda for Debriefing Sessions..... | 207 |
| | Bibliography..... | 208 |
| | Vita..... | 228 |

CHAPTER 1

RECONCEPTUALIZING VICTORY NARRATIVES: AN ACT OF SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION

The Research Question

What are the life histories of white male teachers of diverse students, and how do intersections of whiteness, masculinity, and difference emerge in their stories? This question, which drives and organizes this critical inquiry, emerges from fifteen years of lived experience as a classroom teacher and curriculum worker. My experience as a white male educator of diverse students, like the experiences of many whites in education, represents struggling with and working to bridge differences with diverse students. As many other white teachers from the middle class, the majority of my teaching experience has been one in which I was the only white person in the classroom. As researcher-participant in this critical inquiry, I research my own lived experiences through and with participants' lived experiences.

From Personal Troubles...

My journey as a teacher began in Mérida, Yucatán, México in the late 1980s where I found my first job teaching English at *El Instituto Benjamín Franklin*. As a teacher living in Mérida, I quickly understood that my knowledge of Mexican, regional, and local cultures represented a crucial pragmatics of getting lessons to work, so I took it upon myself to learn about my students and their lives in every way possible. In mastering

Spanish and immersing myself in *yucateco* and Mexican cultures, I sought —through a privileged expatriate frame— a total view and was apportioned space in all sectors of society as an interesting “anomaly.” I fell in love, married into a lower-middle class family, bought a government house in my wife’s name, and set up household as an English teacher working six full days a week. Teaching, both in the *Instituto...* and moonlighting in private classes, gave me access across social strata, and I consumed a total view with the same ambition I had approached other projects of my youth. I learned through teaching and interacting socially with international business executives and government officials, and alternately, the clerks and secretaries who worked for them. These relationships led to others, and I counted among my friends a mechanic at the Coca Cola plant, the Secretary of the Department of Communication in Yucatán, and a Cuban exile teaching at *La universidad autónoma de Yucatán* along with many teachers and students. Additionally, I sought out the social-historical literatures getting guidance from my students, co-workers, and friends regarding historians of the Mexican Revolution or the trajectory of modernist and magical realist traditions. With this guidance, I read voraciously from these traditions and continue to do so —with the increasing feeling of reading over someone’s shoulder with voyeuristic desire. In striving for this the total view, I experienced a strange *déjà vu* in seeing the hierarchy from middle class West Houston that I grew up in take a different form with a new cast of players. Most importantly, what I began understanding during my first five years living in Mexico was the full extension of “realities” that existed both within and beyond the possibilities of understanding. Only after more reading and experience was I able to fully comprehend

the hopes, short-comings, politics, and inherent colonialism in this ostensibly “multicultural” experience.

After living in Mérida, Yucatán, México, my first job teaching public school in the US was in Los Arboles, Texas, a small town about ten miles from Brownsville, the Mexican border, and Matamoros. Because of my wife’s job at Lucent Technologies in Matamoros, I took up residency in Matamoros, Tamaulipas, México for the next five years while working in Los Arboles and Borderville. In South Texas, I re-learned how to teach as my students —no longer attentive adults paying for classes but rather rural, low socio-economic, Mexican, and Mexican-American students— presented a whole different set of concerns for me as a teacher. These concerns included keeping the students on-task, the need to find or develop assignments and projects, how to discipline students’ fairly, and how to get results on state achievement tests. Fortunately for me, I found a mentor in Pedro Luis Pacheco who tossed me a copy of *Stories That Must Not Die* (1989), a book of South Texas legends by Juan Sauvageau, that helped me connect lessons to students’ cultures and languages. Besides re-learning how to teach in a middle school setting, I also learned to negotiate intersections of border culture in which identities of race, class, gender, language, and culture marked with visible power relations. On the border where Mexican, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American identities take on a multiplicity of intersections regarding race, class, gender, language, and culture, patient personal practice emerged as the means of crossing borders and finding intersections of lived experience. Despite patient personal practice, being or being made an outsider represented a distinct possibility that loomed in the background of

many interactions, especially in Matamoros where power and class relations were extremely visible. Put simply, as a border crosser I learned not to assume anything and let others identify their positions and ideas while I, through repeated forays into difference, could gain or ultimately fail to gain others' confidence. Developing a non-imposing pedagogy was key to getting along in South Texas and Northern Mexico where invisibility was not an option.

On leaving South Texas to study a Ph.D. at the Central Texas University at Capitol City¹ in Curriculum and Instruction, I assumed new-teacher status in Central Texas ISD and found myself struggling again with re-imagining the classroom for low socio-economic, Mexican immigrant, Mexican American, and African American 6th graders in an urban setting. My students in Central Texas presented different needs, sets of interests, and family situations from the ones I previously experienced, and much to my dismay, my experiences in South Texas were not completely transferable. Again, I found a mentor in the Department Head, Vincent Rodríguez, who met with me almost daily and coached me through the transition by showing me how to develop alternative lessons that balanced students' choice and structures. These balanced lessons teetered precariously between open-ended lessons, which degenerated into chaos, and teacher-directed lessons, which were boring for everyone. Besides learning to balance lessons between students' choice and structure, I learned to negotiate intersections with gang cultures embedded in the schools and neighborhoods which, though present in South Texas, took on a more prominent role in Central Texas ISD. I also observed the deep ambivalences and opposition my students had regarding school and learning that, though

present in South Texas, became harder to bridge, especially among students directly involved in gang culture, crime, and drugs. Working in an urban setting —succeeding but always on the verge of burnout and disarray, I became aware of the limits of critical projects in conservative institutions, and I also experienced the excitement of making connections amidst the exhaustion of being a career teacher. My personal story provides a motive and later an ethics for this critical inquiry into the life history of white male teachers of diverse students.

...Toward Public Issues

The previous narrative, which describes my lived experience as a white male teacher of diverse students, is recounted as a personal trouble. Yet it reflects a broader narrative experienced by many white teachers from the middle class. It contains, embedded in its structure, the workings of race, class, gender, and other differences that commonly intersect in public school classrooms. It assumes, when read on face value, that learning to teach diverse students represents a continual a rite of passage story in which a dedicated teacher forges relationships in schools with diverse students and their communities. It works from a common sense frame, usually taken for granted, that teachers of diverse students commit their lives to important cultural negotiations with their students and communities. It articulates, when teachers, students, and communities earnestly approach these negotiations, the protracted cultural negotiations turn out fine. This personal narrative is a victory narrative, and as such, forms part of social science’s “redemptive culture” (Cary, 1999, p. 421). While this victory narrative is satisfying to read, it does not re-think, re-formulate, nor re-conceptualize how race, class, gender, and

other differences intersect and play out in schools. It fails to comprehend neither the historical (Tyack, 1974; Anderson, 1988; Spring, 2000) nor the present (Kozol, 1991; Valenzuela, 1999; Nieto, 1999; Gay, 2000) mass failure of the US educational system to include students of color, and it fails to articulate the experiences of frustrated teachers who quit after an initial year or burn out after several (Anyon, 1995; Anyon, 1997). Even worse, the victory narrative often reifies the historical and social structures in place by arguing that if teachers cared enough, sacrificed enough, gave more, worked harder, a functioning liberal State will prevail (Mills, 2000 [1959]; Denzin, 1989; Middleton, 1992; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Cary, 1999).

This critical inquiry into the life histories of white male teachers of diverse students seeks to move the discourse from personal troubles toward public issues. In its broadest impulse, this critical inquiry draws on Mills's *The Sociological Imagination* (2000 [1959]). In this work, Mills (2000 [1959]) argues that critical inquiry refuse personal troubles as they are commonly understood and officially addressed:

Know that many personal troubles cannot be solved merely as troubles, but must be understood in terms of public issues —and in terms of the problems of history-making. ... Know that the problems of social science, when adequately understood, must include both troubles and issues, both biography and history, and the range of their intricate relations. (p. 226)

Moving from the personal troubles toward public issues, argues Mills (2000 [1959]), requires an act of “sociological imagination” (p. 6). According to Mills (2000 [1959]), the

sociological imagination defines, develops, and articulates problems of lived experience as they intersect with historical and social structures:

We have come to know that every individual lives, from one generation to the next, in some society; that he [sic] lives out a biography, and that he [sic] lives it out within some historical sequence. The sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society...No social study that does not come back to the problems of biography, of history, and of their intersections within a society has completed its intellectual journey. (p. 6)

Moreover,

We have come to see that the biographies of men and women, the kinds of individuals they variously become, cannot be understood without reference to the historical structures in which the view of their every day lives are organized.

Historical structures carry meanings not only for the individual ways of life, but for the very character —the limits and possibilities of the human being. (p. 158)

The sociological imagination, it follows, pronounces lived experiences as they intersect with emerging historical and social structures as the proper focus of inquiry. The purpose of this sociological imagination, according to Mills (2000 [1959]), is to re-think, re-formulate, and re-conceptualize personal troubles as public issues for an informed understanding and public conversation.

An Act of Sociological Imagination

This critical inquiry into the lived experiences of white male teachers of diverse students represents an act of the sociological imagination. First, it consciously and

reflexively takes up narrative knowing and inquiry, and more specifically, life history as its methodology. Life history, as a specific type of narrative inquiry (Wisniewski, 1995), provides a research methodology that seeks to illuminate lived experience within historical and social structures, to pronounce personal troubles as public issues.

Regarding life history in sociology, Denzin (1989) articulates the move from lived experiences to structure:

The intent of the biographical project is to uncover the social, economic, cultural, structural, and historical forces that shape, distort, and otherwise alter problematic lived experiences. This focus on structure must never lose sight of the individuals who live these structurally shaped lives. (p. 75)

Moreover, regarding life history in education, Goodson (1989) elaborates on the move from personal troubles to public issues:

What above all is needed, therefore, is a [life history] methodology that stays with the participants, with the complexity of the social process, but catches some understanding of the constraints beyond. The human process by which men make their own history does not take place in circumstances of their own choosing, so too do the potentialities for negotiating reality. (p. 176)

Life history, as reflexively and consciously taken up in this critical inquiry, provides for understanding lived experiences as they intersect with historical and social structures.

This focus on lived experiences as they intersect with structures re-states, re-formulates, and re-conceptualizes personal troubles as public issues.

Second, this critical inquiry into the lived experiences of white male teachers of diverse students consciously and reflexively takes up three historical and social structures: *whiteness*, *masculinity*, and *difference*. These three historical and social structures, embedded in the research question, provide three regions of hegemony or hegemonic structures for analysis of lived experience. Whiteness references and provides an historical and social analysis of participants' lived experiences as they intersect with race. Masculinity references and provides an historical and social analysis of participants' lived experiences as they intersect with gender. Difference references and provides an historical and social analysis of participants' lived experiences as they intersect with lives of diverse students. Each historical and social structure —whiteness, masculinity, and difference— provides for an analysis of participants' lived experiences.

Influenced directly or indirectly by the Birmingham School of scholars, critical scholarship on whiteness (Hall, 1981; Dyer, 1988), masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995), and difference (Julien & Mercer, 1988; Hebdige, 1979; Willis, 1977) articulate three regions of hegemony or hegemonic structures. Gramsci (2000) describes hegemonic structures as emerging combinations of cultural and material ideas —ideologies— that come into conflict with one another until specific combinations gain the upper-hand. These cultural and material ideas become dominant to the extent that they articulate a broad ruling consensus among diverse social classes and groups. This ruling consensus of cultural and material ideas generally dictates acceptable moral-intellectual discourse and “common sense” understandings. As common sense understandings, these cultural and material ideas double for the “natural” world, and in

doing so, become invisible, taken-for-granted, and broadly assumed in the status quo. Increasingly, inquiry into whiteness, masculinity, and difference, develops an intersectional analysis or intersectionality in which multiple hegemonic structures provide for an analysis of lived experiences (Hall, 2004a; Hall, 2004b; West, 1994; Omi & Winant, 1994; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Butler, 1999). This critical inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students consciously and reflexively articulates intersectionalities of lived experiences with hegemonic structures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference.

Whiteness, masculinity, and difference —briefly reviewed below but discussed at length in Chapter Two— provide historically specific hegemonic structures taken up in this inquiry.

1. *Whiteness*. Critical scholarship in this area identifies race, and more specifically whiteness, as a changing historical construct that throughout US history finds religious, scientific-biological, and historical-social rationales and justifications (Horseman, 1975; Jennings, 1976; Omi & Winnant, 1994; Roediger, 1994). Whiteness refers to taken-for-granted and normative viewpoints associated with white cultural practices (Hall, 1981; Dyer, 1988; West, 1993). Whiteness, in addition to articulating taken-for-granted and normative viewpoints, also provides whites with invisible privilege (Dyer, 1988; McIntosh, 1988). This invisible privilege, gained because of complicity with white norms, often results in whites' taking color-blind positions that enact color-power evasion (Frankenberg, 1993) regarding race issues. Related educational literature on whiteness focuses on white epistemological assumptions (West, 1993a; Scheurich & Young, 1997)

and white institutional practices that place whites in control (West, 1993b; Rains, 1999; Scheurich, 2002). Related literatures on white teachers articulate teachers' and preservice teachers' resistance to race-based understandings of inequality in schools (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002).

2. *Masculinity*. Critical scholarship on masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995) emerges from feminist discussions of gender as social construct (Stanley, 1984; West & Zimmerman, 1987; Delphy, 1993; Butler, 1999; Jackson & Scott, 2002). Hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995) reveals the instrumental dominance of males in public, national, and international arenas with particular emphasis on male-dominated fields such as politics, technology, industry, and the military. Hegemonic masculinity, while not corresponding to all men in face-to-face relations with women, maintains its ascendancy through combinations of cultural and material ideas and practices. Related educational literatures on masculinity identify male epistemological assumptions in research (Pinar, 2002b) and pronounces a male language of educational accountability reform (Pinar, 2004b; Mahony, Hextall, & Menter, 2004). Additionally, educational literatures on masculinity focus on gendered practices in schools in areas of course selection, sports activities, achievement, and disciplinary practices (Connell, 1996).

3. *Difference*. For the purposes of this critical inquiry, difference refers to differences of race, class, and culture. Critical scholarship on difference pronounces relations of hegemonic center and margins (Julien & Mercer, 1988; Apple, 1993; Apple, 2000). Western European cultures and North American adaptations articulate the

hegemonic centers that actively construct margins (Zinn, 2003 [1980]; Julien & Mercer, 1988; Katz, 1989; Apple, 1993). This active construction of margins (Zinn, 2003 [1980]; Apple, 1993), in the present conservative restoration (Apple, 1993; Apple, 2000), diminishes historical and social inequality regarding people of color, women, and gays. The hegemonic center (Julien & Mercer, 1988), in diminishing historical and social inequality, pronounces the margins as a morally deficient “cultural pathology” (Katz, 1989, p. 200). The loaded meanings of “welfare mother” provide an example of the ways that the hegemonic centers define poor women of color as morally deficient social disease.

Related educational literatures on difference describe how difference plays out in educational institutions and articulate equity pedagogies for bridging differences. Literatures that describe difference focus on historical and present exclusion-inequality (Tyack, 1996 [1974]; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Spring, 2000; Anderson, 1988; Kozol, 1991), deficit and subtractive understandings of difference (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999), and disjunction between students, teachers, and administration (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Anyon, 1995; Anyon, 1997; Ogbu & Simmons, 1998). Literatures on equity pedagogy, a complex and over-lapping body of strategies and philosophies, pronounces teacher-reflexivity, synthesis, dialogue, caring, and critical engagement as key strategies. Additionally, literatures on equity pedagogy pronounce inclusive, (Cummins, 1986), critical (Freire, 1998a [1969]; Freire, 1998b[1970]; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor, 1992), feminist (hooks, 1994; Goldstein, 1998; Goldstein, 2002), and culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995) pedagogies.

Private Lives...Public Conversations

As an act of sociological imagination (Mills, 2000[1959]), this critical inquiry into white male teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with whiteness, masculinity, and difference transforms private lives into public conversations. In transforming private lives into public conversations, this critical inquiry adds dimension to on-going discussions of race, gender, and diversity in education by focusing on lived-experiences as they intersect with social and historical structures.

Regarding race, in the 2000 census white teachers made up 89% of the teaching profession (US Census Bureau, 2005) while increasingly diverse student populations (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2003) manifest persistent or worsening achievement gaps (National Statistics on Educational Equity Issues, 2002). By inquiring into the lived experiences of white male teachers as they intersect with whiteness, this critical inquiry bridges the gap between public conversations about white teachers (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2001; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002; Chubbock, 2004) and theories on whiteness in educational institutions (West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich & Young, 1997; Scheurich, 2002; Rains, 1999).

Regarding gender, this critical inquiry contributes to a small public conversation on masculinity in education (Skelton, 1993; Connell, 1996; Pinar, 2002b; Pinar, 2004b). While only Skelton (1993) adapts an autobiographical methodology in his study of male physical education teachers, most discussions on teachers' gender remain theoretical (Connell, 1996; Pinar, 2002b; Pinar, 2004b) and none engage participants. While life history represents a central methodology for understanding masculinity (Connell, 1987;

Connell, 1995), this critical inquiry presents the first use of life history in studying teachers' masculinities.

Regarding diverse students, this critical inquiry into the lived experiences of white male teachers adds dimension to public conversations on diversity. In inquiring into the lived experiences of white male teachers, this critical inquiry provides perspective on how differences and pedagogies are experienced and *actually lived out* in complex ways. While white educational researchers (Kozol, 1991; Foley, 1990; Foley, 1995; Anyon, 1995; Anyon, 1997) and researchers of color (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999; Nieto, 1999; Gay, 2000) provide valuable insight into how differences play out in educational institutions, little critical inquiry develops an insider's perspective into lived experiences of white male teachers as they intersect historical and social structures. This critical inquiry into the lived experiences of white male teachers as they intersect with whiteness, masculinity, and difference provides a unique opportunity for uncovering how differences play out from a white perspective.

By articulating white male teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with whiteness, masculinity, and difference, this critical inquiry provides an example of intersectional analysis or intersectionality. Intersectionality holds that, in order to understand difference, multiple historical and social structures of difference must be considered at the same time (Hall, 2004a; West, 1993a; Butler, 1999; Omi & Winant, 1994; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Collins, 2000). By focusing on intersectionality, this critical inquiry contributes, simultaneously, to conversations on race, gender, and

diversity in education. Additionally, this critical inquiry contributes to discussions of social class in education as class, for the purposes of this critical inquiry, is embedded in whiteness, masculinity, and difference, both in the literature review and in the analyses of participants' lived experiences. This embeddedness of class counters race evasive strategies (Frankenberg, 1993; Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2001; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002) that diminish difference by felicitously pronouncing class as the significant difference.

Overview of the Chapters

Regarding the necessary literatures, this critical inquiry follows the contours of the research topic: life histories of white male teachers of diverse students. Literatures on life history along with critical literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and difference will be unpacked in Chapter Two. Related educational literatures are included in each section.

Regarding methodology, this inquiry specifically develops a critical use of life history. This critical use of life history method will be discussed in Chapter Three. Additionally, Chapter Three contains a section on researcher positionality and provides the details regarding participants, settings, and data collection. Finally, Chapter Three outlines the practices of data analysis and discusses issues of research validity.

Regarding data analysis, analysis represents the focus of Chapter Four. Specifically, Chapter Four identifies emergent patterns and subpatterns in participants' life histories as they intersect with whiteness, masculinity, and difference.

Regarding a summary of findings, Chapter Five presents a concise review of major findings. In light of these findings, Chapter Five engages in on-going conversations

regarding the literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and difference along with implications for teacher educators and educational institutions. Chapter Five also presents a personal reflection on the literature and a narrative exit path.

CHAPTER 2

RELEVANT LITERATURES ON LIFE HISTORY, WHITENESS, MASCULINITY, AND DIFFERENCE

Introduction

What are the life histories of white male teachers of diverse students, and how do intersections of whiteness, masculinity, and difference emerge in their stories? Answering this question requires engaging the methodological literatures on *life history* along with critical literatures on *whiteness*, *masculinity*, and *difference*. Literatures on life history, which include uses of life history in education, articulate the purpose of life history methodology in examining lived experiences as they intersect with historical and social structures. Critical literatures on whiteness, which include literatures on whiteness in educational institutions and white teachers, provide for exploration of teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with dominant white structures. Literatures on masculinity, which include literatures on masculinities in educational institutions, provide for an exploration of teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with dominant male structures. Critical literatures on difference, which include literatures on difference in educational institutions and equity pedagogy, provide for an exploration of teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with difference in classrooms.

Each subsection that follows provides for and develops the framework for exploring dimensions of the research question. Life history provides the methodological

choice for exploring teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with emerging historical and social structures. Each of the critical literatures —literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and difference— provide historical and social structures for analysis of lived experiences of white male teachers of diverse students.

Literatures on Life History

Literatures on life history emerge from the constructivist paradigm, locate this methodology within narrative knowing and inquiry, allow for examinations of lives within contexts or structures, and articulate key issues regarding life history methodology.

The constructivist paradigmⁱⁱ. Life history emerges from the constructivist paradigm. The constructivist paradigm begins with a rejection of an objective “‘real world’ that pre-exists and is independent of mental activity and human symbolic language” (Bruner, 1986, p. 95). Instead, the constructivist paradigm holds that realities represent individual and social “product[s] of mind whose symbolic procedures construct worlds” (Bruner, 1986, p 95). The constructivist paradigm understands realities as “intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature” (Lincoln & Guba, 1998, p. 206). Additionally, the constructivist paradigm understands realities as emerging from the practices “of the individual persons or groups holding the constructions” (Lincoln & Guba, 1998, p. 206). Moreover, the constructivist paradigm holds that realities represent shared social constructions that “are not more or less true in an absolute sense, but more or less informed and/or sophisticated” (Lincoln & Guba, 1998, p. 206). Realities in the constructivist paradigm represent individual and

social constructions made manifest in practices. These social constructions, made manifest in practices, provide for what is commonly understood as “the real.”

Systems of knowing take on particular importance in the constructivist paradigm. Systems of knowing, rather than representing *a priori* categories outside of socially constructed realities, reside inside and represent “but another constructed version of the world...taken as given for certain purposes” (Bruner, 1986, p. 97). Systems of knowing, it follows, reference and constitute versions of the world along with criteria for evaluating versions per purpose, and when versions are evaluated as “right” in socially constructed and constituted practices, these “right versions make worlds...” (Bruner, 1986, p. 99). Standard systems of knowing—such as positivist and critical along with the constructivist paradigm itself—reference and constitute realities through “constructional activities guided in each case by different constraints for establishing rightness and different conventions that grow out of their [social] ‘entrenchment’” (Bruner, 1986, p. 101). Regarding systems of knowing,

...the moment one abandons that ‘the world’ is there once and for all immutably, and substitutes the idea that what we take as the world is itself no more nor less than a stipulation couched in a symbol system, then the shape of any discipline alters radically. And we are, at last, in a position to deal with the myriad of forms that reality can take—including realities created by story.... (Bruner, 1986, p. 105)

Systems of knowing, as understood in the constructivist paradigm, reflect and constitute realities. As Bruner (1986) articulates, the constructivist paradigm provides for inquiry into realities constructed and constituted in story or narrative.

Narrative knowing. Narrative knowing provides the system of knowing for life history. Narrative knowing emphasizes human constructions of individual and social meanings from lived experience (Bruner, 1986; Bruner, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1988). Narrative knowing contains a relation with the hermeneutic tradition of Dilthey, Husserl, Heidegger, and others that maintains:

...human existence is made up of interacting layers of reality that extend beyond the objective plane of the physical realm to the linguistic plane of expression. The linguistic realm is not a place; it is a kind of activity. It is the on-going process of creating meaning for existence—a process similar to the creation of meaning that is reflected when a person speaks or writes a poem. Thus, being human is more a type of meaning generating activity than a kind of object. It is an incarnated or embodied making of meaning....(Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 126)

Narrative knowing takes human meaning making, often made manifest in socially constructed and constituted realities, as its point of emphasis in understanding life as it is lived.

Broadly speaking, narrative knowing constructs and constitutes human configurations of time, events, and experience through narrative (Bruner, 1986; Bruner, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1988). Narrative knowing allows for and configures conceptions of history, cultural questions, social understandings, political ideology, individual lived

experience and practices, and what is called and functions as “common sense” (Bruner, 1986; Bruner, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1988). Narrative knowing—in configuring conceptions of history, cultural questions, collective understandings, lived experiences, and social practices—deals in “human or human-like intention and the viscidities and consequences that mark their course” (Bruner, 1986, p. 13). Narrative knowing, in dealing with human intentions, viscidities, and consequences, articulates “a metaphor for reality” (Ricoeur in Bruner, 1990, p. 46) that serves a “mimetic function” (Bruner, 1990, p. 46). This mimetic function allows for a narrative knowing that parallels reality, “not in order to match it, but in order to give it a new reading” (Ricoeur in Bruner, 1990, p. 46). Narrative knowing, it follows, suspends claims of direct reference to capturing “reality” and, instead, deals in understanding lived experiences through participants. Narrative knowing represents “the primary form through which humans construct the dimension of their life’s meaningfulness and understand it as significant” (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 155).

Narrative inquiry. Life history represents a type of narrative inquiry (Walker, Zeller, Herzog, and Foster in Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995). Narrative inquiry begins with narrative knowing in assuming that "...individuals construct past events and actions in personal narratives to claim identities and construct lives" (Riessman, 1993, p. 2). Narrative inquiry, as a methodology, studies participants' narratives as a way of tapping into, mapping, and representing individual and collective experiences (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995; Riessman, 1993; Atkinson, 1998; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001). Narrative inquiry, as a methodology, allows for a window on lived experience that provides

...the best way of representing and understanding experience. Experience is what we study, and we study it narratively because narrative thinking is a key form of experience and a key way of writing and thinking about it. In effect, narrative thinking is part of the phenomenon of narrative. (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 18)

Narrative inquiry, as a methodology, studies narratives that people develop and tell about themselves and their lives: "Experience happens narratively.... Therefore,... experience should be studied narratively" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 19). Narrative inquiry, of which life history presents a type, takes experience as narrative as its starting point.

Narrative inquiry, in taking experience as narrative, pronounces two central critiques (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). First, narrative inquiry pronounces the reductionist critique of positivist science. Positivist science, according to the reductionist critique, enacts a technical search for objective knowledge that implies "no matter what

any particular person happens to believe, there is a correct and true view of the world” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 36). In contrast, the reductionist critique sees such objective knowledge as disembodied and de-contextualized. As disembodied and de-contextualized, the reductionist critique discounts positivist science’s “objective knowledge” as an oversimplified reduction of experience. Through the reductionist critique, narrative inquiry emphasizes experience “as knowing in action...” (Schön in Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 37). In pronouncing the reductionist critique, narrative inquiry discounts the quest for positivist-realist “truth” and emphasizes participants’ lived experiences.

Second, narrative inquiry pronounces the formalist critique of theoretical inquiry. Theoretical inquiry, according to the formalist critique, emphasizes frameworks over experience:

...the facts of the case, the experience that one claims to have, or the data collected by empiricist researchers have little bearing on their claims. Persons, they argue, can never see themselves as they are because they are always something else; specifically, they are whatever social structure, ideology, theory, or framework [that] is at work in the inquiry. (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 39)

In contrast, narrative inquiry begins, not with theoretical framework, but rather “with experience as expressed in lived and told stories” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 40). In pronouncing the formalist critique, narrative inquiry discounts formal frameworks and emphasizes participants’ lived experience as expressed in narrative. Narrative inquiry, of

which life history presents a type, focuses on participants' lived experience recounted in narrative.

Life history. Life history, as a methodology, represents a specific type of narrative inquiry (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995). More specifically, life history represents a subset of narrative inquiry: “a simple distinction between narrative and life history is that one is much broader in scope than (and subsumes) the other” (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 114). Life history, as a methodology, emerges from, corresponds to, and works along—in a broad sense—the assumptions of the constructivist paradigm, narrative knowing, and narrative inquiry.

As a type of narrative inquiry, life history differs only in emphases with narrative inquiry. First, life history, to a greater degree than narrative inquiry, emphasizes researchers and participants' lived experiences as expressed in life stories, biographies, or autobiographies (Denzin, 1989; Goodson & Walker, 1990; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2001): “Individual lives are the unit of analysis in life history work and individual stories are the stuff of narrative analysis” (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 116). Second, life history, to a greater degree than narrative inquiry, emphasizes an inter-textual and inter-contextual mode of analysis (Denzin, 1989; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2001). Regarding inter-textual and inter-contextual mode of analysis, life history begins with

...the life story that the [participant] teacher tells but seeks to build on the information provided. Hence, other people's accounts might be elicited,

documentary evidence and a range of historical data amassed. The concern is to develop a broad inter-textual and inter-contextual mode of analysis. (Goodson, 1992b, p. 243)

Third, life history, to a greater degree than narrative inquiry, emphasizes researchers and participants' lived experience as they intersect with contexts or structures (Denzin, 1989; Goodson & Walker, 1989; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001):

The most important distinction between life history as a method and narrative as a method is the role of context. I think of life history as taking narrative one step further; that is, life history places narrative accounts and interpretations in a broader structures—personal, historical, social, institutional, and/or political. Thus, life history studies go beyond 'the personal.' Related to this, I also see a difference with respect to the broad purposes of life history and narrative research. Narrative focuses on making meaning of individuals' experiences; life history draws on individuals' experiences to make broader contextual meaning. (Cole in Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, 116)

Life history, it follows, develops an inter-textual mode of analysis focusing on intersections of lived experience with historical, social, institutional, and/or political contexts or structures (Denzin, 1989; Goodson & Walker, 1990; Goodson, 1992a, Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Cole & Knowles; Cole & Knowles, 2001).

Issues in life history. Researcher-participant voice, balancing stories and structures, representing participants' experience, and criteria for quality provide issues in

life history research (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995). Regarding researcher-participant voice, life history confronts “issues in the area of authorship, ownership, and voice” (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 119). Specifically, life history researchers confront the following questions:

Who speaks for whom and with what authority? Whose story is it? Who owns the products of the work? Who is the author? What are the purposes of life-history taking? What does the researcher gain from the research? The subject? (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 119)

Most life history resolves this issue by presenting work as collaborative (e.g., Goodson & Walker, 1990; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Nespor & Barber, 1995; Barone, 1995; Atkinson, 1998; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001; and others). However, disruptions of collaborative life history insist that “notions of voice and collaboration need...to be addressed as fictions” (Cary, 1999, p. 421). This critical inquiry draws on Goodson’s (1992b) notion of “trading points” (p. 240) between researcher and participants. Trading points, which posit an ethic of meaningful exchange in the research process, will receive more attention in Chapter Three.

Regarding balancing intersections of lived experience and contexts or structures, life history confronts how, exactly, to situate life histories into social contexts or structures (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995). At issue is

...balancing the story of the individual in all of its uniqueness with the larger social, political, economic contexts which frame it and are, in turn, reinforced or challenged by the individual’s action and responses. How do we place the

individual within her social context and demonstrate the powers and forces that shape her experience and also provide a rich description of her story, her shaping of her world? (Smulyan in Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 120)

While representing lives in contexts or structures provides the focus of life history (Denzin, 1989, Goodson & Walker, 1990; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001), articulating and representing this balance remains un-formulaic, particularistic, and diverse (e.g., Middleton, 1992; Butt et al, 1992; Bloom & Munro, 1995). These particularistic balances of individual and structures reflect and often emerge from un- or semi-elaborated ontological and epistemological assumptions (Cary, 1999). This critical inquiry strives to locate teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with the historical and social structures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference. These emerging structures, whiteness, masculinity, and difference, will be elaborated on in the subsections that follow.

Regarding the representation of participants' experience, life history research confronts the issue of "representing lives in text" (Wisniewski, 1995, p. 120):

At the moment, the major issue pertains to the representation of the data in text. Although this is an issue in all qualitative work, the crisis of representation is writ large when we work solely with life history data. By definition, we are working with one person's life. How we present that life, who is the 'author,' and how subject-researcher get defined are issues that go to the heart of...life history research. (Tierney in Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 120)

In confronting the issue of lived experiences, contexts, and representation, life history increasingly locates itself within literary and aesthetic representation (Denzin, 1989; Blumenfield- Jones, 1995; Emohovich, 1995; Barone, 1995; Zeller, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2001; Knowles & Thomas, 2001; Muchmore, 2001). This identification of life history within literary and aesthetic representations leads to recent understandings of life history as literature that seeks to capture lived experiences (Denzin, 1989; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001). This critical inquiry adopts the stance that life history strives to capture and represent the problematic of teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with historical and social structures (Denzin, 1989; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001).

Regarding criteria for quality, life history's increasing identification with literary and aesthetic representation rejects understandings of internal and external validity, replicability, and objectivity associated with formal science:

Both [life history and narrative] reject orthodox foundational views of validity and reliability; but at the end of the day, we still have to pass judgment. For example, what makes a 'good' narrative or life history? Is just a good story enough? What must be added to story to make it scholarship? What makes for good life history? (Sparkes in Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 120)

In confronting the issue of quality, life history rejects objective truth claims (Denzin, 1989; Emohovich, 1995; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995; Cary, 1999; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001). Instead, life history develops and applies alternative criteria associated with narrative inquiry such as "the criteria of believability" (Bruner,

1986, p. 112), credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Emihovich, 1995; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995), or verisimilitude (Polkinghorne, 1988; Bruner, 1990).ⁱⁱⁱ These criteria strive, in a general sense, to capture participants' lived experiences in ways similar to other forms of aesthetic representation. This critical inquiry applies Bruner's (1986) general "criteria of believability" (p. 112) as its broadest measure of validity. More will follow regarding validity in Chapter Three.

Life History in Education: Teachers' Lives in Context

Applications of life history in education focus on studying teachers' lives in context (Goodson & Walker, 1989; Goodson, 1992a, Goodson, 1992b; Butt et al, 1992; Knowles, 1992; Goodson, 1995; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001). Life history in education 1) articulates teacher thinking and knowledge (e.g., Butt et al, 1992), 2) allows for authentic personal-professional development (e.g., Knowles, 1992; Cole & Knowles, 2000), and 3) provides for analyses of historical, political and social contexts or structures (e.g., Middleton, 1992; Middleton, 1993). This critical inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students draws primarily, though not exclusively, on the last strand of life history.

Influence of Pinar. Pinar's work (1975, 2002a) precedes, provides space for, and maintains a relation to uses of life history in education. Pinar's *carrere* (1975), which posits autobiographical inquiry predicated on European phenomenology and psychoanalysis, emphasizes lived experience in educational institutions as method for understanding curriculum:

Simply stated, *currere* seeks to understand the contribution of academic studies makes to one's understanding of his or her life. The student of educational experience takes as a hypothesis that at any given moment he or she is in a 'biographic situation' [Pinar & Grumet, 1976, p. 51], a structure of meaning that follows from past situations as well as images of possible futures. (Pinar et al, 2002a, p. 521)

Pinar's *currere* initiates a focus on phenomenological inquiry into lived educational experiences that flourishes in a number of directions, especially as feminist and critical strands of phenomenological inquiry in education (Pinar, 2002a).

While life history studies in education share Pinar's focus on lived experience, they diminish subjectivistic phenomenological and individualistic psychoanalytical approaches. Instead, life history studies in education emphasizes "the primacy of biographical understanding over phenomenological understanding..." (Pinar, 2002a, p. 555). Specifically, life history studies in education, whose distinctive yet inter-related strands appear below^{iv}, corresponds to and pronounces the following areas (Pinar, 2002a).

1. Teacher thinking and knowledge. The first distinctive strand of life history in education emerges as a dimension of the practical (Schwab, 1978a, Schwab, 1978b, Schwab, 1978c, Schwab, 1983; Reid, 1984; Reid, 1999; Reid 2001; Davis, 1997) in relation to teacher thinking and knowledge (Doyle & Ponder, 1978; Shulman, 1987; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Butt et al's (1992) "Collaborative Autobiography & the

Teacher's Voice" exemplifies, and therefore, provides a window into this strand of life history in education.

Butt et al's "Collaborative Autobiography..." (1992) begins by describing three inter-related crises in education. First, there exists "a crisis in scholarly inquiry" (Butt et al, 1992, p. 51). This crisis results from an over-reliance on positivist research that neglects "the complex interrelatedness of classroom activities and human interactions ..." (Butt et al, 1992, p. 51). Second, there exists a "crisis of professional knowledge" (Butt et al, 1992, p. 52). Professional knowledge frequently preoccupies itself "with the discovery or invention of sure-fire models which would guarantee generalizable problem solution" (Butt et al, 1992, p. 52). Practitioners, broadly speaking, ignore this professional knowledge because it is inappropriate for their specific classroom concerns. Third, there exists a crisis of reform. Reform frequently is thrust on teachers whose "central role...and pedagogical expertise" (Butt et al, 1992, p. 53) are ignored. This approach to reform fails because it refuses "to ask teachers themselves what classroom change means for them, from their own perspective and criteria" (Butt et al, 1992, p. 53).

As a response to this threefold crisis, Butt et al (1992) argue that teacher thinking, action, and knowledge have "a biographic character" (Butt et al, 1992, p. 56). This argument that teachers' thinking, action, and knowledge have a biographic character lead Butt et al to use life history in approaching teachers' thinking and knowledge:

How teachers, through experience, both in their private lives and in professional contexts, have educated themselves, and have been educated, can be answered through biographical inquiry. It permits us to make sense of individual

experience, to discover the educational significance of a teachers' experiences, and to discover the quality of experience to previous and later experiences (p. 59). According to Butt et al, teacher thinking, action, and knowledge emerge from the interaction of participants' biographies and lived contexts or structures.

Using biographies of Lloyd and Glenda, Butt et al (1992) articulate this interaction of teachers' lives in context. For example, Lloyd, a Japanese-Canadian teacher, develops beliefs, attitudes, and practices that draw on his family's internment during World War II, intense interaction with and interpretation of state curriculum guides, and a staunch Japanese work ethic. Additionally, Glenda, an upper-middle class white teacher of poor and minority students, develops beliefs, attitudes, and practices that draw on cultural experiences from living in Pakistan, syntheses of linguistic- and culturally-based language methods, and working within institutional constraints. Using life history, Butt et al show that teachers' thinking, knowledge, and action emerge experientially over the course of a life time.

2. Authentic personal-professional development. The second distinctive strand of life history in education also emerges from the practical discourse cited above. However, instead of focusing on descriptions of teacher thinking and knowledge, this strand emphasizes life history as a means of authentic personal-professional development (Knowles, 1992; Cole & Knowles, 2000).

Cole & Knowles's *Researching Teaching: Exploring Teacher Development Through Reflexive Inquiry* (2000) exemplifies, and therefore, provides a window into this strand. Cole & Knowles (2000) begin with a critique of prescriptive professional

development based on positivist research. This positivist research holds that “what teachers knew and all that informed practice was observable, measurable, and could be replicated with a degree of certainty” (Cole & Knowles, 2000, p. 6). Personal-professional development from the positivist frame represents “a set of competencies to master and apply, sets of goals to establish and achieve, and a set of prescribed procedures to learn and follow” (Coles & Knowles, 2000, p. 6). In contrast, Cole and Knowles (2000) engage teachers in personal life history and narrative inquiry because they understand “the process of becoming a teacher as an autobiographical project...” (p. 14). Teaching, when understood as an autobiographical project, requires personal-professional development that engages teachers’ life histories and narratives. For example, Cole and Knowles (2000) write:

To teach is to construct an autobiographical account, to develop a living text. The autobiographical nature of teaching is an acknowledgement of the power of lives lived, the primacy of experience, and the potential for on-going self- and other-generated (re)examinations of practice; such re-examinations of professional practice are performed in relation to formal and informal theories about the nature of learning and teaching. (p. 22)

Authentic personal-professional development, argue Cole and Knowles (2000), represents a biographical project, so personal life history and narrative represent an important aspect of personal-professional development in teaching.

Specifically, Cole and Knowles apply personal life history and narrative inquiry as a means of personal-professional development (2000). Personal life history and

narrative inquiry allow for teachers' understandings of their professional lives within contexts or structures. These personal understandings of their professional lives allow teachers to more fully understand how they "respond to, interpret, interact with, and shape the contexts within which...[they] teach" (Cole & Knowles, 2000, p. 87).

Ultimately, the goal of personal life histories and narrative inquiry is the creation of better and more reflexive practitioners. Using personal life history and narrative inquiry, write Cole and Knowles (2000), represents "nothing more than an explication of what inquiring teachers do in the natural course of practice..." (p. 94). Reflexive practitioners, by applying life history and narrative inquiry, engage in Deweyan growth (1997 [1916]; (1997 [1938])).

Experience or practice provides the basis for reflection and analysis, which in turn informs future action. Thus, the assertion that teaching *is* inquiry. Engaging in research on one's own teaching and being reflexive about one's professional practice are one and the same when the inquiry begins and returns to teaching itself. (Cole & Knowles, 2000, p. 94)

Moreover,

...because we assert that on-going professional development is essentially a career-long autobiographical project, understanding teaching must be framed by one's own experiences, perspectives, values, and beliefs. Understandings of students, colleagues, parents, learning contexts, communities, and so on are filtered through our understanding of ourselves. (Cole & Knowles, 2000, p. 94)

Life history and narrative inquiry, for Cole and Knowles (2000), provide methods for reflexive understandings of lived educational experience. Cole and Knowles (2000) represent the distinctive stand of life history in education that applies life history as a means of personal-professional development.

3. Analyses of historical, social, and political contexts or structures. The third distinctive strand of life history in education focuses on analyses of teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with historical, political, and social contexts or structures (Goodson & Walker, 1990; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b, Goodson, 1995; Middleton, 1992; Middleton, 1993). This focus on lived experiences as they intersect with historical, political, and social contexts or structures “embraces stories of action within theories of context. In doing so, stories can be ‘located,’ seen as the social constructions they are, fully articulated by their location within power structures...” (Goodson, 1995, p. 98). Additionally, this focus on lived experiences as they intersect with historical, political, and social structures provides for explorations of

...biographies, historical events, and the constraints imposed on their personal choices by broader power relations, such as those of class, race, and gender. As C.Wright Mills and others have expressed it, ‘biography, history, and social structure become the object of analysis’. (Middleton, 1992, p. 19)

This third strand, maintaining a focus on teachers' lives in context or structures, seeks to articulate the emerging historical, political and social structures as they relate to teachers' lived experiences (Goodson & Walker, 1990; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Middleton, 1992; Middleton, 1993).

Middleton's (1992) "Developing a Radical Pedagogy: Autobiography of a New Zealand Sociologist of Women's Education" exemplifies, and therefore, provides a window into this strand of life history in education. Middleton (1992) provides her life history as it leads up to becoming a radical educator. She discusses class regulation of her youth as she gained the status of socially mobile and talented student who gained access to an elite preparatory school. She analyzes the curriculum content and tracking systems of her preparatory and college experiences as patriarchal and oppressive. She reveals the constant monitoring of girls' sexuality through norms of morality and censorship of promiscuity. She discusses the predominant understanding of the 60s that assumed that educated women necessarily would serve as teachers. Finally, she analyzes the "expert" masculine culture of her preservice and professional development that emphasized behavioral objectives, topic analyses, and measurable outcomes.

At the same time, Middleton (1992) also discusses critical and feminist threads uncovered during her education that allow her to pronounce the world differently. In particular, she discusses the influence of Keith Buchanon, a leftist humanist professor at Wellington University, who introduced her to literatures of Marcuse and Fanon in his lectures. Moreover, she articulates her identification with Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* as an important influence in maintaining autonomy. Interestingly, these educational experiences presented a set of contradictions during Middleton's youth:

I decided that I was a communist.... In the holidays I had loud arguments with my [working class] father and his friends about 'politics.' At the university I was an ignorant, conservative, country bumpkin; in my home-town, I seemed a hippy

radical. I was confused and insecure—marginal in both worlds. (Middleton, 1992, p. 38)

Here, life history allows for the articulation of historically specific lived-experiences as they intersect with historical, political, and social structures in non-reductionist, non-formalistic terms.

Upon beginning student teaching, Middleton (1992) becomes an apprentice to feminist teachers who “...had lived exciting lives. They had traveled, they had had ‘lovers’, they had ‘careers’ and they were single by choice” (p. 39). From these teachers Middleton learns progressive and inclusive pedagogy but then, after being hired at an alternative school, Middleton struggles to enact these pedagogies as issues of violence, student disinterest, and low skills predominate her lived pre-occupations. In Middleton’s (1992) life history, the work articulates social structures that, while dynamic and changing, influenced her lived educational experience: class, gender, morality, patriarchy, feminism, and critical theory. The mix of these structures plays out in highly particular intersections that shed light, simultaneously and contradictorily, on historical, social, and political structures inherent in what is termed “an education.”

Middleton’s “Developing a Radical Pedagogy...” (1992), in articulating her lived experiences within historical, social, and political structures, represents the third distinctive strand of life history in education that seeks to illuminate contexts or structures. This critical inquiry of white male teachers of diverse students draws on, emerges from, and contributes to this third strand of life history in education that seeks to illuminate teachers’ lived experiences as they intersect with historical, political, and

social structures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference. This strand of life history, represented here by Middleton (1992), will receive more attention in Chapter Three.

Approaching Critical Literatures

Before discussing critical literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and difference, it becomes necessary to engage three over-arching concepts assumed and reflected, to differing degrees, in the critical literatures that follow. Specifically, approaching critical literatures requires an unpacking of the critical paradigm, hegemony, and intersectionality. These over-arching terms provide links between the critical literatures, each of which provides a lens for analyzing intersections of whiteness, masculinity, and difference in the lived experiences of white male teachers of diverse students.

Critical paradigm. Critical literatures form, reflect, and emerge from the critical paradigm. The critical paradigm corresponds to yet differs from the constructivist paradigm in several ways (Lincoln, 1996; Lincoln & Guba, 1998; Mertens, 1998; Crotty, 2003). First, the critical paradigm, like the constructivist paradigm, understands realities as constructed and constituted in social practices. However, the critical paradigm, to a greater degree than the constructivist paradigm, emphasizes that realities emerge from “a congeries of social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender factors” (Lincoln & Guba, 1998, p. 207; Lincoln, 1996; Mertens, 1998; Crotty, 2003). Second, the critical paradigm, like the constructivist paradigm, understands realities as emerging from individuals and groups’ practices that articulate, constitute, and maintain social constructions. However, the critical paradigm, to a greater degree than the constructivist paradigm, emphasizes individuals and groups’ practices as situated in historical and

social structures (Lincoln & Guba, 1998; Lincoln, 1996; Mertens, 1998; Crotty, 2003). The critical paradigm, in emphasizing historical and social structures, understands individuals and groups as living in “a series of historical structures that are now inappropriately taken as ‘real,’ that is, natural and immutable... a virtual or historical reality” (Lincoln & Guba, 1998, p. 205). Third, the critical paradigm, like the constructivist paradigm, understands systems of knowing as referencing and constituting versions of reality. However, the critical paradigm, to a greater degree than that constructivist paradigm, emphasizes knowing as a value-mediated, and therefore, embedded in ideologies (Lincoln & Guba, 1998, Lincoln, 1996; Mertens, 1998; Crotty, 2003). The critical paradigm, in emphasizing knowing as value-mediated human activity, emphasizes that knowing “is not a neutral or value free entity...produced in a vacuum absent from political or social ideology” (Lincoln, 1996, p. 88). Finally, the critical paradigm, to a greater degree than the constructivist paradigm, insists that research produce “a more informed consciousness” (Lincoln & Guba, 1998, p. 206) for the researcher, participants, and research consumers. In seeking a more informed consciousness, research in the critical paradigm has “an interest in [human] emancipation” (MacDonald in Lincoln, 1996, p. 88). Literatures discussed in the remainder of this chapter —literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and difference— form, reflect, and emerge from the critical paradigm.

Hegemony. Critical literatures reveal, articulate, engage, and contest hegemony. Hegemony, with its subordinate notion of ideology, represents “a complement to the [Marxist] theory of state-as-force and the contemporary form of the 1848 doctrine of

permanent revolution” (Gramsci, 2000, p. 195). Hegemony presents a critique and expansion of orthodox Marxist thinking. Hegemony, rather than using traditional Marxist understandings of class domination, coercion through force, and economic determinism, identifies the cultural orientations of continued dominance. These cultural orientations of continued dominance include *leadership* of dominant interests, *consent* of the governed, moral-intellectual *discourse*, and historical *alliances* as central for understandings of historical and social domination (Hall, 2004a). Of particular importance regarding hegemony is that these concepts provide a lens for analyzing political practices of individuals and groups in advanced capitalist democracies (Hall, 2004a; Hobsbawm, 1999; Monasta, 1993). For example, in a typical election leadership representing dominant interests generates moral-intellectual discourse that forms an alliance among diverse individuals and groups in gaining the consent of the governed (Gramsci, 2000; Hall, 2004a). Hegemony, in as much as leadership, consent, discourse, and alliances reflect dominant interests, provides for continued historical and social domination.

Additionally, hegemony, in focusing on cultural components, contains the notions of structure and superstructure. While structure refers to particular and historic economic practices that “can be measured with the systems of the exact or physical sciences” (Gramsci, 2000, p. 204), superstructure refers to emerging combinations of cultural, political, and material ideas. These emerging combinations of cultural and material ideas—ideologies—

come into confrontation and conflict, until only one of them, or at least a single combination of them, tends to prevail, to gain the upper hand and propagate itself

bringing about not only a unison economic and political aims, but also intellectual and moral unity, posing all the questions around which the struggle rages....

(Gramsci, 2000, p. 205)

Ideologies represent continually emerging configurations of moral-intellectual discourse that articulate the “coordination of the interests of a dominant group with the general interests of other groups and the life of the state as a whole” (Hall, 2004a, p. 423).

Ideologies, in as much as they coordinate dominant group and general interests, articulate a particular ruling historic bloc or hegemonic center (Julien & Mercer, 1988).

Finally, ideologies play a central role in the formation of individual and collective consciousnesses. Ideologies, in articulating a specific hegemonic center or historic bloc, double for the real world in providing a philosophical shorthand or “common sense” in relation to collective consciousnesses. While this collective common sense provides a cultural backdrop for individual action and interaction, the relationship between ideology and individual, rather than existing as a unitary social determinant of thinking, understands the individual as an historical amalgamation. This understanding of the individual as historical amalgamation sees the individual “as strangely composite...[containing] Stone Age elements and principles of advanced science, prejudices from all phases of history...and intuitions of a future philosophy” (Gramsci in Hall, 2004a, p. 433). Ideologies, while working on individual consciousness, actions, and interactions, represent a collective cultural territory that provides a crucial backdrop “into which individuals are born” (Hall, 1981, p. 32). Ideologies, while they do not control individual consciousnesses, present over-determined understandings and pre-established

structures that individuals and groups intersect with during the course of lived experience. Ideologies, in as much as they reify over-determined understandings and pre-established structures, determine a materiality of ideas that individuals and groups confront on a daily basis.

Intersectionality. Intersectionality provides for flexible critical understandings of individuals and groups' lived experiences in relation to hegemony, especially in recent discussions of hegemony and political practices (Hall, 2004a; West, 1993a; Butler, 1999; Omi & Winant, 1994; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Collins, 2000). Intersectionality emerges as central when engaging in critical analyses emphasizing "historical specificity" (Hall, 2004a, p. 435). Critical analyses emphasizing historical specificity of individual and groups' lived experience allows for understanding...

...the many ways in which capital can preserve, adapt to its fundamental trajectory, harness and exploit these particularistic qualities of labour power, building them into its regimes. The ethnic and racial structuration of the labour force, like its gendered composition, may provide an inhibition to the rationalistically conceived 'global' tendencies of capitalist development. And yet, these distinctions [ethnic, racial, and gendered] have been maintained, and indeed *developed and refined* in the global expansion of the capitalist mode. (Hall, 2004a, p. 436) [Hall's emphasis]

Intersectionality, rather than emphasizing universal structures or similarities across cultures, articulates how hegemony "can function through differentiation and difference" (Hall, 2004a, p. 436). Intersectionality, it follows, provides a framework for critical

analyses that allow for specific and differentiated historical circumstances as experienced by individuals and groups. Intersectionality becomes increasingly important in understanding how hegemony plays out in micro- and historically- specific structures as they intersect with individuals and groups' lived experiences.

In continuation, intersectionality emerges as central in critical analyses that examine multiple hegemonic structures or “regions of hegemony” (Omi & Winnant, 1994, p. 68). Political practices necessarily take place in and among regions of hegemony: race, class, gender, and sexuality. Intersectionality, in approaching these regions of hegemony, sees that “race, class, gender are not fixed and discrete categories” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 68). Intersectionality, in negating fixed and discrete categories, assumes that regions of hegemony

...overlap, intersect, and fuse with each other in countless ways. In many respects race is gendered and gender is racialized. In institutional and everyday life, any clear demarcation of specific forms of oppression is constantly being disrupted [and co-opted]. ...There are no clear boundaries between these regions of hegemony so political conflicts will often involve some or all of these themes simultaneously. (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 68)

Moreover, regions of hegemony are not

...always constituted coherently or consistently in different historical contexts, and ... gender intersects with race, class, ethnicity, sexuality, and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities. As a result, it becomes difficult to

separate out 'gender' from the political and cultural intersections in which it is invariably produced and maintained. (Butler, 1999, p. 6)

Intersectionality, it follows, provides for simultaneous critical analyses along regions of hegemony. Intersectionality, which articulates interacting regions of hegemony, proves central in working with lived experiences of particular groups, like white male teachers, as they intersect locally and specifically with other groups, like groups of diverse students.

Finally, and equally as important as providing for flexible critical analyses along regions of hegemony, intersectionality disposes of a fixed center for analyses and replaces it with shifting intersections of power. Intersectionality, in disposing of this fixed center, articulates that "there is no longer any privileged region of discourse or political action" (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 68) such as class, race, gender, or sexuality that should predominate exclusively over other regions. In recognizing the end of any privileged region of discourse for critical analyses, intersectionality allows for a conceptual frame that diminishes the importance of a fixed center value, frame, or unit. Instead, intersectionality focuses on "complexities within historically constructed groups as well as those characterizing relations among such groups" (Collins, 2000, p. 66). Such a framework, a frame that focuses on intersections between and among groups, "may shed light on the mutually constructing nature of systems of oppression, as well as the social locations created by such mutual constructions" (Collins, 2000, p. 46). Intersectionality, it follows, allows for critical analyses that articulate complex relations among individuals within and across historically constructed groups. Additionally, intersectionality allows

for the specific articulation of structures as they are enacted by individuals and groups in particular situations. Intersectionality, as it allows for specific articulations of lived experiences within structures, further articulates the use of life history methodology in this critical inquiry.

Literatures on Whiteness

Critical literatures on *whiteness* present the first hegemonic structure or region of hegemony articulated in this inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students. Critical literatures on whiteness reveal a relation between whiteness and hegemony, assume the social construction of race and whiteness, and pronounce an invisible privilege before the white gaze.

Whiteness. Even though scholars in the field disagree on definitions of whiteness, most agree:

...that it [whiteness] is intimately involved with issues of power and power differences between white and nonwhite people. Whiteness cannot be separated from hegemony and is profoundly influenced by demographic changes, political realignments, and economic cycles. (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998, p. 4)

The critical inquiry into whiteness, which studies how whites live and experience whiteness, serves as an exploration, interrogation, and complication of the relations between white individuals, groups, and hegemony.

Critical literatures on whiteness articulate the continuing relation between whiteness and hegemony while allowing for variation in the ways whiteness is experienced and lived by individuals. Identifying whiteness as race category requires the

analyses of changing intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality and other differences as they relate to identities that, rather than privileging one marker over the other, sees differences as “mirror images of each other, in the sense that... they feel required to produce a single and exclusive determining principle of articulation” (Hall, 2004a, p. 436). Rather than understanding race, class, gender, sexuality, and other differences in ways that cancel each other out, identifying whiteness as a race category requires an understanding of historical and social intersections that allow for continued dominance by white people. Whiteness pronounces emerging cultural and material ideas — ideologies— that become ascendant in practices of whites but include, to differing degrees, people of color. These ascendant practices of whites relate to many spheres of human interaction including economics, politics, family structure, and education. In becoming ascendant practices, these ideologies provide a common sense shorthand for understanding, simply stated, “the way things are.”

Whiteness has “been enormously, and often terrifyingly, effective in the formation of coalitions that unite people across cultural differences, across class and gender relations, and against their best interests” (Apple, 1998, p. x). While maintaining that whiteness represents “a social, historical, and variable category” (McCarthy and Crichlow, 1993, p.xv), critical literatures on whiteness seek to reveal and complicate the variable yet continuous ties between whiteness, white individuals and groups, and hegemony. Critical literatures on whiteness seek to reveal and complicate whiteness.

Social construction of race. Assumed in revealing the variability and continuity of whiteness is the social construction of race. The work of historians and race theorists

who trace conceptions of race through US history articulates race as social construction. Historians who trace race through different historical periods identify predominant conceptions of race as a series of state-sponsored political projects (Jennings, 1976; Horseman, 1975; Omi & Winant, 1994):

Since the earliest days of colonialism in North America, an identifiable racial order has linked the system of political rule to the racial classification of individuals and groups. The major institutions and social relationships of US society—law, political organization, economic relationships, religion, cultural life, residential patterns, etc.—have been structured from the beginning by the racial order. (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 79)

This racial order, though varied as shown below, continually situates whiteness as dominant in historical configurations. This racial order based on whiteness has drawn strength from religious, scientific, and historical-social frames of understanding (Omi & Winant, 1994).

Colonial understandings of race, as represented in white historical representations of American Indians, emerge from a religious frame that assumes “an innate and absolute superiority over all peoples because of a divine endowment” (Jennings, 1976, p. 5). In successive generations, this position of absolute superiority due to divine endowment becomes secularized as civilization myth. This civilization myth maintains “Christian Caucasians of Europe are not only holy and white but also *civilized* [author’s emphasis], while the pigmented heathens of foreign lands are not only idolatrous and dark but savage” (Jennings, 1975, p. 6). By the Revolutionary Period, the civilization myth of US

leaders maintained that the civilized “could teach the peoples of the world to govern themselves in happiness and prosperity” (Horsman, 1997, p. 142). However, by the 1850s, a doctrine of “scientific racism” (Horsman, 1975, p. 159) provided support for the doctrine of manifest destiny. This doctrine of scientific racism argued that “‘savageness’ stemmed from a conformation of the brain [and] attempts at civilization had little hope” (Horsman, 1975, p. 157). This doctrine of scientific racism, which offered “‘empirical proof’ for a position of white supremacy, dominated US understandings of race until the civil rights movements of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s (Omi & Winant, 1994). These civil rights movements consolidated the previously existing notions of historical and social race formation that is widely accepted today (Omi & Winant, 1994). In the conservative hegemony of the present, racial diversity within diversity, complexities involved in negotiating difference, and the difficulties in forming political coalitions based on race silence racial discussions in mainstream politics (Omi & Winant, 1994). Race, as it moves through religious, scientific, and historical-social understandings toward a silent present, reveals itself as socially constructed category in flux and dependent on political projects (Omi & Winant, 1994).

Additionally, the work of historians concerning “not-yet-white” immigrants articulates whiteness as socially constructed category (Roediger, 1994a; Brodtkin Sacks, 1997; Allison, 1998). Work that focuses on not-yet-white immigrants maintains that “many groups now commonly termed part of the ‘white’ population were historically regarded as nonwhite, or of debatable racial heritage” (Roediger, 1994a, p. 184; Brodtkin Sacks, 1997; Allison, 1998). The not-yet-white immigrant follows the pattern of Scottish,

Irish, Italian, Jewish, Polish, and other immigrant groups that, while considered non-white as early immigrants, “by and large chose whiteness, and even struggled to be recognized as white” (Roediger, 1994a, p. 185). Not-yet-white immigrants, whose race “disappears” through assimilation or acculturation into a hegemonic culture, gain acceptance and belonging as whites when they move into the middle and professional classes, obtain success and privilege, and follow the American Dream (Roediger, 1994). This disappearance of race regarding “not-yet-white” immigrants as they assimilate whiteness begins to explain how whites do “not experience their race as a definitive aspect of their social identity” (Omi & Winant, 1993, p. xiv). Whiteness, when acquired through assimilation or acculturation as success and privilege, provides —ironically— for its diminished importance, and finally, its invisibility before the white gaze. In approaching this disappearance of race among the acculturated, authors seek to *out* whiteness and argue for abolishing (Roediger, 1994b) or committing treason (Ignatiev, 1997) against it.

Invisible privilege before the white gaze. Articulating whiteness in its relation to hegemony makes for a difficult task “partly because white power secures its dominance by seeming not to be anything in particular, but also because it is revealed as emptiness, absence, denial...” (Dyer, 1988, p. 45). To most whites, whiteness represents the normal, natural, and universal assumptions and invisible privileges to which they “remain oblivious” (McIntosh, 1988, p. 1). White privilege “is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances, tools, maps, guides, code books...” (McIntosh, 1988, p. 2) that allow whites to participate in “unearned skin privilege [while

remaining] oblivious about its existence” (McIntosh, 1988, p. 4). Because this invisible white privilege appears normal, natural, and universal, it remains an always present absence perceived by whites as nothing more than the natural state of affairs or simply the way human beings are. Whiteness, it follows, articulates hegemony through doubling for what is natural, normal, and common-sense.

In discussion of race, power, and privilege, whites often articulate hegemony by reifying the invisibility of race and whiteness through strategies of “color-power evasion” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 149). Strategies of color-power evasion re-hash color-blind discourses from the 1950s, 60s, and 70s Civil Rights Movements. This re-hashing of Civil Rights Movement discourses works to “pacify the contradictions between a society structured in dominance and the desire to see society only in terms of universal sameness and individual difference” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 149). Color-power evasion in discussions of whiteness and race manifests itself in clichés such as “‘I don’t care if he’s black, brown, yellow, or green’ [that] camouflage socially significant differences of color in a welter of meaningless ones” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 149). Whiteness, as invisible privilege articulated through strategies of color-power evasion, remains an absent presence to most whites as they go about their lives. This absent presence doubles as a common sense “real world” and supports historically dominant ideologies such as the protestant work ethic and the American Dream of hard work and social mobility.

Inherent in articulating the relation between whiteness and hegemony is “the white gaze” (Hall, 1981, p. 39). The white gaze emphasizes that much of the historical and social discourse on difference emerges from a white hegemonic vantage point,

“always outside the frame —but seeing and positioning everything within it” (Hall, 1981, p. 39). This white gaze, which reaches back to colonial history and forward in popular discussions of “race problems,” represents an

... unmarked position from which ‘observations’ are made and from which, alone, they make sense. This is the history of slavery and conquest, written, seen, drawn and photographed by the Winners. The ‘white eye’ is always outside the frame — but seeing and positioning everything within it. (Hall, 1981, p.39)

The white gaze, as it formulates historical and social discourse, makes racism “so *ubiquitous*, and at the same time, so *unconscious* [Hall’s emphases] —simply assumed to be the case— that it is impossible to get any critical purchase on it” (Hall, 1981, p. 39).

The white gaze, when uncovered as a device for reifying hegemony, provides a starting point in *out-ting* whiteness in order to provide “some headway with grasping whiteness as a culturally constructed category” (Dyer, 1988, p. 45). Uncovering the white gaze works to make visible, articulate, and interrogate whiteness as complicit with present articulations of hegemony.

Whiteness in Educational Institutions

As this critical inquiry looks at white male teachers of diverse students in educational institutions, it becomes necessary to articulate, at an institutional level, how whiteness plays out in these institutions and, at an individual level, how white teachers understand and experience whiteness. Critical literatures on whiteness in educational institutions articulate whiteness as epistemological and normative-hierarchical.

Whiteness as epistemological. West's "The New Cultural Politics of Difference" (1993a) reveals that what historically counts as knowledge emerges from a white male cultural frame. Using a genealogical method, West (1993a) argues that the history of the "humanities" pertains to the Age of Europe (1492-1945) and voices "bourgeois, male, and Eurocentric" (7) viewpoints. Moving through philosophy, history, literature, literary criticism, and critical theory, West reveals the history of "the humanities" as a Euro- and phallogocentric cultural knowledge that works in the historical present as white normative gaze. West also articulates intellectual, existential, and political challenges related to the recent "shattering of male, WASP, cultural homogeneity..." (1993a, p. 14). West (1993a) articulates that humanities knowledge as traditionally understood in our educational institutions emerges from and represents a white male cultural frame.

Scheurich and Young's "Coloring Epistemologies: Are Our Research Epistemologies Racially Biased?" (1997) also provides a discussion of whiteness as it relates to knowledge production. Moving through history, social science, philosophy, and literature, Scheurich and Young (1997) articulate that, in using a number of research epistemologies "...including positivism, postpositivisms, neorealisms, interpretivisms, constructivisms, the critical tradition, and postmodernisms/ poststructuralisms" (p. 132), there exists —implicitly, unconsciously, invisibly— a white civilizational racism inherent in present axiologies, ontologies, and epistemologies. These axiologies, ontologies, and epistemologies that form the bases of what counts as knowledge "become so deeply embedded that they typically are seen as 'natural' or appropriate norms rather than as historically evolved social constructions" (139). By articulating that knowledge

production emerges from a history of white supremacy and silencing of racialized “others,” Scheurich and Young make visible the white bias in knowledge production of educational institutions.

Whiteness as normative-hierarchical. Besides making visible the relation between whiteness and epistemology, critical literatures on whiteness in educational institutions articulate whiteness as normative and hierarchical (West, 1993b; Scheurich, 2002; Rains, 1999).

West’s “The Dilemma of the Black Intellectual” (1993b) articulates this position of whiteness as normative and hierarchical. West argues that black intellectuals in an historically white academy must immerse themselves in and address “the very culture and society which degrade and devalue the black community from whence one comes” (p. 72). In articulating the dilemma of black intellectuals in an historically white academy, West (1993b) argues for the position of black critical organic catalyst. This black organic catalyst recovers influences of “black preachers and musical artists with all their strengths and weaknesses” (p. 84) and engages in political practice of shaping new “collective intellectual work and communal resistance” (1993b, p. 84). West (1993b) reveals that educational institutions like the academy, rather than being value-free, emerge from and articulate a white hierarchy into which black intellectuals must critically assert themselves.

Scheurich’s “Toward a White Discourse on White Racism” (2002) also articulates whiteness in educational institutions as normative and hierarchical. Scheurich argues that white privilege allows whites to “believe that each person is largely the source or origin

of herself or himself ...[and that] individualism is considered a natural facet of life” (Scheurich, 2002, p. 29). This belief that individualism represents a natural facet of life is “deeply infused in white judgments about the way life works” (Scheurich, 2002, p. 29) allowing one’s conditions in life to be seen as “largely due to her or his own individual choices” (Scheurich, 2002, p. 29). Scheurich argues that this belief in individualism held by whites plays a normative role in the academy’s hierarchy:

When people of color contend that we white academics are racist, they are not primarily judging our individual behavior (though certainly they sometimes are); they are, most importantly, judging our membership in a racial group that has produced and maintained skin color as a socially enforced category of difference within a hierarchy of social groups. (Scheurich, 2002, p. 32)

Scheurich (2002) articulates the relationship between beliefs in individualism and whiteness and how these two play out in educational institutions as hierarchy.

Rains’s “Dancing on the Sharp Edge of the Sword: Women of Color in White Academe” (1999) also articulates whiteness in educational institutions as normative and hierarchical. Written from the positionality of a “First American woman” (Rains, 1999, p. 148), Rains uses ethnography to articulate the precarious position occupied by women of color in an “academe that has long been the bastion of White males” (1999, p. 149). In articulating the normative hierarchy of white males in higher educational settings, Rains (1999) uncovers “imposed invisibility...[and]...designated visibility” (p. 153) that “coexisted in the lives of many of the participants in ways that daily tested their perseverance in the academy...” (p. 153). Rains (1999) articulates the contradictions of

an imposed visibility in the academe in which “many women of color...are neither seen nor heard of” (Rains, 1999, p. 153) and a designated visibility in which women of color are “on display...as the spokesperson or token member of ...[an] ethnic group” (p. 159). In institutions dominated by white males and their cultures, Rains (1999) argues that women of color suffer an appropriation of their identity that makes them “invisible when their colleagues have no pressing need to acknowledge their presence” (p. 161) and visible “for the benefits of their white colleagues and the institution itself” (p. 162). Rains (1999) reveals the difficulties women of color have with educational institutions in which whiteness works in relation to norms and hierarchies of success.

From critical literatures on whiteness in educational institutions, it becomes clear that knowledge and its production work along white epistemological assumptions. It also becomes clear that institutional understandings of success work in relation to white male norms and hierarchies.

White teachers and preservice teachers. Critical literatures focusing on white teachers and preservice teachers identifies their relation to whiteness as resistant-evasive and contradictory (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002; Chubbock, 2004).

Sleeter’s (1992) “Resisting Racial Awareness: How Teachers Understand the Social Order from their Racial, Gender, and Social Class Locations” identifies white teachers’ position concerning whiteness as resistant. Sleeter (1992), who uses ethnography as method of investigating participants’ race consciousnesses, describes teachers as “resisting racial awareness” (7). Sleeter (1992), whose work assesses the

effectiveness of staff development interventions regarding race, class, and gender in the classroom, finds in her interviewing and observations that white teachers “tended to minimize or neutralize racism and multicultural education’s implications for action” (1992, p. 28). Many of Sleeter’s (1992) respondents minimized or negated the importance of race by adapting “culturist explanations that blame ‘the culture of poverty’” (p. 22) that did not present “a convincing framework for thinking about racial inequality” (p. 22). Sleeter’s (1992) work shows that teachers who work with children of color, rather than having developed perspectives regarding difference in institutions, uphold institutional norms in resisting discussions of race.

Sleeter, in her subsequent work, uncovers and articulates white teachers’ position concerning whiteness as evasive (1993; 2002). Sleeter’s “How White Teachers Construct Race” (1993) articulates the position that teachers evade discussions of whiteness through emphasizing European ethnicity and denying the salience of race. In interviewing white teachers, Sleeter (1993) found that they professed a color-blind stance regarding American “ethnic groups” that emphasized “individuals should be able to succeed and fail on their own merits...despite the deficiencies of their race” (p. 161). Sleeter (1993) also found that, right behind this liberal color blind position, resided negative perceptions of children of color and their families,

[For children of color]....Just to have a totally helter-skelter house where there is nothing regular and the people who are your parent figures come and go...[And] all of these blacks, they’re coming to school late every day. Well, nobody takes

care of these children, you know, they have to get up and everything like that....
(1993, p. 162)

Sleeter (1993) also found that white teachers taking a color blind position often denied the “salience of race” (p. 161). Rather than emphasizing a continued struggle for racial equality taking place in their classrooms, Sleeter’s participants reported that “most of those kinds of days are gone...I don’t think it’s that way [racist] anymore” (1993, p. 162). In her research on white teachers, Sleeter (2002) argues that whites evade “a discourse on white racism...” (p. 43) because this discourse “challenges the legitimacy of white peoples’ very lives” (2002, p. 43). Sleeter’s (1992; 1993; 1995; 2002) research articulates that white teachers resist and evade discussions of race and whiteness in educational institutions.

McIntyre’s “Exploring Whiteness and Multicultural Education with Prospective Teachers” (2002) supports Sleeter’s findings concerning white teachers as resistant and evasive of whiteness. McIntyre, in analyzing discussions participated in and collages made by white preservice teachers, finds that these teachers articulate whiteness as “fairy tale,” “resistance,” and “denial.” While one pattern that McIntyre uncovers with preservice teachers “denotes whites as living a fairy tale existence” (McIntyre, 2002, p.35), she confirms and extends Sleeter’s findings (1992; 1993; 1995; 2002) concerning white resistance and evasion. White resistance takes the form of dialogue in which preservice teachers contend whether whites “actually are like that [privileged]” (McIntyre, 2002, p. 39). White evasion takes the form of preservice teachers’ belief that racism is “about the past...” (McIntyre, 2002, p. 41) and focusing on racists as “those

white people who intentionally or overtly engage in racist practices” (McIntyre, 2002, p. 39). Regarding white preservice teachers, McIntyre confirms and extends understandings of white teachers’ resistance and evasion of race.

Chubbock’s “Whiteness Enacted, Whiteness Disrupted: The Complexity of Personal Congruence” (2004) works the contradictions of the critical discourse on whiteness and its relation to classroom pedagogy. Chubbock (2004), who uses a case study analysis of two teachers of African American students, discovers that teachers’ stated intentions about interrupting whiteness play out as contradictory. Beth, a secondary English teacher of a majority African American group with “a fairly sophisticated understanding of race and whiteness,” (Chubbock, 2004, p. 316), “maintained low expectations for behavior and academic achievement with her African American students” (Chubbock, 2004, p. 322). In contrast, Joe, another secondary English teacher of a majority-white group of students, took up the conservative discourse that racism represents “misplaced liberal compassion” (Chubbock, 2004, p. 324). Joe, who proclaims that he is “doing crowd control” (Chubbock, 2004, p. 324), maintains “fairly high standards in practice” (Chubbock, 2004, p. 325). Chubbock’s findings (2004) de-emphasize the importance of theoretical positions in serving minority students since teachers’ professed understandings of whiteness did not include a visible practice piece.

From the critical literatures on whiteness in relation to white teachers and preservice teachers, it becomes clear that teachers resist and evade understandings of whiteness and white racism. It also becomes clear that teachers’ understandings of whiteness play out in contradictory ways in the classroom.

Literatures on Masculinity

Critical literatures on *masculinity*, more recently considered *masculinities*, reveal and describe the second hegemonic structure or region of hegemony required in this inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students. Critical literatures on masculinities articulate a hegemonic masculinity, assume the sociological frame of gender as social construction, emphasize the centrality of personal practices, and pronounce a multitude of masculinities, three of which are salient to this study.

Hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity holds that masculinity represents a region of hegemony (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987, Connell, 1995, Connell, 1996; Connell, 2002, Skelton, 1993; Beynon, 2002; Mahony, Hextall, & Menter, 2004). Hegemonic masculinity articulates men's dominance over women. Hegemonic masculinity articulates men's dominance that, rather than spreading evenly over women in a uniform way, emerges unevenly through men and women's lived experiences and collective practices. That is, hegemonic masculinity refuses simple categorical thinking of men's dominance over women (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Connell, 1996; Connell, 2002; Beynon, 2002). Instead, hegemonic masculinity allows for difference within, among, and between gender categories as they intersect with other regions of hegemony. Hegemonic masculinity also allows for differences within gender categories and recognizes that women as well as men appropriate masculinity (and femininity) in relational contexts. Nonetheless, hegemonic masculinity articulates, at a mass level, an emergent relation securing men's instrumental dominance over women. In

advanced capitalist societies, men's instrumental dominance is apparent in four social components:

(a) the hierarchies and work-forces of institutionalized violence – military and paramilitary forces, police, and prison systems; (b) the hierarchy and labor force of heavy industry (for example, steel and oil companies) and the hierarchy of technology industry (computers and aerospace); (c) the planning and control machinery of the central state; and (d) working class milieu that emphasize physical toughness and men's association with machinery. (Connell, 1987, p. 109)

In light of these four components, it becomes clear that, while complex structures of difference emerge within gender relations, a structure of instrumental male domination, nonetheless, remains:

There is an ordering of versions of femininity and masculinity at the level of the whole society...The sheer complexity of relationships involving millions of people guarantees that ethnic differences and generational differences as well as class patterns come into play. But in key respects the organization of gender on the very large scale must be more skeletal and simplified than the relationships in face-to-face milieu...Their interrelation [masculinity to femininity] is centered on a single structural fact, the global dominance of men over women. (Connell, 1987, p. 183)

Hegemonic masculinity, like the relation of whiteness and hegemony, allows for flexible critical analyses of specific contexts and structures while providing a broad understanding of men's domination over women.

Equally important, hegemonic masculinity, as other regions of hegemony, rather than representing coercion of women by men, refers to an “ascendancy achieved within a balance of forces, that is, a state of play” (Connell, 1987, p. 184). Because of this flexibility, hegemonic masculinity discards gender literatures that study “men” or “women” as belonging, categorically, to one gender or the other. Rather than studying men or women, “the cultural ideal (or ideals) of masculinity need not correspond at all closely to the actual personalities [or bodies] of the majority of men” (Connell, 1987, p. 184). Instead, hegemonic masculinity secures and spreads its ascendancy through cultural and material ideas —ideologies— that sustain men’s social position:

The public face of hegemonic masculinity is not necessarily what powerful men are, but what sustains their power and what large numbers of men and women are motivated to support. The notion of ‘hegemony’ generally implies a large measure of consent. Few men are Bogarts or Stallones, many collaborate in sustaining those images. (Connell, 1987, p. 185)

Hegemonic masculinity sustains a maintenance of men’s dominance over women while also managing and including consent in its social and institutional practices (Connell, 1987, Connell, 1995, Connell, 2002; Beynon, 2002).

Social Construction of Gender. Critical literatures on masculinity, as understood in the notion of hegemonic masculinity, assume the social construction of gender (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Connell; 1996; Skelton, 1993; Beynon, 2002; Mahony, Hextall, & Menter, 2004). Literatures on masculinity, rather than understanding gender as inexorably tied to nature or biology, take direction from feminist

scholarship and queer theory in insisting that gender represents a social construction (Stanley, 1984; West & Zimmerman, 1987; Delphy, 1993; Butler, 1999; Jackson & Scott, 2002; Pinar, 2004a). Analyses that detached gender from nature/biology focused on variations of gender over time and through cultures (Stanley, 1984), gender as emphasized social practices (West & Zimmerman, 1991), and gender as sets of discursive and theatrical performances (Delphy, 1993; Butler, 1999). This detachment of gender from biology or nature, as it emerged in feminist scholarship, is summarized below:

The resurgence of feminism in the 1970s changed this state of affairs, challenging the androcentric view of the world which had prevailed for so long. It was central to the feminist project to counter the assumption that existing differences between men and women were ordained by nature [biology]. The concept of gender was adopted to emphasize the social construction of gender masculinity and femininity and the social ordering of relations between women and men. (Jackson & Scott, 2002, p. 1)

This position regarding gender as social construction emerges throughout critical literatures on masculinity:

Masculinity and femininity, as characteristic of men and women, exist only as socio-cultural constructions and not as the property of persons. Indeed, they are no more than a set of assumptions which people hold about each other and themselves. ...the sexed body and the gendered individual should not be chained together since both are socially constructed. (Beynon, 2002, p. 8-9)

Gender, as a social construction, removes masculinity from the realm of nature/biology and places it in the realm of socially constructed and constituted practices.

“The personal is political.” Critical literatures on masculinity, borrowing from insights of feminist scholarship and queer theory (West & Zimmerman, 1987; Scott & Jackson, 2002b; Pinar, 2002b; Pinar, 2004a; Pinar, 2004b; Bryson, 2003), emphasize the personal as a realm of political practices (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995, Connell, 2002; Beynon, 2002). Once gender moves from natural/biological categories to socially constructed and constituted practices, it becomes possible to re-interpret personal or psychological “problems” as political issues (Jackson & Scott, 2002). Because feminist scholarship and queer theory work with gender as socially constructed and constituted practices, gender emerges as

a routine, methodical, and recurring accomplishment. Doing gender is undertaken by women and men whose competence as members of society is hostage to its production. Doing gender involves a complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micro-political activities(West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 125)

For example, given that the personal represents a complex and situated micro-politics, personal “problems” reveal themselves as areas of political engagement. That is, depressed housewives no longer represent an aberrant psychological type, but rather they can be understood as tied to socially constructed and constituted practices of male domination. Similarly, gays living outside the boundaries of traditional family no longer represent a psychological pathology, but rather they can be understood as living outside socially constructed and constituted practices of dominant heterosexuality. Both of these

situations, which previously (and presently) appear as aberrant psychologies, are revealed —through the focus on the personal as political— as spaces of micro-political engagement.

In continuation, critical literatures on masculinity adapt this stance with an emphasis on “personality as practice” (Connell, 1987, p. 219; Connell, 1995; Tolson, 1977; Beynon, 2002). Regarding personality as practice, critical literatures on masculinity sustain that personal life represents, inevitably, an engagement in cultural and material ideas —ideologies—

The real question is not whether politics can be removed from personal life, but what kinds of politics invest personal life and how far can it be democratic or egalitarian. Most important is the political question as to whether personality can be reconstructed ‘from below’. (Connell, 1987, p. 230)

Moreover,

No one is an innocent bystander in the arena of change. We are all engaged in constructing a world of gender relations. How is it made, what strategies different groups pursue, and with what effects, are political questions. ... Yet choices are always made in concrete social circumstances, which limits what can be attempted; and the outcomes are not easily controlled. (Connell, 1995, p. 86)

Critical literatures on masculinity, corresponding to and reflecting feminist scholarship, emphasize masculinity as socially constructed and constituted sets of collective practices.

Masculinities. Critical literatures on masculinity, in addition to providing for hegemonic masculinity, gender as social construction, and the personal as political,

articulate a multitude of masculinities with differing relations to hegemonic masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987, Connell, 1995; Beynon, 2002). Masculinity, as reflected in the critical literatures, “is composed of many masculinities” (Beynon, 2002, p. 1):

...there are numerous forms and expressions of gender, of ‘being masculine’ and ‘being feminine.’ Masculinity is always interpolated by cultural, historical, and geographical locations[,] and in our time the combined influence of feminist and the gay movement has exploded the conception of a uniform masculinity.

(Beynon, 2002, p. 1)

Although a range of masculinities emerge in different research studies and synopses (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995, Connell, 1996; and Beynon, 2002), Connell’s *Masculinities* (1995) provides three masculinities particularly salient to this critical inquiry into white male teachers: 1) instrumental-rational masculinity, 2) feminist masculinity, and 3) protest masculinity.

1. *Instrumental-rational masculinity.* Instrumental-rational masculinity refers to exercising of professional expertise assumed in hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995) . White male teachers’ relationship to instrumental-rational masculinity articulates a point of strain regarding masculinity. White male teachers engage in work that is historically (Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Spring, 2001) and socially (Pinar, 2002b; Pinar, 2004a) constructed as feminine, as the great majority of teachers are women. Yet technical and pragmatic expertise of teaching often takes a masculine language of positivist and cognitivist sciences (Lagemann, 2000) or dialectical knowledges of pedagogy, content knowledge, and routines (Doyle & Ponder, 1977;

Shulman, 1987). Teaching, especially for the white male public classroom teacher, represents an enactment of craft that relates, through a problematic intersection, to instrumental-rational masculinity. For the greater part, teaching represents domestic knowledge separated from understandings of technical expertise (Pinar, 2004a).

2. *Feminist masculinity.* Feminist masculinity refers to men's political practices that have been influenced by feminism (Connell, 1995). Feminist masculinity concerns "a group of men who have attempted to reform their masculinity, in part because of feminist criticism" (Connell, 1995, p. 120). White male teachers of diverse students, whose co-workers are predominantly educated women, encounter, to differing degrees, influences of feminism either through university or workplace exposure. Feminist masculinity also implies engagement in other political projects, such as work in environmentalism (Connell, 1995). White male teachers of diverse students, who often have daily contact with poor and minority students, often identify, to differing degrees, to liberal political activism in their work. Like the question of scientific and practical expertise, white male teachers' masculinities, articulated through a problematic intersection.

3. *Protest masculinity.* Protest masculinity articulates a "hyper-masculinity" associated with working class males (Connell, 1995). Protest masculinity presents patterns of "violence, school resistance, minor crime, heavy drug/alcohol use, occasional manual labor, motorbikes or cars, short term heterosexual liaisons" (Connell, 1995, p. 110). Protest masculinity represents

... a collective practice and not something inside the person. ... [These patterns] appear in the collective practice of working-class, especially ethnic minority street gangs in the United States. There seems to be no standard path into it, apart from the level of tension created by poverty and an ambience of violence. (Connell, 1995)

In relation to white male teachers of diverse students, protest masculinity, to differing degrees, presents a competing masculinity often brought to the fore as male students' critique male teachers' social position when compared with masculinities represented as valid in students' neighborhoods and families.

Masculinities in Educational Institutions and Teachers' Masculinities

Critical inquiry into socially constructed and constituted masculinity presents an opening in educational research, especially in relation to male teachers' masculinities (Connell, 1995; Connell, 1996)^v Critical literatures on masculinity in education, represented primarily by Pinar's inquiry (2002b; 2004b), reveal masculine epistemological assumptions, articulate masculine languages of reform and divisions of labor, and identify normalizing collective practices of masculinity. Critical literatures on male teachers' masculinities represent, by and large, uncharted territory in educational research.

Masculine epistemological assumptions. Pinar's "Understanding Curriculum as Gender Text" (2002b) identifies and critiques masculine epistemological assumptions prevalent in educational institutions. According to Pinar (2002b), the epistemological assumptions regarding what counts for and is valued as knowledge contains masculine

assumptions. In enacting gender analyses of the academic disciplines, Pinar (2002b) argues that research methodologies contain a masculine organization, women's knowledge is trivialized and devalued, and knowledge for and about men is over-generalized as knowledge about "humanity." Moreover, Pinar (2002b) argues that disembodied knowledge emerges from a masculine frame, positivistic objectivity represents a form of masculine domination, and accepted forms of knowledge production serve to silence women's and minorities' voices. In sum,

...the research methodologies of these disciplines were found to prevent certain kinds of information; whole areas of inquiry related to women continued to be overlooked or trivialized; generalizations to both sexes were made based on the study of men only; research itself, while claiming objectivity, was revealed to be value-laden; ...knowledge was revealed as knowledge of men, not of human beings. (Pinar, 2002b, p. 367)

Pinar (2002b) reveals, through a lens of gender analysis, that what counts as knowledge in educational institutions emerges from masculine epistemological assumptions.

Masculine languages of reform and divisions of labor. Additionally, Pinar's "The Primal Scene: 'Mortal Educational Combat'" (2004b) reveals masculine languages of reform and masculine divisions of labor. Historic and current languages of reform represent and constitute a masculine hierarchy. Historically, the languages of educational reform emerge around masculine themes of nation building (Spring, 2001), designing one best system of education (Tyack, 1974), and strengthening and invigorating American youth (Pinar, 2004b). According to Pinar (2004b), the present business model of

accountability emerges from a recent history of masculine reform language. In the 60s and early 70s, this masculine language articulated Cold War, post-Sputnik reforms focusing on physical fitness, math, and science education designed to “‘strengthen’ and make more ‘rigorous’ or ‘muscled’ young [boys]...” (Pinar, 2004b, p. 69). In the late 70s and 80s, this masculine language articulated reforms behind the Reagan administration’s *A Nation at Risk* (1984) along with an emerging “get-tough” discourse on standards and accountability designed to correct “presumably ‘lax’ conditions of American schools” (Pinar, 2004b, p. 69). In the 90s and to the present, a masculine managerialism combining standards, accountability, and teachers’ pay-for-performance represents, not simply a modernizing business agenda, but “in reality, a ‘masculinizing’ agenda” (Mahony, Hextall, & Menter 2004, p. 147). Pinar’s work (2004b) reveals the masculinizing agenda underlying recent mainstream national reform movements.

In continuation, Pinar (2004b) argues that the business model of accountability adheres to masculine models of authority. These masculine models of authority place predominantly male politicians, administrators, and experts at the top and predominantly female practitioners at the bottom (Pinar, 2004b; Mahony, Hextall, & Menter, 2004). This masculine hierarchy in reform language articulates an historical division of labor that enacts and constitutes administrative work and expertise as a masculine domain. This masculine hierarchy also represents, defines, and casts the emotional labor of caring for children as a feminine domain—in other words—“women’s work.” This masculine hierarchy requires predominantly female practitioners to enact and constitute an historically feminine role of “gracious submission” (Pinar, 2004b, p. 71) as curriculum

becomes increasingly manufactured and implemented by state officials and local administrators along with a cadre of positivist or realist area “experts.” The present business model of accountability represents a “gendered assault on public education with a ‘hearty condescension’ toward public school teachers” (Pinar, 2004b, p. 70). This critical inquiry into white male teachers’ masculinities presents a complex intersection in which teachers’ masculinities overlap with what is, historically and presently, enacted and constituted as feminized work.

Normalizing masculine practices. Connell’s (1996) “Teaching the Boys: New Research on Masculinity, and Gender Strategies for Schools” articulates schools as sites of normalizing masculine practices. In relation to educational institutions’ role in normalizing masculine practices, Connell (1996) writes that there “is no mystery about why some schools made masculinities: They were intended to” (p. 214). Historically, educational institutions have

...defined and enforced a suitable masculinity among its boys through rigidly enforced conventional dress, discipline (prefect having the authority to beat younger boys), academic competition and hierarchy (emphasized by constant testing), team games, and gender exaggeration among its staff. (Connell, 1996, p. 215)

Moreover,

The discipline, dress code, and so forth can be considered a set of masculinizing practices governed by the gender regime of the school. Different circumstances produce different formulas. ...[Historically, New World schools] laid more

emphasis on toughness and physical hierarchy among the boys, through masculinizing practices such as initiation, “fagging,” physical punishment, and Spartan living conditions. This agenda was obviously connected with the context of colonial conquest, and the goal of maintaining racial power over colonized peoples. (Connell, 1996, p. 215)

Educational institutions’ play an historical role in producing normalizing collective masculine practices.

This historical role in producing normalizing collective practices continues in the present through three vortices: boys’ subjects, discipline, and sports (Connell, 1996, p. 216). Regarding boys’ subjects, some school subjects, in practice, become male territories. Although institutions make a formal equal offering of subject areas to boys and girls, masculinized patterns emerge:

System wide data on subject enrollment in ...secondary schools show a minority of subjects with marked gender differences in enrollment. They include physics, engineering, and industrial technology, where boys predominate; and home science, textiles and design, where girls do. (Connell, 1996, p. 216)

Subject segregation presents the first vortex in which schools produce normalizing collective masculine practices.

Regarding discipline, discipline systems, both informal and formal, “often... [become] a focus of masculinity formation” (Connell, 1996, p. 217). Regarding informal and formal discipline,

Teachers from infants to secondary levels may use gender as a means of control, for instance, shaming boys by saying they are ‘acting like a girl.’ Punishment, too, is liable to be gendered. When corporal punishment was legal, boys were much more often beaten than girls. Nonviolent punishment still bear down more heavily on boys. For instance, a recent study of suspensions in working class area of Sydney found that 84 percent of the pupils suspended were boys, as were 87 percent of the pupils with repeat suspensions. (Connell, 1996, p. 217)

Moreover, where hegemonic gender regimes are unstable with competing masculinities, male students often display a “protest masculinity” (Connell, 1996, p. 217):

Where hegemony is lacking, a protest masculinity may be constructed through defiance of authority, all too familiar in working class schools. With corporal punishment, defiance requires bravery in the face of pain, a masculinity test of the crudest kind. Even with nonviolent discipline, such as the “punishing room” in the African American school studied by Ferguson, the contest with authority can become a focus of excitement, labeling, and the formation of masculine identities. (Connell, 1996, p. 217)

Both discipline systems and consequent students’ defiance construct a second vortex of normalizing masculine practices.

Regarding sports, organized sports present a vortex of normalizing collective masculine practices. Organized sports, especially “the football ritual,” as reported by Foley (1990), represents a “celebration and reproduction of dominant codes of gender” (Connell, 1996, p. 217). Sports often present

...aggressive and dominating performance as the most admired form of masculinity... The cheerleaders become models of desirability among the girls, and their desirability further defines the hierarchy of masculinities among the boys, since only the most securely positioned boys risk ridicule by asking them for a date. (Connell, 1996, p. 218)

Sports, with the gendered environment of aggressive competition, present a third vortex of normalizing collective masculine practices.

Teachers' masculinities. Critical literatures on teachers' masculinities represents an under-developed area of educational research.^{vi} Critical inquiry into teachers' masculinities, which could serve to inform this inquiry, represent an uncharted territory of educational research. Skelton's "On Becoming a Male Physical Education Teacher: The Informal Culture of Students and the Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity" presents a founding document in the critical inquiry into male teachers' masculinities.

Skelton's (1993) autobiographical narrative, which details the hazing rituals and rites of passage for freshman and underclassmen at "Major PE College," explores the contrasts between the formal physical education curriculum and informal student culture. The formal physical education curriculum purports to value sensitivity, pupil interest and enjoyment, cooperation, and an equalitarian spirit. In contrast, the informal culture of physical education of pre-service teachers, teachers, and university professors ridicules weakness, re-enforces hierarchy and competition, and emphasizes an enactment of male sexism. The relationship between the formal curriculum and the informal curriculum

represents an enactment of “carnival” in which formal authority is ridiculed in specific symbolic practices. Skelton writes:

Far from nurturing an openness to new ideas amongst its students [pre-service teachers at Major PE College], the experience of training to be a male PE teacher at this college encouraged an attachment to a different and oppositional value system, one which emphasized physical prowess, aggression, competition, pride, and sexist attitudes. (Skelton, 1993, p. 299)

Skelton concludes that PE remains a conservative enactment of hegemonic masculinity because of the contrast between the formal curriculum, which represents the public and progressive face of the institution, and the informal culture, which presents an underlying private attitude system condoned by students, faculty, and administration. Key in Skelton’s (1993) narrative is the feminization of progressive academic curriculum such as child-centeredness, cooperative learning, and equality when encountered by local masculinities.

Literatures on Difference

Difference represents the third hegemonic structure or region of hegemony in this inquiry. For the purposes of this critical inquiry, difference in this section refers to differences of race, class, and culture and how these differences play out in educational institutions with diverse students.

Critical literatures on difference pronounce hegemonic center and margins, resistance at the margins, and conservative constructions of the “other” as social pathology. Critical literatures on difference in educational institutions articulate

difference as exclusion-inequality, deficiency-subtraction, disjunction, and absence along with theories of equity pedagogy designed to bridge differences and empower students.

Hegemonic center and margins. Difference, in critical literatures, exists in relation of hegemonic center and margins (Gramsci, 2000; Hall, 2004a; Apple, 1993; Julien & Mercer, 1988). The hegemonic center emerges from a contested flux of “Western European culture and its institutions” (Julien & Mercer, 1988, p. 2). The margins, as they form in relation to hegemonic centers, represent complex areas of difference (Villenas, 1996; Villenas, 2000) that “critical theories are just beginning to reckon with...” (Julien & Mercer, 1988, p. 3). Difference, when understood through hegemonic center and margins, emerges as protracted struggle. Critical literatures on US history articulate difference —differences of race, class, gender, sexuality, and other difference markers— using the struggle metaphor (for overview see Zinn, 2003 [1980]).

Resistance at the margins. In this discussion of hegemonic centers, resistance at the margins takes on importance (Gramsci, 2000; Hall, 2004a; Apple, 1993; Julien & Mercer, 1988). The marginalized, those individuals located at the margins along with those who self-identify there, create cultural spheres of resistance to counter the hegemonic center. Historically, resistance at the margins takes on numerous forms from revolutionary conflict to silent reticence, from guerilla squirmishes to passive resistance, from party propaganda to literacy campaigns, from generational peer groups to counter or alternative cultures. The marginalized refuse a passive role in relation to the center (Julien & Mercer, 1988).

In the period of late capitalism (Gramsci, 2000; Hall, 2004a; Apple, 2000) after World War II, the processes and products of cultural expression take on increasing significance in this discussion (Hall, Clarke, Jefferson, Roberts, 1993 [1975]; Willis, 1993 [1975]; Willis, 1977; Hebdige, 1979). Resistance at the margins, since the post-war period, takes the form of cultural expression resistant to the hegemonic center's ideologies. Regarding the hegemonic center,

the crucial question has to do with which specific ideologies, representing the interests of which specific groups and classes prevail at any given moment, in any given situation. To deal with this question we must first ask how power is distributed in our society. That is, we must ask which groups and classes have how much say in defining, ordering, and classifying the social world. (Hebdige, 1979, p. 14)

Counter or alternative cultures, subcultures opposing the hegemonic center's ideologies, take on importance (Hall, Clarke, Jefferson, Roberts, 1975 [1993]; Willis, 1975; [1993]; Willis, 1977; Hebdige, 1979). Regarding resistance at the margins,

we can now return to the meaning of [counter or alternative] subcultures, for the emergence of such groups has signaled in a spectacular fashion the breakdown of consensus in the post-war period. ...the challenge to hegemony which subcultures represent is not issued directly by them. Rather it is expressed obliquely, in style. (Hebdige, 1979, p. 17)

Alternative and counter subcultures overlap with race, class, gender, sexuality, and other difference markers in contradictory ways —allowing for complex articulation of

resistances. This understanding of resistance through counter or alternative cultural style provides for critical readings of peer groups (Willis, 1977; Foley, 1990), illegal drug use (Willis, 1975 [1993]), and pop culture consumption (Hebdige, 1979) as forms of resistance. Each subculture emerges as historically specific in its resistance (Hebdige, 1979).

Social constructions of “the other.” The hegemonic center, however, also refuses a passive role in defining margins. In the present “conservative restoration” (Apple, 1993, p. 27), the hegemonic center actively diminishes difference in relation to race, class, gender, sexuality, and other difference markers (Hall, 2004a). Instead, the present conservative restoration emphasizes “free” market and economic themes such as “self-interest, competitive individualism, and anti-statism” (Apple, 1993, p. 29). Working alliances of an internationalist neo-liberal elite group with a majority of white upper-, middle- and working-class groups, the hegemonic center pronounces difference in terms of “we” that marks the hegemonic center and “they” that marks difference on the margins. This understanding of difference on the margins pronounces difference through a-historical and “moral” code words:

‘We’ [white majority] are the ‘law-abiding, hard-working, decent, virtuous, and homogeneous.’ The ‘theys’ are very different. They are ‘lazy, immoral, permissive, heterogeneous [Hunter,1987, p. 23].’ These binary oppositions distance most people of color, women, gays, and others from the community of ‘worthy’ individuals. (Apple, 1993, p. 33)

In the present historical moment, the hegemonic center actively re-articulates difference through constructions of the “other” at the margins.

In the conservative restoration, constructions of the “other” serve to describe difference as pathology. Rather than articulating difference in relation to historical domination, constructions of “the other” emphasize demographics, descriptions, behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs in constructing the “other” as “cultural pathology” (Katz, 1989, p. 200). Constructions of the “other” as pathology mystify difference in relation to history, and in doing so, pronounce difference naïvely as deficiency, problem, or disease of “culture and family structure...” (Katz, 1989, p. 200). To illustrate, constructions of the “other” as pathology typically use positivist measures in identifying deficiency in parenting skills, race “problems” in inner-cities, or diseases in the underclass. Rather than conceiving of difference as “question of race, class, gender, and the [historical] bases of power” (Katz, 1989, p. 238), constructions of the “other” as pathology allow discussions of difference to proceed “along a fairly narrow band of possibilities...” (Katz, 1989, p. 239) that remain silent “about the processes of inclusion and exclusion in American life” (Katz, 1989, p. 239). In ignoring or diminishing difference in relation to historical domination, constructions of the “other” pronounce difference as pathology.

Additionally, constructions of the “other” as pathology rearticulate difference as an individual moral choice. Because the culture of capitalism “measures persons, as well as everything else, by their ability to produce wealth and by their success in earning it” (Katz, 1989, p. 8), constructions of the “other” as pathology “lead naturally to the moral condemnation of those, who for whatever reason, fail to contribute....” (Katz, 1989, p. 8).

By emphasizing moral and individual failure while diminishing historical difference, constructions of the “other” as pathology pronounce race, class, gender, sexuality and other differences as “moral...category” (Katz, 1989, p. 201). In pronouncing difference as moral category, constructions of the “other” as pathology focus on individuals’ vices, character, failing work ethic, or immorality as causes of inequality. To illustrate, the popular discourses concerning “welfare mothers” and “crack babies,” which emphasize poverty as gendered moral choice among sexually promiscuous and irresponsible teen-aged girls, exemplifies a construction of the “other” as moral pathology. Simply stated, the “other,” when constructed as pathology, is understood as a moral failure who is unworthy of consideration. According to the logic that constructs the “other” as pathology, “the ‘theys’ are undeserving” (Apple, 1993, p. 33) of any social benefits or assistance because of their lack of morality, which—in an ironic twist—traps “them” in a culture of poverty.

Difference in Educational Institutions

Critical literatures on difference in educational institutions further develop the language of “other” as pathology as played out in educational institutions. Specifically, critical literatures on difference in educational institutions articulate difference as exclusion-inequality, deficiency-subtraction, disjunction, and absence.

Exclusion-inequality. Critical historical and sociological literatures on education in the US document difference as exclusion and inequality (Tyack, 1996 [1974]; Tyack & Cuban; 1995; Spring, 2000; Anderson, 1988; Kozol, 1991). Critical historical literatures document a past of exclusion from educational opportunity and achievement. Because of

differences based on “place of residence, family occupation and income, race, and gender...[many were] excluded, segregated, or given inferior education despite the rhetoric of democracy and equality of educational opportunity” (Tyack & Cuban, 1995, p. 23). While educational opportunity and achievement increased for a majority of white upper-middle, middle, and some working class male children, many girls, immigrant children, children of color, and poor children obtained little educational opportunity and attainment for the greater part of the 20th century. The education these groups received frequently happened in segregated classrooms that served to channel them toward non-academic tracks, marriage, domestic services, manual labor, and vocational programs (Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Tyack, 1996 [1974]; Spring, 2000; Anderson, 1988).

Additionally, the rise of mass “intelligence” testing took on particular importance regarding difference as exclusion. Especially in the case of African Americans, Latinos, immigrants, and poor children, “intelligence” tests articulated difference as “retarded or of low mental level” (Tyack, 1996 [1974]; p. 219; Spring, 2000). Administrators used mass “intelligence” tests un-critically and exclusively “to segregate students by ability, to aid in vocational guidance, to detect unusually able or retarded students, and to diagnose learning ‘problems’” (Tyack, 1996 [1974], p. 208; Spring, 2000). While the Chicago school research department critiqued “intelligence” testing as “corresponding in a startling way to the social levels of the groups named” (Tyack, 1996 [1974], p. 215), for all of the 20th century and through the present schools go on “making discriminations between pupils through testing” (Tyack, 1996, p. 215). This well-documented history of

exclusion from educational opportunity continues to manifest itself in the present as continued inequality (Tyack, 1996 [1974]; Spring, 2000; Anderson, 1988).

Kozol's *Savage Inequalities* (1991) documents how difference plays out as inequality in urban school settings. Kozol, who uses a qualitative-journalistic method in his work, provides descriptions of continued inequalities in inner-city schools in St. Louis, Illinois; Chicago, Illinois; Camden, New Jersey; Washington DC; New York City, New York; and, San Antonio, Texas. In these descriptions, Kozol (1991) presents inner-city schools serving poor and minority children in a state of advanced decay. The inner-city schools that Kozol (1991) describes exist in unsafe and polluted environments, have insufficient light and space for student learning, and lack materials necessary to conduct instruction or field athletic teams. Additionally, they suffer from continuing teacher turnover and administrative disarray, have little academic focus, and contain facilities in disrepair. Kozol's (1991) overall view of these inner-city schools...

was simply the impression that these urban schools were, by and large, extraordinarily unhappy places. With few exceptions they reminded me of 'garrisons' or 'outposts' in a foreign nation. Housing projects, bleak and tall, surrounded perimeter walls lined with barbed wire, often stood adjacent to the schools I visited. ...Their [schools'] doors were guarded. Police sometimes patrolled the halls. (p. 5)

Kozol's descriptions of inner-city schools contrast with middle- and upper-class suburban schools serving predominantly white children. These suburban schools provide "future doctors [with] 18 biology electives...future musicians [with] the use of seven well-

appointed music suites....computer-equipped subject-related study halls” (Kozol, 1991, p. 164). Kozol, who identifies the inequality of educational opportunity for inner-city African American and Latino children, argues that “where there is any struggle [for equality] being waged at all, it is closer to the one that was addressed in 1896 in *Plessy v. Ferguson...*” (1991: 5). Kozol identifies how difference plays out as inequality in US schools.

Deficit-subtraction. Besides articulating difference as exclusion-inequality, critical literatures in education illuminate how difference translates as deficit in educational institutions (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997). This deficit literature also identifies how this translation of difference as deficit serves in the subtraction of students’ cultural resources (Valenzuela, 1999).

Valencia and Solórzano’s “Contemporary Deficit Thinking” (1997) provides a theoretical discussion articulating ways that difference is understood as “deficit” (p. 160) in educational institutions. Rather than interrogating difference as historical exclusion or continued inequality in educational institutions, “deficit thinking” (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997, p. 160) articulates difference as 1) genetically inferior, 2) culturally deprived, or 3) environmentally deficient. Neo-hereditarian views, which focus on measurement and testing of innate “intelligence,” articulate this position of difference as genetic inferiority. Hernstein and Murray’s *The Bell Curve* (1994), which compares “intelligence” across different racial groups as limit on possible social roles in information economies, articulates this logic of difference as genetically inferior and therefore dependent. Cultural deprivation, which “focuses on attitudinal and behavioral

aspects of the underclass that are allegedly at odds with mainstream values and behaviors” (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997, p. 183), articulates difference as deficient cultural background for social participation. ED Hirsch’s *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (1988), which argues for prescribed schemata of Western cultural “knowledge,” exemplifies this logic of cultural deprivation. Environmental deficiency, which argues that “low-income parents of color typically do not value education” (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997, p. 190), articulates difference as deficient family structure. In relation to social work, *Communities in Schools* and other federally funded programs, whose purpose is providing parental support and guidance, articulate this logic of environmental deficiency.

Valenzuela’s *Subtractive Schooling* (1999) articulates how schooling that works from a deficit frame serves to subtract cultural resources from students and communities. Using quantitative data analysis and qualitative descriptions in approaching “the problem” of achievement regarding US-born Mexican youth in an inner-city school in Houston, Texas, Valenzuela (1999) argues that “alleged ‘deficiencies’ of regular-track, US-born youth from a low-income community are themselves symptomatic of the ways that schooling is organized to subtract resources from them” (p. 5). Finding a schooling environment that serves to fracture students’ ethnic and linguistic identities in uncaring educational environments, Valenzuela (1999) argues that schooling, rather than taking advantage of students’ differences, make for a “*subtractive* process [that]...divests these youths of important social and cultural resources, leaving them progressively vulnerable to academic failure” [Valenzuela’s emphasis] (p. 3). This subtractive process crosses

generations, and while it begins with immigrants who maintain cultural resources, the subsequent generations of US-born Mexican youth find themselves divested of cultural resources. In identifying schooling as a subtractive process for immigrant and US-born Mexican youth, Valenzuela (1999) “locates ‘the problem’ of achievement squarely in school-based relationships and organizational structures designed to erase students’ culture” (p. 10). In *Subtractive Schooling* (1999), Valenzuela identifies the processes of cultural subtraction inherent in schooling as the underlying and central cause for US-born Mexican youths’ underachievement.

Disjunction. In addition to articulating difference as exclusion-inequality and deficit-subtraction, critical literatures in education articulate how difference plays out as disjunction between dominant and marginal cultures in schools. Disjunctions between students and schools (Gay, 2000), schools and communities (Nieto, 1999), and students, communities, and administration (Anyon, 1995; Anyon, 1997) provide a context for a continuum of student responses to dominant practices (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998).

Gay’s “Perspectives and Challenges” in *Culturally Responsive Teaching* (2000) provides a theoretical discussion articulating difference as disjunction between students’ culture and school. Gay (2000) identifies culture as a “dynamic system of social values, cognitive codes, behavioral standards, worldviews, and beliefs used to give meaning to our lives as well as the lives of others” (p. 8) that greatly influences “how we teach and learn” (p. 9). Gay reveals that difference as disjunction emerges because school cultural is “primarily of European and middle class origins” (p. 9). These origins become “so deeply ingrained in the structures, ethos, programs, and etiquette of schools that it is

considered... ‘normal’ and ‘right’...” (Gay, 2000, p. 9). In this context in which European and middle class cultures represent what is normal and right, the cultures of schools and students are not “synchronized” (Gay, 2000, p. 13), and these cultural disjunctions “interfere with students’ academic achievement...because how students’ are accustomed to engage in intellectual processing, self-presentation, and task performance is different from the processes used at school” (Gay, 2000, p. 13). In developing an argument for culturally responsive teaching, Gay (2000) articulates how difference plays out as disjunction between the students’ and the school’s culture.

Nieto’s “Culture and Learning” and “Who Does the Accommodating” in *The Light in Their Eyes* (1999) also provides a theoretical discussion articulating difference as disjunction between community and school. Working the same argument as Gay (2000), Nieto (1999) argues that culture provides the center of educational institutions, and this culture contains embedded social, political, and economic assumptions:

In essence, then culture is deeply entangled with economic and political privilege. That is, the tastes, values, languages, and dialects that have the greatest status are associated with the dominant social class *not because these tastes, values, languages, or dialects are inherently better but because they have higher prestige as determined by the group with the greatest power* [Nieto’s emphasis] (p. 54).

Differing only in social emphasis with Gay (2000), Nieto argues “...if we accept Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), the failure to learn represents the failure of the social system...” (p. 16). Since student learning takes place in societal contexts or communities, Nieto (1999) locates student failure at the disjunction between

communities and schools. In developing an argument for multicultural learning communities, Nieto (1999) articulates difference as disjunction between community and school that results in students' failure.

Anyon's (1995; 1997) research emphasizes disjunction of students, community, and schools as it relates to administrative reform in Newark, New Jersey. Anyon's (1995) critical qualitative research substantiates Gay (2000) and Nieto's (1999) general-theoretical discussions of disjunction. Anyon's (1995) research articulates black and white teachers' "deep frustration... [resulting in] systematically abusive behavior towards their students" (p. 91). Anyon's research also articulates children's "oppositional stance to their teachers... [in a] school that is hostile and aggressively rejecting of them" (p. 85). Of particular importance in Anyon's (1995) work are "socio-cultural differences between reformers and parents and teachers, and between reforms and the student population" (p. 68). Anyon (1995) articulates that disjunction resides—not only between students, school, and community cultures—but also in progressive reform processes designed to bring "improvement to schools in America's inner cities" (p. 69). In articulating the failed progressive reform attempts in Newark, New Jersey, Anyon describes (1995) "socio-cultural disjunctions" (p. 68). These socio cultural disjunctions emerge as white suburban staff development specialists' disconnect with inner-city teachers, culturally incongruent textbooks purchased by central office professionals, dysfunctional meetings between parents and reformers, and a resultant "low achievement that has the potential to worsen classroom relations between teachers and students" (Anyon, 1995, p. 80). In arguing for political intervention to alleviate the poverty surrounding inner-city schools,

Anyon (1995; 1997) articulates how progressive reforms can exacerbate relations between students and teachers.

Simultaneously developing and working within the frame of cultural disjunction, John Ogbu's research (for overview/defense of Ogbu's work from 1970-1998, see Ogbu & Simmons, 1998) provides a continuum of minority students' responses to difference in educational institutions. While Ogbu's early work dealt with the broad category of minority students' failure in educational institutions, Ogbu's research since 1980 approaches the question of "why immigrant minorities do well in school while nonimmigrants [minorities] do less well" (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 155). In approaching this question, Ogbu develops the categories of autonomous, voluntary, and caste-like minorities. Autonomous minorities —e.g., Amish, Jews, and Mormons— are usually small in number, and while differing in race, language, ethnicity, or religion, "are not totally dominated and oppressed, and their school performance is no different from the dominant group" (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 161). Voluntary minorities —e.g., immigrants from Africa, Cuba, China, India, Japan, South America, and Mexico— "chose to move to the US society in the hope of a better future" (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 161). In contrast, caste-like minorities —e.g., black Americans, Mexican Americans (Southwest), American Indians, Alaskan Natives— "have been conquered, colonized, or enslaved...[and] made to be part of the US society against their will" (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 162).

The central argument of Ogbu's research (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998) articulates a continuum between voluntary and caste-like minorities. The continuum, which allows for

“differences within voluntary and involuntary categories” (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 162), provides a general framework for understanding differences within difference, especially in relation to the broad category of “minority.” Voluntary minorities, according to Ogbu’s continuum (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998), “have a positive frame of reference” (p. 163) when comparing circumstances to their home country. Voluntary minorities “see more opportunity for success in the US than back home” (p. 163). In relation to school, voluntary minorities believe that they have “more educational opportunity in the United States...” (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 164). These voluntary minorities’ understandings of “making it” focus on “how getting a good education will lead to good employment and success in US society...” (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 164). In subsequent generations, voluntary minorities pass on to their children that school represents a “major route to making it in the United States” (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 164). This end of the continuum emphasizing voluntary minorities’ positive frame of reference contributes in unraveling notions of “model minority” (Lee, 1996) students who selectively assimilate while also critiquing and challenging dominant white culture in educational institutions.

At the other end of Ogbu’s continuum (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998), caste-like minorities contain “a different and negative” (p. 165) frame of reference toward schooling in US culture. This different and negative frame of reference (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998) emerges “because they see their economic and social condition, as well as their schools, as inferior to those of middle class white Americans” (p. 165). In relation to education, caste-like minorities “do not believe they are fully rewarded or accepted for

their education and hard work when they compare their situation to that of their white peers” (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 166). Finally, caste-like minorities “see the school as a white institution” (Ogbu, 1998, p. 167). Because caste-like minorities develop identities in “response to discrimination and racism, these minorities are not anxious to give them up simply because their ‘oppressors’ require them to do so” (p. 167). This end of the continuum emphasizing caste-like minorities’ negative frame of reference contributes in unraveling the continuing “achievement gap” as it relates to some minority students’ resistance to learning and “collective oppositional identities” (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998, p. 171). These oppositional identities make for antagonistic relations between students and teachers, communities and schools.

It is important to note, however, that Ogbu’s research (Ogbu & Simmons, 1998) receives on-going critique in relation to his dual-category continuum (for detailed overview of critiques see Nieto, 1999). First, Ogbu’s categories of voluntary minorities and caste-like are overly deterministic and a-historical. Second, others find the understanding of oppositional identity among black Americans that developed since 1975 at odds with traditional black culture as well as white mainstream culture. And third, Ogbu’s categories oversimplify the relation between successful minorities and dominant white institutions (Nieto, 1999).

Absence. Finally, Pinar’s work (1993; 2004a) articulates difference as “absence” in dominant curriculum discourse. Pinar (1993; 2004a) explores, interrogates, and analyzes dominant curriculum discourse represented by the present Bush administration’s “No Child Left Behind” legislation. According to Pinar (2004a), this dominant

curriculum discourse functions to erase differences and install a classist, racist, misogynist, and heterosexist business model. In reading dominant curriculum discourses emphasizing state sanctioned curriculum, alignment of instruction with testing and student/teacher accountability, Pinar (2004a) asserts that understanding these discourses “cannot be grasped by class analysis alone” (p. 6). In order to grasp dominant discourse’s aspirations to “control of the curriculum...[and its] vicious contempt for teachers and *their* teachers —the educational professoriate,” (p. 6-7) one has to

...invoke models of racial prejudice and misogyny, wherein complex and convoluted psychological structures and processes intensify emotion well beyond rhyme or reason. We must move to the sphere of psychopathology to grasp the history of the present of public education in America. (Pinar, 2004a, p. 6)

Pinar (1993; 2004a) argues that dominant curriculum discourse as represented by No Child Left Behind legislation represents the presence of white male authority re-asserting its dominant position.

Pinar’s “The Primal Scene: Mortal Educational Combat” (2004a) unpacks this position by revealing absences in dominant curriculum discourse. Pinar (2004a) identifies repressed and/or *absent* discourses. In identifying absences in dominant curriculum discourses, Pinar (2004b) emphasizes amnesia concerning African American educational thinking embodied in freedom schools. “Freedom schools” (Pinar, 2004b, p. 80-84) represent an absence in the present business model of accountability. In revisiting the Civil Rights Movement of the 50s and 60s, Pinar (2004b) recalls the “plans developed for a ‘freedom school’ program” (p. 80). Curriculum for the freedom schools, “developed in

March 1964 at a meeting of educators, clergymen, and SNCC workers in New York” (Pinar, 2004b, p. 80), focused specifically on the development of African American intellectual talent. In characterizing freedom schools, Pinar (2004b) writes,

Freedom school teachers tended to ignore traditional classroom routines, employing innovative teaching methods in an effort to encourage the free expression of ideas. ...As part of the leadership training, students discussed the role of the freedom schools and, specifically, the educational importance and political necessity of preserving and advancing African American culture (p. 81).

African American discourse concerning education, which ran into intense resistance and sabotage from the US government (Pinar, 2004a), represents another significant absence in dominant curriculum discourse. Pinar’s contribution, as it relates to presences and absences in dominant educational discourse, reveals how difference plays out in the language of educational institutions and how this language becomes manifest in taken-for-granted understandings of schools.

Difference and Equity Pedagogy

Critical literatures on difference in education also pronounce pedagogical theories and programs for approaching differences and empowering students in educational institutions. Literatures on equity pedagogy focus on reflexivity, synthesis, dialogue, caring, and critical consciousness while providing understandings of pedagogy that aspire to ameliorate, bridge, or transform differences.

Reflexivity. Reflexivity, a direction borrowed from critical theory, anthropology, and especially ethnography (Foley, 2002a; Foley, 2002b; Emerson et al., 1995), emerges

in literatures on equity pedagogy. Reflexivity, in its broadest ethnographic sense, refers to self-awareness, understanding positionalities, co-creation of shared spaces, and awareness of the implications of production and consumption of knowledge as power laden. When introduced into pedagogical literature, “auto-ethnographic reflexivity” (Foley, 2002a, p. 474), which focuses on dialogic knowing and positions the teacher-as-learner, provides an important contribution.

First, being a dialogic knower or witness to a cultural scene positions the ethnographer as a much less imperial authoritative knower. Second, it obligates the researcher to embrace her/his personal indebtedness and responsibility towards other individuals. [And third, it]...valorizes emotion, intuition, and aesthetics...as ground of knowing. (Foley, 2002, p. 475)

Vivian Gussin Paley’s *White Teacher* (2003), which records her changing reflections of difference in co-creating classroom spaces with diverse students, articulates the importance of reflexivity.

Synthesis. Synthesis emerges with continued importance in literatures on equity pedagogy. One level of synthesis focuses on child and curriculum. Rather than putting the children’s cultural experiences and interests to one side and the classroom curriculum to another, synthesis holds that teaching and learning—if they transcend abstract trickery or meaningless memorization—integrate the students’ cultural experiences and interests with classroom curriculum (Dewey, 1990 [1902]; Dewey, 1997 [1916]; Dewey, 1938 [1997]; Greene, 1988; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, 1992). John Dewey’s *The Child and the Curriculum* (Dewey, 1990 [1902])

provides a description of synthesis as it relates to teaching and learning. Taking the cultural experiences and interests of the child as “self-explanatory or self-contained is inevitably to result in indulgence and spoiling” (1990 [1902], p. 193). Subject matter curriculum provides a map that gives “the benefits of the results of others’ explorations without the waste of energy and loss of time involved in wanderings...” (p. 199).

Teaching and learning, it follows, requires the synthesis of child and curriculum.

A second level of synthesis includes the child, curriculum, school, community, and its institutions as deliberative process for teaching and learning (Nieto, 1999; Moll, 1992). This second level of synthesis, which argues for a synthesis of child, curriculum, school, community, and its institutions emerges from the realization that specific changes, for example changes in programs or methods, are “inadequate in transforming conditions that can improve learning” (Nieto, 1999, p. 162). Rather than focusing on specific changes,

...we must also pay attention to relationships among students, teachers, and families; to the identification and connection that students feel with schools and communities; to the cultural and social realities of students’ lives....(Nieto, 1999, p. 162)

Luis Moll’s Funds of Knowledge project (Moll, 1992), which synthesizes children, curriculum, school, and community using anthropological methods, provides an example of synthesis as method of institutional change.

Dialogue. Dialogue, taken primarily from critical and feminist pedagogies (Freire, 1998a [1969]; Freire, 1998b [1970]; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor, 1992; hooks, 1994),

emerges in literatures on equity pedagogy. Dialogue represents a way of knowing that co-creates inter-subjectivity and common understandings that can be leveraged to overcome difference between teacher and students “as a means for the transformation of both” (Freire, 1998b [1970]: 163). Dialogue as a way of knowing hopes that listening, conversing, and living together provides a

...change in students’ experiences of learning, encouraging them to learn more and to develop the intellectual powers to think about transforming society. The power to think critically and act constructively; the power to study in depth, to understand school, society, work, politics, and their lives....(Shor, 1992, p. 111)

Dialogue and its resultant critical thinking, when applied to classroom practice, allows for the on-going teaching and learning as an “additive process” (Cummins, 1986, p. 24).

Through this process of adding one another’s cultural experiences, students critically manipulate differences in academic “codes of power” (Delpit, 1988, p. 296) without losing ties with their communities, and teachers learn a cultural frame of reference that, through an imaginative leap, echoes and supports their students. Ira Shor’s *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life*, which presents his experiments in dialogic teaching at the community college level (1980 [1987]), articulates this position.

Caring. Caring, a direction coming from the second wave of feminism that reclaimed feminized ways of knowing (Noddings, 1984), emerges in literatures on equity pedagogy. Caring represents a way of knowing that co-creates inter-subjectivity and common understandings (Goldstein; 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1992; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1994; Valenzuela, 1999). The caring relationship “involves stepping out of one’s own

personal frame of reference and into another's" (Noddings in Goldstein, 1998, p. 247).

This inter-mingling of frames of reference requires that "the one caring meets the cared for with engrossment...with full attention and with receptivity to his perspective and situation" (Goldstein, 2002, p. 12). This notion of engrossment leads to displacement, which is "when the one-caring is feeling with the cared-for, fully receiving him, his motives—his motives become her motives" (Goldstein, 2002, p. 13).

Caring relationships in the classroom "encourage students to work within a collective structure" (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 60) that focuses on developing a learning community with a family feeling:

Patricia Hillard [a teacher in the study] defines her relationship with the students as that of an extended family. Each year the school year begins with the shaping of an 'undefined contract.'...the students form 'extended family groups' within the classroom and even make up names for the families....(Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 62)

Moreover, teachers who overcome difference through caring develop "relationships beyond the boundaries of the classroom" (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 64) that move toward church, recreation, and home. Lisa S. Goldstein's *Reclaiming Caring in Teaching and Teacher Education* (2002) articulates caring in the new pedagogical terrain.

Critical engagement. Critical engagement, a direction taken from critical theory and pedagogy, emphasizes teaching and learning as critical encounter containing the possibility of collective and social change (Freire, 1998a [1969]; Freire, 1998b [1970]; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor 1992; Nieto, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1994; hooks, 1994).

Teaching and learning as critical engagement, rather than focusing on depositing knowledge in students as assumed in traditional “banking education” (Freire, 1998b [1970], p. 74) assumes “critique is the fundamental characteristic of a democratic mentality” (Freire, 1998a [1969] p. 91). Critical engagement allows, “through transformative action operating over reality, the creation of a different situation, the search for something more...” (Freire, 1998b [1970], p. 38). Teaching and learning as critical engagement “expects students to engage in learning with others, to be curious, to question, and to become problem solvers...[in order to] develop the important critical judgment and decision-making skills they will need to become productive members of a democratic society” (Nieto, 1999, p. 104). Critical engagement assumes that teaching and learning go beyond institutionalized activities. Critical engagement holds that “without the capacity to think critically about ourselves and our lives, none of us would be able to move forward, to change, to grow...” (hooks, 1994, p. 202).

Specific equity pedagogies. Critical literatures on equity pedagogy emerge from and articulate specific examples of inclusive, critical, feminist, and culturally relevant pedagogies. These pedagogies, rather than existing in distinct or competing categories, articulate themselves through differing influences and emphases. As the categories exist for the purpose of description, they work to describe how teachers understand and work difference.

Inclusive pedagogy. Cummins’s “Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention” (1986), influenced by critical understandings of cultural dominance, provides a framework that represents the category of inclusive pedagogy. This framework

begins with the notion of “the *dominant* group that controls the institutions and reward systems in society [and] the *dominated* group [that] is regarded as inherently inferior by the dominant group...” (Cummins, 1986, p. 22). Schools that empower students from culturally dominated groups, use an additive approach in integrating students’ language and culture into the school setting, make for a cooperative environment regarding community participation, and engage in reciprocal and interactive pedagogy. The goal of inclusive pedagogy, as represented in Cummins’s framework, is to empower individuals from culturally dominated groups and include them in the larger society.

Critical Pedagogy. Shor’s (1992) *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*, influenced by inclusive pedagogies, cultural studies, and critical theory, provides a framework that represents the category of critical pedagogy. *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change* engages students from culturally dominated groups “in a critical-democratic pedagogy for social change” (p. 15). This framework for critical pedagogy includes students’ active participation in lesson building, consideration of students’ affective reactions, and critical problem posing as the entry point to teaching content. It also embraces a multicultural approach to difference and a dialogic framework that includes an on-going critique between students and teacher. As a goal, critical pedagogy seeks, not only the empowerment of the student but the transformation of the teacher and students’ historical determinants through dialogue for critical consciousness.

Feminist pedagogy. Hook’s (1994) *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*, influenced by feminisms, cultural studies, critical theory, and

critical pedagogy, provides a framework that represents the broader category of feminist pedagogies. *Teaching to Transgress...*, which weaves personal narratives, philosophical discourse, hooks's classroom experiences, and dialogues with imagined personages and professional colleagues, develops a

...progressive, holistic, 'engaged pedagogy' [that] is more demanding than conventional critical or feminist pedagogy. For unlike these two teaching practices, it emphasizes well-being. That means that teachers must be actively committed to a process of self-actualization that promotes their own well-being if they are to teach in a manner that empowers students. (hooks, 1994, p. 15)

Hooks focuses learning in community, makes for critical dialogue, pronounces a multicultural world, builds intersectional coalitions among groups, and proposes learning as an on-going critical engagement.

Culturally relevant pedagogy. Ladson-Billings's *Dreamkeepers* (1994), influenced by inclusiveness, critical theory, critical pedagogy, feminisms, and cultural studies, provides a framework that represents the broader category of culturally relevant pedagogies. Using ethnography as a method for developing grounded theory, Ladson-Billings develops descriptions of teachers who enact culturally relevant teaching. From Ladson-Billings's profiles of teacher-dreamkeepers, she finds that culturally relevant teaching represents a complex of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors internalized by experienced teachers. The teachers in the study, for example, often live in the communities where they teach and are visible members of that community. Additionally, these teachers hold the teaching profession in high esteem, show self-esteem through

their physical dress, and believe that teaching is an art. Moreover, these teachers believe all children can learn, see students as community members with valuable knowledge, and work to develop relationships with their students. Finally, these teachers see students in classrooms as critical co-constructors of knowledge, ensure that students develop necessary academic skills for continued schooling, and create a standard for excellence in achievement while respecting students' differences. Most interestingly, practitioners of culturally relevant teaching use an eclectic mix of methods tailored to their specific children that range from child- to teacher-centered.

CHAPTER 3

A CRITICAL USE OF LIFE HISTORY

Introduction

This critical inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students, emerging as part of my lived experiences, articulates a critical use of life history. Regarding participants and settings, participants were selected from Central Texas school districts using a purposive snowball sampling technique. Regarding data collection, data were gathered using interviewing, focus groups, researcher journaling, and peer debriefing. Regarding data analysis, analysis identifies, explores, and articulates patterns of participants' lived experiences as they intersect with historical social structures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference. Regarding validity, validity of this critical use of life history adapts “credibility” as evaluative criterion.

Researcher Positionality

As narrated in Chapter One, this critical inquiry emerges from and is informed by my own story as white male teacher and curriculum worker with diverse students over the last fifteen years. This position is further articulated by my role as researcher-participant, as I am the sixth participant in the study. In this critical inquiry, I am investigating and theorizing about my own race, gender, and—to a lesser degree—, social class categories. The choice of investigating and theorizing about my own race, gender, and class represents a self-conscious one, a choice that corresponds with the reflexive turn

(Foley, 2002a; Foley, 2002b) in social science research. This reflexive turn in social science research recognizes that, historically, the relation between researcher and participants represents a colonial one (Said, 1989), especially in research studies in which a privileged researcher investigates marginalized and less powerful participants to “provide voice.” This choice of reflexively inquiring into my own group adds to a growing body of research (McIntosh, 1988; Sleeter, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Valenzuela, 1999; Scheurich, 2002; and others) that seeks equal social relations in which researcher and participants come from and represent the same groups.

Nonetheless, the enactment of equal social relations during the research process remains a complex task. Often, research that strives for equal social relations contains traces of the original colonial relation (Villenas, 1996; Villenas, 2000) as research and scholarly writing represent a worldly activity (Said, 1989; Said, 1993). Research and scholarly writing exist within economies of desire regarding credentialing, career, and tenure, and it remains important for consumers of research to read this desire along with arguments and findings (Britzman, 1997). My work here, reflexively understood, exists as part of a credentialing process, but as Said (1989) holds in his notion of worldliness, research and scholarly writing present worldly activities but should not be dismissed as such. This research, while representing a worldly activity of credentialing, also provides an opportunity to negotiate “trading points” (Goodson, 1992, p. 240) between researcher and participants.

Goodson’s (1995) concept of trading points provides ethical direction in negotiating the relation between researcher and participant:

A good deal of work now emerging on teachers' lives and careers develops insights about structure that help locate the teacher's life within the deep social structure and embedded milieu of schooling. This work and these contexts provide a prime trading point for the external researcher. One of the most valuable aspects of a collaboration between teachers as researchers and externally located researchers is that the collaboration takes place between parties that are differentially located in social structure. In this sense, each of the two collaborators sees the world through a different prism of thought and practice. This difference, far from providing a barrier to collaboration, can be valuable when trading points are sought. (p. 97)

In relation to this critical inquiry, trading points are facilitated because I represent an internal researcher, still located within public school settings.

These trading points provide an opportunity to work collaboratively and reflect sensitively on my life and lives of participants as they intersect with historical and social structures. Although I approach their stories with more cultural capital as represented in my academic training, I can remember and recognize what it was like to perform their work, as I performed and continue to perform it. As a reflexive researcher-participant intending to enact research among equals, I hope to reveal, illuminate, and critique the stories while avoiding re-writing teachers as pathology, which is too often the case in pedagogical and sociological literatures in education. In sum, although this critical inquiry represents a worldly activity, it also allows for my contribution to the literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and difference, a contribution presented by a researcher who

did the same work as the participants for fifteen years. As very few critical researchers in education spent lengthy careers in public school classrooms with diverse students, my positionality presents a unique trading point (Goodson, 1995).

Critical Use of Life History

This inquiry into the lived experience of white male teachers of diverse students develops a critical use of life history. This critical use of life history draws on and further articulates Goodson's (1989; 1992a; 1992b; 1995) study of teachers' lives within contexts. Goodson's (1989, 1992a; 1992b; 1995) methodological discussions of life history in education, which emerge from the constructivist paradigm in articulating teachers' lived experience, move toward the critical use of life history as developed and enacted in this study. Goodson's (1992a; 1992b) "An Emergent Field of Inquiry" and "Problems and Possibilities" articulate the move from a constructivist toward a critical life history. Goodson (1992a) argues, from a constructivist perspective, that the purpose of life history is to understand teachers' lives within contexts:

The crucial focus for life history research is to locate the teacher's own life story alongside a broader contextual study analysis, to tell in Stenhouse's words 'a story of action, within a theory of context'. The distinction between the life story and the life history is therefore absolutely basic. The life story is the 'story we tell about our life'; the life history is a collaborative venture, reviewing a wide range of evidence. The life story teller and another (or others) collaborate in developing this wider account by interviews and discussions and by scrutiny of texts and

contexts. The life history is the life story located within historical and social contexts. (p. 6)

Like Goodson (1992a), this critical inquiry seeks to locate teachers' lived experiences within historical and social contexts.

In continuation, Goodson (1992b) articulates a move toward a critical life history with his notion "genealogy of context" (p. 240). Genealogies of context focus on intersections between teachers' lived experiences and historical, political, and social structures:

Much of the work that is emerging on teachers' lives throws up structural insights which locate the teacher's life within the deeply structured and embedded environment of schooling. (Goodson, 1992b, p. 240)

Moreover,

Teachers, as well as their students, should analyze the relationship between their individual biographies, historical events, and the constraints imposed on their personal choices by broader power structures, such as those of class, race, and gender. (Middleton in Goodson, 1992b, p. 243)

Goodson (1992a; 1992b), although he does not fully articulate a critical perspective (Cary, 1999), pushes life history in the critical direction of revealing emerging structures of race, class, and gender.

This critical use of life history, taking Goodson (1989; 1992a; 1992b; 1995) as a starting point, continues Goodson's move toward critical analyses of emerging historical, political, and social structures. First, this critical inquiry works with teachers' lived

experiences and seeks a contextual and inter-textual mode of analysis developed through intersections of interviews, focus groups, peer de-briefing, and relevant critical literatures along with the researcher's experiences. Second, this critical inquiry seeks to find trading points with participants in articulating de-contextualized life stories into intersectional- and structurally located life histories. And third, this critical study analyzes teachers' lived experiences as they intersect with and are located within emerging structures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference within educational institutions.

In sum, this critical use of life history takes up Goodson's (1992a) challenge to articulate teachers' lived experiences within "theories of context" (p. 6) and Cary's (1999) critique that paradigmatic perspectives in life history are under-articulated. Specifically, this critical use of life history takes up critical literatures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference as historical and social structures that provide for an intersectional analysis of participants' lived experiences. This use of critical literatures in analyzing lived experience adds to a growing body of educational research that examines how participants negotiate or fail to negotiate power structures (e.g., Willis, 1977; Foley, 1990; Valenzuela, 1999; Middleton, 1992; Skelton, 1993; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995). This critical use of life history, by developing theories of context using critical literatures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference, develops a critical use of life history.

Participants and Setting

The researcher initiated a purposive snowball sample of five white male teachers of diverse students. After carrying out the purposive snowball sample of five white male

teachers of diverse students, the researcher interviewed himself for the study as the sixth participant because of his deep identification with participants' stories.

The researcher started the sample by engaging former colleagues from Central Texas schools for participation. The researcher explicitly did *not* include in the sample any colleagues whom he currently supervises in order to ensure voluntary participation and participants' ability to discontinue the study at anytime. Criteria for participants in the snowball sample included 1) working as white male teacher of diverse students, 2) choosing to work with diverse students, and 3) having worked for at least four years with diverse students.

- 1. Working as white male teacher of diverse students.** Besides indicating the participants' race and gender categories, this criterion requires participants to have taught in classrooms that contain a majority of students from diverse backgrounds. For the purposes of this study, diverse backgrounds will mean students from non-white backgrounds. This criterion excludes possible participants who teach *only* in classrooms composed of a majority of white students.
- 2. Choosing to work with diverse students.** This criterion indicates that participants have chosen to work with diverse students. This criterion includes teachers who initially chose to work with diverse students or those who were initially placed in a diverse setting and have since decided to continue in a diverse setting. This criterion excludes possible participants who did not choose, in any way, to work with diverse students. It also excludes possible participants who are *actively* seeking to leave or have left a diverse setting.

3. **Having worked for at least four years with diverse student groups.** This provides a minimum experience measure by including only participants who have continued work through the, often difficult, first years of teaching. This criterion provides a concrete number for accommodation into work routines with diverse students. This criterion excludes possible participants who are just beginning their work with diverse students and whose perspectives are unstable.

These three criteria represented the non-negotiables of this purposive snowball sample (Mertens, 1998). The researcher screened participants from the purposive snowball sample based on these criteria during initial contact phone calls or e-mails. Before the initial interview, the participants signed a consent form. (See Appendix A for the consent form used in this study). After initial interviews that engaged former colleagues, the sample used a snowball technique in which participants collaborated in nominating other possible participants. The snowball sample of participants was rounded out by the researcher's participation as the sixth participant in the inquiry. The researcher was not part of the snowball sample but added himself as a participant after identifying deeply with participants' stories.

All participants from the snowball sample worked in Central Texas schools that contained a majority of students labeled "minority," "low SES," "at risk," or "below grade level." The five participants from the sample were Jake Baynes, Rudy Smith, Gene Johanson, Benet Ferris, and Jack Springman. Names, school districts, and schools of participants from the purposive snowball sample have been replaced with pseudonyms.

The researcher-participant, Jim Jupp, will use his name as participant in the study while providing pseudonyms for the school district and schools at which he worked.

Jake Baynes works at Central Eastside Middle School in Central Texas School District. Starting his teaching career at wilderness camps for “troubled youth,” he has taught in special education settings for the last several years. He currently supervises the Social Behavior Skills Unit and teaches all core subject areas including language arts, social studies, math, and science each day.

Rudy Smith works at South Central Middle School in Central Texas School District. Having taught regular, Pre-AP, and magnet English over his thirteen year tenure at South Central, he currently teaches remedial reading to predominantly immigrant and special education students. He also coaches basketball at South Central and chairs the English Department.

Gene Johanson works at Eastside Middle School in Central Texas School District. Having begun his career teaching resource language arts for special education students, he currently teaches remedial reading to predominantly immigrant and special education students. Gene has been at Eastside for six years.

Benet Ferris works at South Central Middle School in Central Texas School District. He teaches 6th grade language arts in the magnet program at South Central. Additionally, he teaches a number of school-wide electives including semester-long course on philosophy and communications. He also sponsors several afternoon clubs. Benet has spent five of his six years teaching at South Central.

Jack Springman works at South Central Middle School in Central Texas School District. He teaches English I along with media studies electives at South Central Middle School in Central Texas School District. Having taught for six years, he has taught his last five years at South Central.

Jim Jupp, not part of the purposive snowball sample, takes the role of researcher-participant in this inquiry. He is currently Curriculum Coordinator of the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program at Central Eastside Middle School. His teacher biography is included at the opening of Chapter One.

Each of the participants receives a detailed life history profile in Chapter Four.

Data Gathering

Regarding methods for data gathering, interviewing, focus groups, researcher journaling, and peer debriefing provided the methods for gathering data in this study.

Interviews. The researcher engaged five participants in two rounds of interviews followed by member checking. These interviews took place during December of 2005. The researcher included himself as the sixth participant in this critical inquiry after the last interview. For the first five participants, both rounds of interviews followed by member checking were tape recorded for verbatim transcription. In the first round of interviewing, participants told their life histories. The researcher took notes during the interview and engaged the participants in member checking at the end of the first interview. In the second round of interviewing, the researcher followed up on participants' understandings of whiteness, masculinity, and difference using, as closely as possible, the participants' language provided in the first round of interviewing. During

the second round of interviewing, the researcher took notes and member checked with participants immediately following the second round of interviewing. In interviewing himself as the sixth participant, the researcher responded to both rounds of interview questions in written form. (See Appendices B and C for questions used in flexible semi-structured interviews.)

Focus group meeting. The focus group meeting was designed to provide a layer of reflexivity regarding the initial interviews. The focus group engaged four of the six participants in the study. The focus group meeting took place on February 11th at a local coffee house in South Capitol City. The focus group meeting was tape recorded and transcribed in the same way as the interviews. The focus group meeting began with participants' reviewing, revising, and/or expanding on transcripts. After reviewing transcripts with participants, the researcher engaged participants regarding emergent findings. When participants finished reflecting on the findings, the researcher asked participants to share their reflections on the research process. The participants were given the opportunity to comment on, revise, critique, and participate in developing research findings. (See Appendix D for the flexible agenda of the focus group meeting.)

Peer debriefing sessions. Peer debriefing was designed to add another layer of reflexivity. This study used two peer debriefing sessions as a third source of data. The researcher engaged in two peer debriefing sessions with two colleagues of color: one school-based and the other university-based. The peer debriefing session with a school-based colleague took place on December 23rd, 2005. The peer de-briefing session with a university-based colleague took place on January 28th, 2006. The peer debriefing

sessions, in which the researcher reflected on and received collegial feedback from peers of color, represented a third data source. These peer debriefing sessions, like the interviews and focus group meetings, were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim for use in data analysis. (See Appendix E for flexible agenda of peer debriefing meetings.)

Researcher journal. The researcher used a researcher journal as a source of data. The researcher recorded his on-going reflections in the journal. The researcher recorded reflections on the research as he engaged in interviewing, the focus group meeting, peer debriefing, continued professional and personal reading, and any other relevant experiences related to the research process. Writing in the journal took place from December through February during the data gathering process.

Data Analysis and Validity

Data as text. Analysis for this study begins with an understanding that data are text that contains, represents, and expresses traces of lived experience (Reissman, 1993; Denzin, 1989; Cole & Knowles, 2001). In approaching analysis, this critical use of life history strives to “capture, probe, and render understandable problematic experience” (Denzin, 1989, p. 69). Although the relation between experience and data is necessarily problematic in life history methodology (Denzin, 1989; Reissman, 1993; Cole & Knowles, 2001; Cary, 1999), for the purpose of this critical inquiry, data are understood as text containing traces of participants’ lived experiences.

Analysis. Analysis in this critical inquiry follows a recursive and non-linear process that allows for the complexities of lived experiences as they intersect with historical and social structures (Denzin, 1989, Reissman, 1993; Cole & Knowles). This

recursive and non-linear analysis includes 1) holistic coding and categorization of data for emergent patterns, 2) critical literatures for contextualizing and situating data patterns, and 3) underlying researcher positionality. Each of these three components—holistic coding and categorization, critical literatures, and researcher positionality—work dialectically in detecting, exploring, and analyzing patterns of participants’ lived experiences as they intersect with historical and social structures.

Holistic coding and categorization present the first component of data analysis in this critical use of life history (Cole & Knowles, 2001). This coding and categorization necessarily requires “systematic attention to the information gathered” (Cole & Knowles, 2001). However, this coding and categorization must also be carried out with attention to “understand, in a holistic way, the connectedness and interrelatedness of human experience within complex social structures” (Cole & Knowles, 2001, p. 101). Important for holistic understanding of participants’ lived experiences, coding and categorization in this critical use of life history avoids strict and formulaic coding, categorization, and triangulation processes (Cole & Knowles, 2001). Instead, this critical use of life history draws on Cole and Knowles approach (2001) that holds, “...it [data analysis] does not require researchers to devise and strictly adhere to a rigid categorization or analytic scheme” (p. 101). In this critical use of life history, the predominant purpose of coding and categorization is identifying and articulating patterns in participants’ lived experiences as they intersect with structures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference. These patterns of lived experiences often take particular trajectories that need to be honored in data analysis and representation.

Critical literatures provide a second component for the data analysis. Critical literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and difference—all of which extend into discussions of their relevancy in education— provide historical and structural lenses from which to question, explore, and analyze patterns in the data. Corresponding with the purposes of life history, the critical literatures provide theories of context (Goodson, 1992b, Goodson, 1995; Middleton, 1992) for life stories, and thereby, articulate historical, political, and social structures (Mills, 2001 [1959]; Denzin, 1989; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1995; Middleton, 1992) for intersectional analysis of data patterns. In this critical use of life history, literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and difference serve to articulate participants’ patterns of lived experience as they intersect with historical and social structures. Each of these critical literatures provide an historical and structural lens for viewing emergent patterns in data.

The researcher’s positionality as researcher-participant, which provides a motive and ethic for this study, also necessarily provides the third component for data analysis. Regarding interview and focus group interactions, the researcher’s positionality provides a basis for empathic conversations with participants from the same line of work. Given that the researchers’ positionality marks a starting point in these conversations, this critical inquiry assumes that data analysis is embedded at all levels of data generation and coding including interviews, identifying patterns, analysis of critical literatures, and articulating participants’ lived experiences (Cole & Knowles, 2001). This critical use of life history, conceptualized with the researcher’s positionality in mind, assumes that the researcher’s experience underlies data analysis, interpretation, and findings.

Each of these components of the data analysis —the researcher’s positionality, critical literatures, and gathered data— function dialectically in the analysis. Each of the components of the analysis will interact and respond to the other two. The research findings will follow a genealogical pathway assumed in the writings of Goodson (1995) who argues for the articulation of genealogical contexts in the historical, political, and social structures of teachers’ lived experiences.

Validity. This critical use of life history works with notions of validity as credibility (Bruner, 1985; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Emihovich, 1995). This critical use of life history, corresponding generally with assumptions of narrative inquiry, “precludes verification as the basis for [its] ‘reality’ or ‘meaning’” (Bruner, 1985, p. 112). Because it precludes verification for its reality or meaning, this critical use of life history also precludes discussions of quantitative-scientific validity (Bruner, 1985). Regarding validity, this critical use of life history assumes “the criteria of believability” (Brunner, 1986: 112) or *credibility* (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Emihovich, 1995).

Using the criterion of credibility, research validity moves toward discussions of transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Transferability assumes that findings of the research are relevant and transferable to consumers of research in other settings. Dependability refers to the ability of other researchers working in comparable perspectives and using comparable methods to come across similarities and differences in the research conclusions. Confirmability refers to the ability of researchers working from the same epistemological assumptions to revisit evidence and find conclusions reasonable though variable. Emihovich’s (1995) “Distancing Passion:

Narrative in the Social Sciences” articulates the process assumed when credibility is the central measure of validity: “The key for transformation through narrative lies in collaboration, of constantly testing out meanings against those of all others, building consensus around shared meaning, and ensuring as many voices as possible are heard” (p. 45). In short, using the criteria of credibility regarding validity, researchers measure validity through influencing a larger discussion concerning understandings of research and teaching practices.

This study’s use of critical life history, in judging validity, adapts the criterion of credibility with the sub-criteria transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher, in addressing validity, develops a study that 1) engages his life-long struggle and preoccupation, 2) joins white male teachers like himself who work with diverse students, 3) contains member checking during and immediately after two rounds of interviewing, 4) provides focus groups for the researcher and participants to negotiate perspectives and meanings while reflecting on and critiquing the research process, and 5) uses peer de-briefing sessions as a form of shared reflection regarding the research process.

Limits of critical life history. Critical life history, although it allows advantages of analyzing lives within historical and social structures, also presents limits regarding analyses and findings. As life history research provides aesthetic representations of participants’ lived experiences (Denzin, 1989; Blumenfield- Jones, 1995; Emohovich, 1995; Barone, 1995; Zeller, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2001; Knowles & Thomas, 2001; Muchmore, 2001), it is important to bear in mind that subsequent analyses and findings

remain problematic (Denzin, 1989; Reissman, 1993; Cary, 1999), especially in relation to participants' reported classroom pedagogies, which remain unconfirmed in observation. With life history research, it remains important to bear in mind that researchers work with participants' reported lived experiences as they emerge in the interviewing process (Denzin, 1989; Reissman, 1993; Cary, 1999). This focus on participants' reported lived experiences presents a limit on how consumers of research should approach the findings of life history.

CHAPTER 4

ALTERNATIVE LIVES: LIVED INTERSECTIONS WITH WHITENESS, MASCULINITY, AND DIFFERENCE

Introduction

This chapter presents three analytical representations of participants' life histories. Specifically, this chapter elaborates on and develops 1) life history profiles, 2) a collective life history, and 3) an overview of lived intersections. First, the life history profiles present participants' lived experiences individually. Each life history profile is followed by a brief analysis of lived intersections regarding whiteness, masculinity, and difference. Second, a collective life history presents analyses of patterns in participants' lived experiences. This collective life history provides for examining collective patterns in participants' lived experiences as they intersect with whiteness, masculinity, and difference. Third, the overview of lived intersections concisely presents and elaborates on participants' lived intersections with whiteness, masculinity, and difference.

Life History Profiles – Alternative Lives

The participant profiles present the first elaboration of participants' life histories. Although any elaboration on participants' life histories presents a collaborative representation and interpretation (Goodson & Walker, 1990; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles, 2001), the life history profiles present an individual overview of participants' life histories. Life history profiles

provide for emergent patterns of participants' lived experience as they intersect with whiteness, masculinity and difference. Although patterns of lived experiences of white male teachers varied in their contours, an over-arching pattern emerged, to differing degrees, in the life history profiles: alternative lives.

Jake Baynes – It all boils down to helping myself. Jake was born in Dallas, but grew up in Resaca, Texas, a small town north of San Antonio, Texas. The move to Resaca took place before he had conscious memory. As Jake tells it,

My father left when I was three months old, left my mom and I stranded in San Antonio, took her car, drove it back to Dallas, said he didn't want to be a part of the family. So they were soon divorced and he gave away all parental rights.

(Interview#1a, p. 1)

The abandonment of Jake's father would prove an event around which all others would revolve. It became, in retelling of his life, an assumed reference point around which many other events and understandings were organized.

The abandonment of his father when he was three months old relocated him from an urban middle class life in Dallas to a rural working class life in his grandmother's house. His grandmother was a religious conservative who "had a picture of Ronald Reagan up in her bedroom, a framed picture" (Interview#1a, p. 6). Throughout his childhood, his mother, who taught reading for Resaca ISD, worked steadily after she re-married when Jake was ten. Jake described his family as staunch Republicans. Although Jake's family qualified for free lunch, his mother told him, "...That's for the Mexicans" (Jake Baynes, Focus group meeting, p. 10). In relation to Resaca ISD, this school district

was about 50% white and 50% Hispanic. Only two African-Americans attended his school.

Jake recalled his early childhood as “Happy Days” (Interview#1a, p. 1) in rural Central Texas. The sarcasm in this phrase became clear in light of what he recalled growing up. Despite reporting happiness, the realization that other kids grew up with their fathers, the experience of being sexually molested by a relative, and physical altercations with his alcoholic step-father presented themselves as main memories. In the abusive relationship with his step father, Jake’s youth articulated the precarious social and economic circumstances that he found himself in after his mother’s divorce.

In relation to school, Jake told of being “extremely successful” (Interview#1a, p. 2). He was identified as gifted and talented (GT) and participated in a pull out program every Friday where students “worked on logic problems and it was a really fun atmosphere” (Interview#1a, p. 1). This gifted and talented pull out program provided a social center of gravity, and most of his friends came from that group. Regarding success in school, Jake recalled scoring high enough on the PSAT to go to college in eighth grade. He also recalled being selected for a Congressional Leadership Conference and flying to Washington, DC during middle school. This experience, in which he left Resaca, Texas, removed him from his immediate environment. Of this Conference, Jake reported “I was really surprised at how many Caucasian people there were” (Interview#1a, p. 4). This conference in Washington, DC, received as prize for academic “talent,” set the stage for access to advanced academics in high school and college.

In high school, Jake continued this academic and social successes experienced in middle school. He was first chair as a freshman in band. He got voted class clown by his peers. He graduated in the top ten percent, and he received scholarships to several universities. But also during high school, Jake began to develop an oppositional stance toward his family's white Christian conservatism that would re-assert itself more strongly in college. In high school, Jake started drinking and later taking illegal drugs in countering his home environment. Additionally, Jake began what turned into a life long interest in hip hop music and African American culture. Jake summed up this opposition to his family's conservatism with this assertion: "They wanted me to go to A & M [conservative], so I chose Central Texas University [liberal]" (Interview 1a, p. 6).

According to Jake, "...college really opened my eyes" (Interview#1a, p. 10). While studying marketing at Central Texas University, Jake sought exposure to different viewpoints, radical politics, and alternative ideas and life styles. It is during this period that Jake became politically aware. Jake recalled participating in political rallies and protests, including the sit-in calling for the resignation of Professor Graglia, who had commented that African-American and Hispanic students were less likely to succeed in law school. College exposed him to alternative understandings of history and culture as presented in his classes. While Jake sought to change his major from business to education after two years, he did not have the financial resources to re-organize his degree plan, so he graduated as a business major.

Rather than taking the corporate job offers he had as a UT graduate in the 90s, Jake began working at an East Texas Wilderness camp for emotionally disturbed youth.

Jake reports, "...I turned down some pretty lucrative offers from Sears and Bacardi. ...I wanted some time to give back" (Interview#1a, p. 11-12). Jake began work with emotionally disturbed children at a wilderness camp. Suspicious of the label "emotionally disturbed," Jake reported that the students at the camp were almost all minority and a step away from the Texas Youth Corrections. At the wilderness camp, Jake found his vocation for working with emotionally disturbed children. From his own experiences of abandonment, sexual abuse, and physical altercations, Jake reported a connection with abandoned and abused children. Over the next several years working at the camp, Jake received promotions three times until he reached third in command and was routinely on-call for the camp. But besides the satisfaction of reaching kids labeled "emotionally disturbed," Jake found that the interactions with the kids became therapeutic for him, and he reported feeling guilty he was getting paid because of the therapy he received regarding his own circumstances of abandonment, sexual abuse, and physical abuse. Working with emotionally disturbed youth provided Jake with self-therapy and a version of success different from taking the high paying jobs at Sear or Bacardi.

After finding his vocation, Jake has continued to work over the last ten years in a number of similar circumstances, and he currently works at East Downtown Middle School in Capitol City, Texas in the social-behavior skills unit, teaching English, reading, social studies, math, and science. Regarding the meaning he made from his work, Jake responded, "For me it all boils down to helping myself. ...I mean, really – really I'm helping myself" (Interview#1b, p. 13). Jake's self-help understanding of his work spanned across the personal realm into his work and community life.

Lived intersections. Jake’s academic and career successes (West, 1993a; West, 1993b, Scheurich, 2002), reported un-reflexively, provided lived intersections with whiteness. His involvement during middle school with the predominantly white Congressional Leadership Conference in Washington, DC emphasized the relation of his “talent,” advanced academics, and whiteness. Although Jake’s immediate community and friends contained many Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, his school successes (gifted and talented preparation, SAT scores, scholarships) provided him access to predominantly white institutions (West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich, 2002), like Central Texas University. Providing for this access to white institutions in his youth appeared to have been important to his mother and grandmother as they directed him toward GT identification and advanced academics in school.

However, Jake re-shaped the white Christian conservative identity his family sought for him in significant ways. This re-shaping led to illegal drug use and an engagement in hip hop and African American cultures. This reshaping of whiteness led him down the problematic and contradictory path of rejecting privilege (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995), as evinced when he passed over job offers.

Jake’s lived intersection with the working class, including sexual and physical abuse he shared with many of his students, provided for sense-making in rejecting privilege. Having lived through sexual and physical abuse and become successful, Jake experienced, at least in part, what some of the children in his classes experienced. Yet his calling in working with emotionally disturbed children became—in the enactment—a very intense self-salvation narrative in which he re-lived his childhood and his own

possibilities of overcoming poverty and abuse with each child he taught. Far from the typical white rookie teacher who enters the profession as great white hope and later quits, Jake's life chances got confirmed or confounded with every child. In speaking with him recently, he lamented that another African American kid was removed from his class to the Alternative Learning Center.

Rudy Smith – Experience...a type of education. In reporting on his life, Rudy emphasized living outside society, testing boundaries, and ultimately overcoming as central in “learning about myself” (Interview#2a, p. 13). In talking about his college life in restaurant culture, illegal drug scenes, and living on the margins, he reported

I was just kind of learning about myself, I guess, but whether or not I would want somebody else to do that... I don't – because I was sort of maybe deprived of as a – growing up of experiences...I was largely left on my own. ...I hope there's different ways to do that. (Interview#2a, p. 13)

Ironically, the experiences that Rudy reported as crucial to self-making represented ones he hoped others —especially his son— might avoid.

Rudy grew up on the poor Southside of San Antonio, Texas. His father left his mother when he was four, and as he recalled, “...my sister and I, and my mom just kind of survived.” (Interview#2a, p. 2). Of his living conditions, Rudy remembered, his mother's debt, the house as a wreck, and his own anger problems. Rudy also remembered spending much time alone during his childhood due to his mother's long work week, chronic migraines, and exhaustion after getting home from work. Although Rudy's mother and father were both college educated, his mother never finished school. Instead,

she dropped out after three years and helped his father finish. His father was a shop teacher and later a school counselor. Of his father, Rudy recalled him sneaking into the house and stealing items to pawn. He also recalled his mother taking him to court for child support. The large backdrop of Rudy's youth was his mother's divorce and entry into the working class. Rudy's mom, having three years of college, became an office worker who was "determined to get us through school and get us into college" (Interview#2a, p. 2).

Of school, Rudy remembered always being a good student, especially regarding orchestra. For Rudy, school represented a contrast to the loneliness of home. In relation to elementary school, Rudy recalled it as an adventure "because... it was probably the first time in my life where I was surrounded by other kids and I could, you know, play and interact with a whole bunch of kids" (Interview#2a, p. 2-3). Of particular importance to Rudy in middle school was his relationship with Tim Johnston, Director of the San Antonio Youth Orchestra. Of his successes in middle and high school, his excellence in orchestra stood out. Rudy, apart from doing well in academics and test scores, became an extremely talented viola player who made all-city and all-state orchestras three times. The class dimension of orchestra was not lost on Rudy, as he recalls, "It's one of those experiences where you – you step outside your little circle..." (Interview#2a, p. 20). In stepping outside of his circle of involvement, he also successfully crossed social class. As he began to realize he was poor, it gave Rudy satisfaction to play viola better than the rich kids from the Northside. Ultimately, Rudy used his talent in orchestra to get scholarships to Baylor University, Rice University, and Central Texas University. He

took the scholarship offered by Central Texas University because it was the only University that did not require that he study music. He began studying business administration at Central Texas University after graduating from high school.

At the University, Rudy reported starting out as a business major, but after scraping by, he switched majors to English where he was a successful student. But even after switching to English, Rudy reported that he took a year off without withdrawing from the University, and finally, he received a round of Fs in the mail. It was during this period when Rudy began restaurant work, first busing and then waiting on tables. For Rudy, academic experiences did not play a significant role in self-making. In reflecting on Rudy,

I think, in revising my memory of our entire six-year relationship, that he has never really communicated to me a passion for academics. I think school, which he reported he was good at, was just routine learning and didn't count for self-defining experiences. (Researcher journal, p. 35)

Academics, to Rudy, played a secondary role in self-making. As Rudy described it, "I took a circuitous route to my degree" (Interview#1a, p. 2). This circuitous route included dropping out of Central Texas University orchestra, taking up restaurant work, and getting involved in drug culture. During this period, he moved into a house with two other employees from the restaurant. This house became a drug scene for restaurant employees and friends. According to Rudy, his experiences with illegal drugs, which he reported as extensive, allowed for self-identification at the margins. These experiences of

living on his own, gaining friends, and belonging to a drug scene provided for the authentic education that countered his disinterest in educational institutions.

Retrospectively, Rudy recalled this period at the restaurant as a period of personal growth. Rudy recalled drugs as part of a lifestyle experiment that resulted in personal learning. During this time working in the restaurant and participating in the drug scene, Rudy made a living, put himself through school (after losing his scholarship), and gained confidence as member of a social scene. As a waiter, Rudy learned to project his voice, make eye contact, take on a role, and have a personal shtick—all qualities he ended up valuing as a teacher. His experiences waiting tables became especially significant because he learned how to develop and play a role. Playing the role of Mr. Smith became “a powerful thought when it finally – when it finally occurred to me” (Interview#2a, p. 7). Rudy, who was offered a job at the school where he student taught, has remained there for the last thirteen years.

Lived intersections. Rudy’s experiences with orchestra, which allowed him to rise above the poverty of his childhood and gain access to white institutions (West, 1993a; West, 1993b, Scheurich, 2002), articulated a major lived intersection with whiteness. In addition to the class dimension that Rudy perceived in his experiences in orchestra, the cultural content of this lived experience provided an intersection with codified dominant white culture —classical music and other written traditions (Hall, 1981; West, 1993a). Illegal drug use and becoming part of a drug scene in college, which provided the main meaningful experience of college, re-shaped this prescribed role as

bearer of high culture. This re-shaping allowed for Rudy's self-identification at the margins (Hebdige, 1979).

Additionally, in Rudy's case, a lived intersection with masculinity emerged in his life story. Rudy's masculinity countered an instrumental hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995). In the descriptions of drug experiences, a masculine tone of braggadocio emerges that focuses on an experiential masculinity in which Rudy tested himself, engaged in dangerous practices, and sought experience as the coin of the realm. Rudy remembered his drug experiences, as opposed to academic learning, as the significant part of his university experience. An experiential masculinity emerged in Rudy's life story.

Jim Jupp – Border crossings. Jim Jupp spent ten years living in Mexico. First, he lived in Mérida, Yucatán and then in Matamoros, Tamaulipas. While living in Matamoros, the Mexican companion city of Brownville along the US border, Jim “crossed the US-Mexican border almost everyday” (Interview#6a, p. 19) when going to work in Los Arboles, and later, in Borderville. This border crossing became, in the retelling of his life story, a metaphor for what white teachers do.

Jim began his youth in the wake of the Oil Boom of West Houston in the 60s and 70s. In commenting on his middle class youth and education, he stated, “It must be said, that all of this was happening within a totally white center of gravity” (Interivew#6a, p. 7). Although he recalled a sense of permanent outsidersness as a transplant from New Jersey, he remembered having the same experiences as other kids. In talking of his youth, he focused on sports, especially tennis, cross country, and track—all of which he won

competitions at regional levels. This focus on sports ended with a case of chronic tendonitis that landed him in a cast during ninth grade.

Regarding school, most of Jim's recollections were about West Houston High School. During high school, Jim was a good student. He was placed in advanced academics classes in English, Spanish, and history, which would today be called gifted and talented (GT) classes. In West Houston High School, Jim reported that he was on the margin of the group of students who went to MIT, Berkley, Stanford, and other elite universities. This group, according to Jim, took advanced academics classes in all subject areas. In his senior year, Jim received a tuition scholarship to Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas. Although he was a good student in high school, Jim considered school "a grade economy that I learned to manage with little effort except in sciences, and then in my senior year, in math" (Interview#6a, p. 6).

For a brief period in high school, Jim took to fundamentalist religion, which did not last long because of his critical scrutiny of its truth value. At the same time as studying the Bible, he was also studying the lyrics and chord progressions of rock, soul, jazz, and funk records. Jim remembered listening and eventually learning to play a wide range of music from the African American traditions. Jim listened to P-Funk, Muddy Waters, Howlin' Wolf, Mingus, and Bird from the jazz and funk traditions. From the rock traditions, he listened to the Sex Pistols, Ramones, The Rolling Stones, Doors, Richard Hell, Lou Reed, and the Velvet Underground. As Jim recalled, the youth pastors and several religious friends eventually told him he should throw his records into Buffalo

Bayou. At that moment, “the bifurcated Soul appeared and I, mentally, killed off religion in favor of rock music, the greater Love” (Interview#6a, p. 5).

When religion got killed off in favor of music, Jim developed an oppositional stance to mainstream school culture. Illegal drugs, especially marijuana and mushrooms, consolidated this opposition and extended into college. Regarding drugs, Jim commented on his dislike of the Reagan Era “Just Say No” program, which he characterized as “total bullshit” (Focus Group Meeting, p. 1). Drugs, for Jim, took on oppositional meanings that combined with music and lifestyle.

After one year at Trinity on scholarship, Jim transferred to Central Texas University. Jim began working in restaurants, playing music, and taking classes. For sophomore and junior years, Jim kept his grades up while becoming more active in the music scene. During this time, Jim was in the Golden Key and prestigious Junior Fellows Program at Central Texas University, both of which required high grades. As Jim puts it, “I could study..., work, take drugs, play music, and keep my grades up” (Interview#6a, p. 13). At the point of highest involvement in the music scene, Jim dropped out of college for a year while continuing restaurant work and playing in music venues all over the region. A year later, Jim received a form in the mail telling him he only lacked twelve hours to get a degree. With that information in hand, he re-enrolled, talked to an academic counselor, and made a plan to finish up his degree. A year later, Jim had earned his degree in sociology and English, and although he considered teaching at that time, his involvement in the music scene and drugs kept him from taking this professional route.

Jim continued to work in restaurants during this period while looking for a job outside restaurant work. Having little success in finding jobs in Texas during the Oil Bust of the late 80s, he ended up looking for work in Mexico, and more specifically, in Mérida, Yucatán. In Mérida, Jim found work as an English teacher in El Centro de Idiomas del Sureste, and immediately, he left the music scene and cleaned up his drug habit. In these new surroundings, Jim excitedly recalled a period of great learning that included language, culture, literature, social mores, and other facets of society. Being in Mérida changed his perspectives into difference, as he was exposed —through a privileged expatriate frame— “a total view [of] all sectors of society” (Interview#6a, p. 18). During this period, Jim got married, bought a government house in his wife’s name, and began working six shifts a week to sustain a household. Three years later, his wife and unborn daughter died during pregnancy of, according to the doctors’ diagnosis, viral meningitis. Jim’s experience with the Mexican health care system, the Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social (IMSS), radically changed his relativist view toward difference: “After my wife died, I knew, very firmly, that things like modern medical attention meant you didn’t die like she did. ...Relativist thinking about different cultures...was buried *with my wife*” (Interview#6a, p. 22). The death of his wife required him to see, firsthand, how inequalities played out in institutions like hospitals. Later, as a teacher, Jim saw how inequalities played out on a massive scale in schools.

In 1995, Jim, who had since re-married, moved to Matamoros with his second wife. It was during this period, in which Jim crossed the US-Mexican border every day as public school teacher in Los Arboles, and later, Borderville, Texas. Jim began teaching

poor Mexican immigrant and Mexican-American school children. In 2000, after moving to Capitol City, Texas, to pursue a doctorate, Jim took an English position in Central Texas ISD teaching predominantly Mexican immigrant, Mexican-American, and African-American students. In making meaning of his teaching as it related to his life story, Jim turned to the metaphor of crossing cultural borders. In crossing cultural borders, Jim emphasized the importance of learning Spanish to near-native fluency because it forced him to listen closely. Additionally, Jim also emphasized the importance of speaking with messages similar to parents, church members, and other elders in the child's community. Finally, Jim stressed that border crossing included communicating white codes of knowledge to students. Jim's lived experiences, especially in crossing cultural borders, strives to develop a non-imposing pedagogy, but self-consciously realizes that the majority of institutional structures are —perhaps inescapably— white.

Lived intersections. Jim's lived intersections with whiteness (West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich, 2002), which contained white religious fundamentalism, advanced academics, and a scholarship to Trinity University provided an example of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988). Ultimately, Jim's lived intersections with whiteness sought to re-shape white roles, like the role of white religious conservative available to him. This re-shaping of a white roles contained lived intersections into African-American and white counter-cultural musical styles and illegal drugs as form of resistance (Willis, 1993 [1975]; Hebdige, 1979). It appears, in Jim's playing in the music scene, that his rock heroes provided the model for this stylistic re-shapings (Hebdige, 1979) of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988). These first cultural intersections into cultural difference,

however, provided for virtual —almost fantasy— negation of whiteness similar to Roediger's white abolitionism (1994b) or Ignatiev's race treason (1997). His teaching experiences in Mexico and South Texas, which provided an intense continuation of his original desire to re-shape white identity, provided for a self-conscious and reflexive (Foley, 2002a; Foley, 2002b) understanding of difference and privilege . His wife and unborn daughter's death in Mexico provided, once and for all, a lived intersection into difference with irrevocable consequences. This lived intersection of whiteness and difference provided conscientizing (e.g., Freire, 1998a [1969]; Freire, 1998b[1970]; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor, 1992) moment that informed the rest of his lived experiences with difference.

Jim's lived intersections with masculinity provide more data for an experiential masculinity. We see in his rejection of white religious conservatism, re-shaping of white roles, drug abuse, life in Mexico, and teaching of inner-city youth, a masculinity that sought, as a goal, experience with cultural others as a form of testing worth and contribution.

Gene Johanson – Away from the Big Easy. Gene grew up in the Big Easy or New Orleans, Louisiana. Teaching for Gene, instead of representing a life calling, meant getting out:

That was what's weird about New Orleans. Everybody stayed. And it's very hard to get out. If you leave it's easy to come back. I guess that's one of the reasons they call it the Big Easy. (Interview#3a, p. 2)

In his life story, the culture of New Orleans before Katrina lingered in the background, even when not referenced directly. According to Gene, New Orleans represented—for his youth—a culture of “poverty values” (Interview#3a, p. 2). Getting away from the Big Easy, for Gene, represented a major challenge and life success.

Gene, coming from a lower-middle class family, went to private schools because “in New Orleans if you have any money at all you go to private school” (Interview#3a, p. 2). Regarding his family’s social class, Gene remembered that his family did not have any extras but got what they needed. Gene reported that he, as the eldest in his family, was the first who went to college. Gene recalled, in describing his family, that “it’s a step above hand to mouth, but most of the time you have to spend right away what you earn” (Interview#3a, p. 4). Additionally, Gene shared that, in coming from the Deep South, he came from “an extremely racist place” (Interview#1b, p. 3) In characterizing his background, Gene stressed traditional gender roles and lack of social and political consciousnesses. Although Gene knew that his students came from working class backgrounds and predominantly single-parent families, he remarked, “all this stuff [about New Orleans] is... it’s very similar to the poverty level that we have with these kids that we see” (Interview#1a, p. 4).

According to Gene, his background with poverty values helped him understand and relate to his students. However, Gene identified school as an institution with “white middle class values” (Focus group meeting, p. 10), and he questioned its legitimacy in the minds of his students and their families. On the fringes of the middle class, Gene

conceived of overt racism, political discussion, and interest in school as issues dominated by social class.

Growing up, Gene was not a good student. Math and history bored Gene, but he enjoyed reading, drawing, and biology. Teachers encouraged him throughout school — telling him he had talent, but he was disinterested and un-involved in many classes during his time in Catholic school. He reported, however, that he was good at all the liberal arts, and although he did not necessarily enjoy those classes, he “had a real knack for them” (Interview#1a, p. 5). Gene also reported that his cultural background engendered a lackadaisical approach to school work and work in general. Gene recalled doing work, especially school work, with focus on completion. In recalling the tone of his Catholic school experience, he remarked, “I passed, and that’s about all you can say...” (p. Interview#1a, p. 7).

When asked what he remembered about his schooling, Gene focused primarily on college. After graduating from Catholic High in New Orleans, Gene studied graphic design at the University of New Orleans (UNO), the local community college. After two years at UNO, which Gene described as “boring as hell” (Interview#3a, p. 8), he moved to Lafayette, worked part time, and moved into a dorm with some high school friends. In remembering this period at Lafayette, Gene reported that he went on a tear of partying and did not reel himself in for two or three years. It was at this time that Gene started experimenting with illegal drugs. After two semesters at LSU, Gene flunked out, moved back to the Big Easy, re-enrolled at ONU, and finished up his graphic design degree.

Upon finishing his degree, Gene worked for several years in New Orleans as a freelance illustrator. Three years later, Gene moved to San Diego, continued freelance work, and enrolled in Cal Arts part time. According to Gene, life as a freelancer was great, except for the long dry spells without work. In San Diego, Gene remembered working, studying, and getting high between jobs. Even though Gene enjoyed San Diego, the art scene, and meeting artists and musicians, freelance work, with its ups and downs, became un-nerving, so he moved back to the Big Easy, rekindled his contacts, and enjoyed a period of prosperity in the mid 90s as bartender and freelance artist.

After having worked and gained success as a freelancer, Gene started “questing for meaning” (Interview#3a, p. 15). This quest for religious meaning took him back to and beyond his Catholic roots as he began reading Scriptures, with special emphasis on Buddhism, Zen Buddhism, Native American shamanism, and Islam. While questing for meaning, Gene gave up, one by one, drinking, meat, and lastly marijuana. Gene became a practicing vegan as a form of gaining clarity, especially in light of his spiritual practices. During this time, Gene also traveled across the US for more than a year writing songs, reflecting under the stars, earning his money as a ranch hand. After questing for meaning and traveling, Gene returned to the Big Easy one last time, gathered up his things, and moved to Capitol City to locate a girl he had visited in his travels.

Without art contacts in Capitol City, Gene found it difficult to break into the market, so he started substitute teaching. In teaching, Gene found an acceptable creative outlet. Additionally, after his first year substitute teaching, Gene worked on a wagon train “...for incarcerated kids” (Interview#3a, p. 19). While working on the wagon train, he

made connections with the kids, and Gene decided to teach special education. When he started working in Central Texas ISD, he taught resource language arts. Now he teaches in a remedial English language program.

In discussing his work, Gene saw his transition from freelance artist to teacher as an acceptable switch. Although he discussed his work as service to the community, Gene did not talk of his work as an inspiring vocation. Rather, Gene—as he did his school work in his youth—focused on task completion, getting through it, putting it behind him. In his closing remarks, Gene stated, “At least teaching got me out of the Big Easy” (Interview#1a, p. 19).

Lived intersections. Gene’s lived experiences made class and race visible. He saw class and race throughout his life and work. Although Gene reported that he is from the lower-middle class, his proximity to the working class caused him to reflect at length on his intersections with it. In particular, Gene explained what he understood as a working class resistance to academics (Willis, 1977; Foley, 1990; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor, 1992). Presumably, his talent in liberal arts, and graphic arts in particular, allowed him to eek out degrees in high school and the community college. According to Gene, he shared, understood, and comprehended this disinterest on the part of his students, even to the point of questioning the legitimacy of schooling. Gene saw educational institutions as, predominantly, white and middle class (West, 1993b; Scheurich, 2002).

Additionally, Gene reported direct intersections with white supremacist attitudes in his family. To Gene, white supremacy represented an identity he resisted. White racism, rather than being invisible (Dyer, 1988; McIntosh, 1988), presented an overt

identity and required resistance and reshaping. Regarding masculinity, Gene provided data for an experiential masculinity in his questing for meaning, traveling, spiritualism, and drug use.

Benet Ferris – An activist step I’m taking.... Benet’s critical activism, as emphasized in his life story, spilled over into his work in the classroom. Regarding race, Benet reported,

Well, it’s – it [my position] is not colorblind in the sense that I see a certain group of – of children and – and – and those kids happen to be Hispanic and African American and I – and I want to emphasize that they get into the program, so – so in that – in – in that sense I’m – I’m reaching out to – to this segment of – of the population. (Interview#4b, p. 2)

Benet, who developed a critical consciousness in college, reported creating a classroom where he attempted to recreate an activist experience for his students.

Benet’s father was an itinerant worker, so he grew up all over the US. In describing his father’s work, he remarked, that he worked in a number of manual labor jobs. As a result of his father’s status as a laborer, Benet frequently moved around during his childhood. Specifically, he recalled moving from place to place as “a double edged sword” (Interview#4a, p. 2). Although he remembered feeling unstable, he also enjoyed moving around, seeing new places, and meeting people. Benet came from a working class family.

Benet recalled his early schooling as enjoyable. He found enormous pleasure in reading, which led to successes academics. He recalled reading, avidly, *The Hardy Boys*

series, *Tom Sawyer, and Huck Finn*. These adventure novels, which paralleled his moving about and meeting new people, served “as a metaphor for my childhood” (Interview#4a, p. 3). He recalled, during his childhood, playing sports and exploring with his brothers with whom he was “pretty solid, [even] into adulthood” (Interview#4a, p. 3). Benet recalled doing well in all school subjects, especially language arts, history, and geography. While doing well through middle, elementary, and even the beginnings of high school, Benet dropped out in tenth grade.

In describing this period in which he dropped out of high school, Benet recalled that “I wasn’t feeling like that I was getting a whole lot of the high school experience” (Interview#4a, p. 4). After having moved around for many years, he found little connection with the high school where he ended up, and consequently, it was very easy for him to drop out. However, as he became a drop out, he planned to take his talent in reading and writing to community and junior college settings. As Benet reported, “What I wanted to do was to...drop out of high school and start taking college classes, and that’s exactly what I did” (Interview#4a, p. 4). Rather than dropping out into working class jobs as his father and brothers did, Benet accelerated his move toward higher education by getting his GED and taking classes in various junior college settings.

As Benet’s family continued to move around, he took junior college classes in Oregon, California, and Connecticut. After having maintained a high GPA and transferred hours from one institution to the next, he won a scholarship to West Texas University. Regarding West Texas University, he recalled not liking the city too much nor the cowboy culture. Nonetheless, the classes, the professors, and the university

setting was clearly a step up socially and academically. Benet, with his interest in reading and language, found a place in the department of communication studies. It was in this department that Benet received his bachelors, and later, his masters.

During this time, Benet engaged in and developed a critical perspective regarding several issues. This critical perspective included an examination of oppressive governmental structures, an oppositional illegal drug use, critical politics of food production and consumption, vegetarian politics of veganism, and an interest in martial arts and Eastern religion. For Benet, illegal drug use, veganism, martial arts, and spiritualism provide a related complex of alternative beliefs.

Interestingly, Benet's teaching, which is highly personal, contained several manifestations of these alternative components. He developed and taught, over the last five years, a critical unit of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* that required students to examine the social stratification of the school environment. Additionally, he developed and taught a philosophy course that discussed, in its ethics component, a unit on vegetarianism. Moreover, he conducted kung-fu classes after school that he used to develop student and parent relationships. All of this took place within an activist magnet program that, according to Benet, focused on serving poor and minority students.

Lived Intersections. Benet's lived experiences reveal an interaction with and reshaping of whiteness. Certainly, his early experiences at school, in which he found a white canon of childhood adventures, articulated a successful interaction within school's implicitly white cultural frame (Scheurich, 2002; West, 1993a; West, 1993b). This successful interaction in his early experiences provided him with cultural capital that he

later used to negotiate access to community and junior college settings, and later, gain a full scholarship. Benet, from a working class background, provided a story of access to white institutions, in his case West Texas University. Once at West Texas University, Benet developed and shared critical perspectives with a key professor and several other students. This critical perspective, which was present in his teaching and interaction with students, made for a re-shaping of white identity in the search alternative life styles (Willis, 1993 [1995]; Hebdige, 1979) and experiences such as veganism, eastern religion, and activist teaching became important.

This critical perspective, which Benet sought to reproduce in his students, remained outside any conscious examination in the telling of his story (Scheurich & Young, 1997; Scheurich, 2002). Benet, in the telling of his story, did not articulate class or race assumptions implicit in unpacking “the critical” (Scheurich, 1997; Scheurich, 2002).

Jack Springman – Not completely beholden. When talking about teaching as his chosen profession, Jack Springman reported that he continued teaching because it provided a living without being completely beholden to corporate structures:

So I decided to follow this path [of the alternative] down to its logical conclusion, wherever that leads me. And it led to teaching children, diverse groups of children. And talking about the issue of this job, I really value it because it’s a way to sustain a living without being completely beholden to other forces or powers...like corporate conglomerates. (Interview#5b, p. 14)

Teaching, to Jack, provided an alternative life style that allowed him a degree of independence from the corporate world.

Jack grew up in a middle class household in conservative Orange County, California. His father was a corporate lawyer whose main account was State Farm Insurance, and his mother was a nurse at a Los Angeles hospital. Regarding his class background, Jack reported, he “never really struggled for money..., but at the same time, it wasn’t like we can have, I could have, anything I want” (Interview#5a, p. 1). Regarding conservative Orange County, Jack recalled growing up as “very difficult” (Interview#5a, p. 2) because of the pressures of conformity. Jack recalled, if you strayed from the norm, you were “basically...shunned” (Interview#5a, p. 2). The pressures of conformity to norms appeared through out Jack’s interview as he described his experiences as being “forced into” advanced academics, extracurricular activities, and sports.

The racial component of Jack’s middle class life emerged in his story. In characterizing his lived experiences at school, Jack recalled, “I think there was one African-American in my high school...like one” (Interview#5a, p. 4). Jack, in discussing the racial component of his parents’ background, characterized his parents’ conservative Christianity as “white-centric” (Interview#5a, p. 18). White-centric, to Jack, meant a cultural orientation that placed white culture at the top from which everything “trickles down” (Interview#5b, p. 1) Jack, in the telling of his life story, articulated how the middle class intersected with race.

In describing his schooling, Jack reported being a successful student. In elementary school, Jack’s teachers recommended him for the gifted and talented (GT)

program. As a part of this GT program, Jack participated in a pull out curriculum that took him and other GT students off campus to receive instruction in special projects once a month. Additionally, in correspondence with this GT placement, Jack studied in advanced sections of language arts, social studies, and foreign language. Jack's success in GT and advanced academics settings laid the groundwork for and extended into his undergraduate degree in English at University of California San Diego and his masters in film studies at Boston University.

During his high school years, Jack also began what turned into a life long-interest in what he broadly referred to as "the alternative" (Interview#5b, p. 15). The alternative, to Jack, referred to "having alternative expectations...alternative to the norm." In further elaborating on the alternative, Jack returned to his parents (white, middle class, Christian, conservative) expectations which focused on established professions as the only form of success. This seeking out of the alternative represented a breach with his family, and in particular, with his mother who accepted his choice "only when she was dying in the hospital" (Interivew#5b, p. 15). The alternative, as it appeared in Jack's life story, made for divisive family politics.

The 90s, for Jack, represented an important time for alternative culture due to the rise of independent music and cinema. In particular, Seattle and Capitol City emerged as cultural centers for alternative music and cinema. Jack spent most of the 90s studying literature, film criticism, and film production, and after graduating with a masters degree, he worked freelance production gigs and other related media jobs in LA and San Diego. Regarding his time spent working there, he remembered not making enough money to get

by. He ultimately gave up his aspirations to work in film when he left LA for Capitol City. Teaching represented an escape route after having failed as a movie producer but also an opportunity to continue an alternative lifestyle.

Jack found his experiences in counter or alternative cultures as important in relation to his teaching. Jack explained that he believed himself more accepting of different viewpoints because of experiences with the alternative. Jack's experience with alternative cultures provided him with the ability to accept students' different from himself. Jack also explained in his interview that, as a result of his experiences in counter or alternative cultures, he provided multiple perspectives in his classroom including feminist, multicultural, and gay perspectives. Jack's experiences with the alternative provided him with multiple viewpoints and an attitude of tolerance. Jack reported having taught from these different viewpoints in order to engage kids. Most importantly, Jack reported that teaching provided with "a way to sustain a living without being completely beholden to other forces or power, like the corporate conglomerates" (Interview#5b, p. 15).

Lived intersections. Jack's lived intersections with whiteness emerge from his middle class family background. Living in a virtually all white suburb and coming from a school with one African-American, Jack's GT identification, advanced academics placements, and subsequent entrance into college represented an almost standard white middle class set of cultural practices (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998) and shrouds his life in white privilege (McIntosh, 1988). "The alternative," as Jack refers to it, represented an oppositional (Hebdige, 1979) re-shaping of the identity that his white, conservative,

Christian parents took as given. Jack identified his background as white-centric. Because most of his experiences in counter or alternative cultural practices took place as cultural consumption (Hebdige, 1979) or as a university forum, his recountings of the alternative provided, for the most part, virtual forays into difference.

Teaching diverse students represented for Jack initial interactions with difference. Yet, as Jack reported it, his experiences in the alternative provided him with a background for understanding of difference in the realm of lived experiences. Additionally, Jack's experiences in the alternative provided him with different viewpoints and a consciousness of a white-centric world (Hall, 1981; Dyer, 1988; McIntosh, 1988; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Scheurich, 2002). In this way, the alternative, though it provided a virtual foray into difference, made for a reflexive (Foley, 2002a; Foley 2002b) understanding, an understanding that more than a white viewpoint existed. This reflexivity provided for tolerance for different learners. Jack's emphasis on the alternative provided a fortuitous pedagogical starting point in approaching difference in his classroom.

Emerging lived intersections. In the life history profiles, participants' patterns of lived experience begin to emerge in relation to whiteness, masculinity, and difference. First, the participant profiles showed multiple relations to whiteness as mediated through social class. These multiple relations to whiteness, an emerging pattern of whitenesses as lived experiences, presented a conspicuous absence in discussions of whiteness (West, 1993a; West, 1993b) and white privilege (McIntosh, 1988; Scheurich, 2002). Four of the participants recounted coming from a working class background, and two of the

participants recounted coming from families headed by single mothers. Second, the participant profiles articulate a re-shaping of received white identities also missing in discussions of whiteness (McIntosh, 1988; Scheurich, 2002) and white teachers (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002). This re-shaping of whiteness, to differing degrees, pronounced the broad theme of alternative lives.

Reshaping of white identities emerged around themes of illegal drugs often accompanied by virtual forays into difference through experiences counter or alternative cultures along with critical university curriculum. These virtual and lived forays into difference preceded and, to a lesser extent, prepared participants for work with diverse students.

Third, an experiential masculinity—inseparable from this re-shaping of white identities in its enactment—contrasted to hegemonic masculinity with its instrumental orientation (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995). This experiential masculinity provided a second expression of alternative lives. This experiential masculinity, present in differing to degrees for participants, countered instrumental hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995). This re-shaping of whiteness, combining with experiential masculinity, made for and provided counter or alternative identities. These emerging intersections receive more attention, elaboration, and development in the following sections.

Collective Life History

This “collective life history” (Middleton, 1993, p. 81) develops a shared life history. This collective life history explores patterns in participants’ lived experiences as they intersect with historical and social structures. Specifically, this section develops and elaborates on an over-arching account of growing up, going to college, and working as a

teacher. Developing this overarching account provides for examining collective patterns—similarities and differences—in participants’ lived experiences as they intersect with whiteness, masculinity, and difference. As in participants’ profiles, counter or alternative identities emerge as dominant theme.

Growing up White Pt.1: Social class, school successes, and re-shaping whiteness. Social class emerged as central in participants’ lived experiences. Four of the participants, Jake, Rudy, Gene, and Benet recalled coming from working or lower middle class backgrounds. These class backgrounds made for lived intersections with whiteness significantly different from those described in accounts of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988). Jake recalled moving in with his grandmother during the Reagan Era “...I just kind of thought it was sickening being poor” (Focus Group Meeting, p. 1). Rudy recalled “We were poor...but we didn’t know it” (Interview#2a, p. 2). Gene reported his family came from “a history of want, a history of not having much” (Interview#3a, p. 1). Benet recounted “my dad did a number of jobs in the – in... [manual] labor” (Interview, Interview#4a, p. 2).

Different family circumstances emerged in interviews with Jake, Rudy, Gene, and Benet. Jake and Rudy recounted childhoods thrust into the working class after divorce. Jake recounted his father stealing his mother’s car, leaving him and his mother stranded in San Antonio, and ceding all parental rights. These circumstances presented conditions in which Jake was later “sexually molested by an older cousin on a couple of occasions” (Interview#1a, p. 1). In Rudy’s case, his father was simply absent, came around when he needed something to pawn, and left his family in solitude. Rudy recalled, “and, you

know, there'd be days when I wouldn't, you know, talk to...anybody at my house” (Interview#2a, p. 3). Benet and Gene’s families stayed together. Benet reported moving constantly as part of an itinerant family, dropping out of high school, and working his way up from community colleges in different states. Benet recalled “climbing two ladders” (Interview#4a, p. 6), work and community college, into his late twenties. Gene recalled coming from a white supremacist culture of poverty values in New Orleans. As Gene recounted, he grew up in a family that emerged from a white racist ideology of the Deep South. Jake, Rudy, Gene, and Benet’s lived intersections with whiteness differ a great deal from McIntosh’s (1988) metaphorical knapsack of invisible privilege. However, recognizing their difference from McIntosh’s (1988) description of white privilege does not release them from its benefits.

In contrast, Jim and Jack’s lived intersection with whiteness mirror white privilege (McIntosh, 1988). Jim and Jack both grew up in middle class circumstances. Jim reported growing up in sprawling suburban West Houston. Jim, in emphasizing differences between him and his students, stated, “I come from a white West Houston middle class background. My students’ background is poor and minority” (Interview#6b, p. 2). Jack reported growing up outside of Newport Beach from a “moderate” (Focus Group Meeting, p. 4) background, but at the same time, he recalled that “...you could certainly go one town over and... you knew the areas that poverty existed” (Focus Group Meeting, p. 4). Jim and Jack’s lived experiences of class privilege intersected with white privilege. Jim and Jack’s lived class experience, which intersected with white race privilege (McIntosh, 1988), differed the other four participants’ backgrounds.

Rather than hardship and struggle, alienation and conformity emerged as patterns in Jim and Jack's life histories. About high school, Jim reported,

West Houston was a nice place for high school back then, if you liked being preppy, wearing Ray-Bands, getting a car from your parents the minute you turned sixteen, and other such status symbols [associated with elites]. For people somewhat outside those possibilities, you were pretty fucked over or considered non-existent. (Interview#6a, p. 7)

Growing up within this background yet outside of these possibilities resulted in Jim's developing an oppositional stance. As Jim remembered, by high school, "I think my life pretty much existed as the counter expression of what it meant to be 'accepted'..." (Interview#6a, p. 1). This opposition found expression, symbolically, in drug abuse, punk rock, and ultimately, becoming an expatriate. Jim, whose lived intersection of race and class presented a characteristic white privilege (McIntosh, 1988), developed a counter identity to his white middle class background.

Jack, also recounting lived race and class intersections characteristic of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988), reported similar preoccupations regarding conformity and alienation. Regarding his youth, he recalled,

...especially in southern California and in Orange County and in the late 80's, if it's not the norm, then somehow you're weird or if you were willing to accept that there were other possibilities, other than the norm popular acceptable attitudes, then you were weird....(Interview#5a, p. 14)

This position, which revealed the conformity required at intersections of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988), fueled Jack's interest in exploring alternative music, cinema, lifestyles, and ideas (Hebdige, 1979). These concerns, as expressed through counter or alternative styles, both express and complicate understandings of lived intersections of whiteness and class characterized as white privilege (McIntosh, 1988).

School successes. With the exception of Gene, all of the participants' life stories reported school successes. Gene, who identified himself as lower middle class, recounted his hours spent in the classroom as boring drudgery. Gene, the only participant who reported not liking school, pronounced race and class components of school success. Regarding race and class in schools, Gene reported,

The truth is that probably more than 99% of children identified special education are minority. ... Teachers are certainly biased against certain children, especially if they don't know them, and often are surprised at the amount of intelligence and cultural awareness of minority children who have been raised in *quote-unquote* the right way, you know, the middle class family type of situation instead of the lower class family mentality. (Interview#3b, p. 2)

Moreover, Gene identified the framework of schooling as classed and raced:

... people in poverty were definitely separated from the middle class. ...And the whites were separated from the blacks for the most part unless you were below poverty level. ... It is often puzzling to me that we expect kids in poverty level areas and poverty families to change to what we call 'better.' ...And yeah, if we want them to fall into this particular framework that the education system has set

up, then I guess we do need to take a stand on just about everything. [School]

Behavior is a cultural learned thing. (Interview#3b, p. 1-2).

Gene, who reported barely passing in school, identified the school framework at the intersection of the middle class that often exclude poor and black children. Nonetheless, all participants—including Gene who eked out a degree at ONU, benefited from this white middle class framework represented by school (Westb, 1993; Scheurich, 2002).

Ironically, however, all the participants except Gene reported *their own successes* without reference to whiteness, uncritically. As Jake recalled, “I ... took the SAT and ACT in seventh grade and I scored high enough to be admitted into college at that point, but it was just, you know, it was one of those things...” (Interview#1a, p. 4). As Rudy recounted, “I did very well in orchestra and was able to play in all-state orchestras in high school and got music scholarships to go to college and I ended up going to UT” (Interview#2a, p. 2). As Jim recalled, “I was placed with students who ended up going to Berkley, Harvard, MIT, and the like in both English and Spanish. It would be considered the gifted group.” (Interview#6a, p. 2). As Benet recalled, “I had, as you can imagine, a number of – of classes and the GPA was pretty good ...and I began looking for, ah, scholarships. I happened to find one...” (Interview#4a, p. p. 6). As Jack recounted, “I was pretty much forced into a lot of high academics and high academic classes. I was identified as gifted and talented in the 6th grade” (Interview#5a, p. 1). Among the successful students, four of the five participants “won” scholarships to universities. Although several of the participants identified a white middle class orientation to schooling as exemplified by Gene’s reflection, in recounting their own successes they

adapted the common sense ideology based on merit (Hall, 1981; Apple, 1979; Apple, 1993; Scheurich, 2002). This taking credit for their own successes provided support for the position that, among whites, the dominant ideology of individual merit remains the common frame of understanding: “individualism is addictive” (Scheurich, 2002, p. 31). A feeling of smugness existed regarding individuals’ recounting themselves, implicitly, as “smart.”

Reshaping whiteness. In growing up, participants’ re-shaping of whiteness emerged as a significant pattern. Although this pattern became stronger in participants’ university experience as engagement in alternative cultures, it emerged with Jake, Gene, Jim, and Jack in adolescence. Jake and Jim provide pointed examples of re-shaping whiteness from the working and middle classes, respectively.

In Jake’s case, his religious conservative family, which identified with the Reagan Presidency, prescribed the Reaganite professional business identity in Apple’s description of the “conservative restoration” (1993, p. 27; 2000). This identity was manifest in attendance and participation in GT, winning a trip to Washington, DC as a youth, and selection of a business administration major on starting college. In referring to his live intersection with the working class, Jake recalled,

I think that poor or poverty families try to hide that the fact that they are in poverty because of the stigma. ...So just to kind of like really be[ing] from that generation that was still clinging to the American Dream and like this is a place for everyone and anyone can do anything really embracing that and not giving up on it, paint[ing] a rosier picture than it often was. (Focus group meeting, p. 5)

The re-shaping of this whiteness, for Jake, took two forms. First, Jake began partying and taking illegal drugs, which represented a rejection of his family's religious conservatism.

As Jake recalled,

[I] hid it, you know, successfully all of the way through high school and as well as the drinking, even though, you know I was, I don't know if I was self medicating, or just being young and dumb, but you know I got to the point where I think I had alcohol poisoning one time and you know had to be taken care of. (Interview#1a, p. 4)

Second, Jake started an intense engagement in hip hop culture, which he continued throughout college and up through the present. He accelerated this lived intersection into difference through interactions that "re-enforced all these [negative] stereotypes I had heard..." (Interview#1a, p. 4). One of the two African American students at his high school, after developing a brief acquaintance with Jake, stole his stereo from his truck. This student, who subsequently got arrested, was caught with the goods, and Jake, who got called into the police station because he had etched his license number on the stereo, took his stereo back. He also "...took a lot of his CDs, and that was my first exposure to some really underground rap...back then" (Interview#1, p. 4). Jake's lived intersection with African American culture, which falls short of Roediger's white abolitionism (1994b) or Ignatiev's treason to whiteness (1997), began, quite literally, in theft.

In both cases of theft, the objects (Hebdige, 1979) stolen provide significance. In the African American student's case, the object stolen is a coveted piece of hardware, more than likely, outside his economic possibilities. In the case of Jake's counter-theft,

the objects stolen are counter to his white cultural background. The tapes provided Jake a deeper intersection into African American culture. Nonetheless, Jake recounted his lived intersection into African American culture as important in disciplining students, choosing materials, talking to parents, and getting students engaged in class work.

In Jim's case a fundamentalist identity also offered itself during the Reagan Presidency's conservative restoration (Apple, 1993; Apple, 2000). After coming down with tendonitis in his ankle that removed him from sports, Jim reported a brief, though be it, intense engagement with fundamentalism:

I experimented with [fundamentalist] Christianity through youth groups related to schools. I projected myself in the groups, and I immediately read the whole Bible... The people around me were pretty much fundamentalists. Most of the kids who belonged to this group did so for social reasons, and I guess I was there, at least partly, for the group of ready made friends. But my serious study and concern for the truth value of the Bible led me on a dilemma way of thinking about true vs. untrue... I couldn't stay in that religious group taking religion seriously.... (Interview#6a, p. 5)

After receiving pressure from fundamentalist friends and youth pastors to cast off rock music, Jim recalled, "religion ended up being drugs and rock music, if they were going to make me choose" (Interivew#6a, p. 6).

After choosing rock music and drugs to replace fundamentalist religion, Jim's interest in drugs and music escalated:

...by my senior year, I was smoking dope constantly. I remember rolling joints and blowing them out the window of the bathroom. I remember studying for a trig exam, blowing a joint out the window, and listening with a lot of visual imagination to the Door's *LA Woman* as a peak experience regarding drugs and music. I also remember the ecstasy of playing music on drugs, which allowed for very lengthy experiments on the guitar. And this is where David and I became friends, between drugs and music. David and I would smoke reefer, go to his house and drink beer, and then jam for hours in very simple chord progressions. ...This, ultimately, went on for [eight] years. I think we played together the last time in February of 1989 at the Ritz in Capitol City. The overwhelming number of times we played together, we were on drugs of some kind. (Interview#6a, p. 7)

This identity switch from religion to rock music/drugs emphasizes, to a greater degree than Jake's story regarding hip hop, the lived intersection between white privilege (McIntosh, 1988) and counter or alternative cultures. This counter or alternative identity, in the same way as the conservative fundamentalist identify, appeared ready-made and as part of his race and class intersection. When viewed through the lens of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988), an alternative identity emerged as opposite side of the coin to the white religious fundamentalism prevalent during the conservative restoration (Apple, 1993; Apple, 2000). At the same time, this privileged counter or alternative identity pronounced a dramatic critique of white fundamentalism, and this impulse away from religious conservatism resulted, over a life's course, in a self-conscious and reflexive border-crossing pedagogy recounted earlier in this chapter.

Re-shaping whiteness, present in the adolescence of four participants, emerged pointedly in Jake and Jim's life histories. This re-shaping whiteness, although emergent in participants' adolescence, continues and spreads to all participants during their university experiences and beyond. During the university experiences, experiential masculinity—while inseparable from participants' reshaping of whiteness above and into adulthood—emerged as part of the lived intersections with whiteness. This experiential masculinity will be described in detail as it emerged in participants' lived college experiences.

Lived whitenesses. Inherent in participants' intersections with whiteness, white institutions, and reshaping of white identities presented a plurality of experiences and lived relations. Participants' lived intersections with whiteness articulated plurality, especially in relation to social class orientations and experiences. Jake and Rudy's intersections of whiteness emerged from a middle class orientation thrust into the working class from divorce. Gene and Benet's intersections with whiteness emerged as ascendancy, begrudging in Gene's case, from the working class into the middle class. Jim and Jack's lived relation to whiteness, amidst stories of conformity and alienation, represented life histories characteristic of McIntosh's knapsack (1988) of privileges. In light of this plurality, which takes direction from critical literatures on *masculinities* (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987, Connell, 1995; Beynon, 2002), the plural *whitenesses* reads participants' school successes and re-shapings of whiteness as complex negotiations rather than monolithic privilege too often assumed in the literatures (McIntosh, 1988; Scheurich, 2002; Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993). However, whitenesses accepts yet

complicates more monolithic descriptions of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988; West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich, 2002; Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; McIntyre, 2002).

Growing Up White Pt. 2: The University, Alternative Lives, and Masculinity

All of the participants placed significance on the time spent at the university, if not on academic learning, on the experiences and social experimentation accompanying it. As in the case of school successes, the significance placed on university experience emerged as engagement in counter or alternative lifestyles. This engagement in the alternative, left critically unexamined by participants and their institutions (West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich & Young, 1997; Scheurich, 2002), emerged in participants' life histories as an experiential masculinity that resulted in both virtual and lived intersections with difference. This experiential masculinity, a counter expression to instrumental hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995), extended participants' youthful reshaping of whiteness. This experiential masculinity also corresponded with and made for participants' counter or alternative identities (Hall, Clarke, Jefferson, Roberts, 1975 [1993]; Willis, 1975; [1993]; Willis, 1977; Hebdige, 1979).

The university. University experiences, as they emerged, were left critically unexamined as “meaningful experience.” Jake recalled the university fueled his political activism, present in his worldview and teaching, in that he saw “people taking action and protesting” (Interview#1a, p. 5). Rudy articulated his work experiences and drug experimentation as “very spiritual... in that I was learning things about myself...it was a period of – of growth” (Interview#2a, p. 11). Jim reported that his university experiences represented “the real fruition of all that was ‘counter’” (Interview#6a, p. 8). Gene

described his university as “experimentation, you know, with lots of things...a time when I really came out of my shell” (Interview#3a, p. 9). Benet described his academic learning, involvement in drugs, vegetarianism, and Eastern religion as “some very important intellectual experiences....” (Interview#4a, p. 11). Jack reported an engagement in alternative media that would also shape his worldview and teaching: “...the alternative music thing was, I would say really significant [for me] and, you know, the music also kind of ties into the film also and the literature.” All participants’ reported the personal significance of their university experiences as they related to alternative lives. Within this university experience and in the years immediately following it, radical politics, illegal drugs, alternative media, and the cult of experience emerged as significant sub-patterns in participants’ life histories.

Radical politics. Four participants reported engagement in radical politics during their university experiences. Benet’s life story provided a pointed example of this engagement. For Benet, these radical politics took the form of structural political analyses, an interest in food production and consumption, and the vegetarian politics of veganism. Regarding structural political analysis, Benet reported,

...– one – one of the metaphors that came up a lot was – was the idea of “the sword of the State”, when we were talking about, ah, police power. “The sword of the State” where the – where the police, ah, represent the enforcement division, they represent the sword, they carry out the – the duties of the state, um; we lived or we went to school when – in a – in a city that for the most part was – was very Republican and very conservative. And so things were happening in that – in that

city that were – that were somewhat strange to us – they would show people on the news routinely, ah, on – on – on these police commercials, these ‘wanted’ commercials and their crime would – would be, um, busted for smoking pot, and then they skip bail ...that to us was – was, um, was the show of – of – of the – of the oppression of the state....(Interview#4a, p. 11-12)

Moreover, Benet recounted becoming engaged in the politics of food production and consumption:

...I was looking at relationships of – of agribusiness and – and – and – and the average consumer and – and what – what happens along that food line and what that – that is about. Ah, I was very concerned that there’s a number of, um, smaller farms being consumed by a few major agro-corporations and these – these business are controlling even – even getting, um, patents on – on certain foods, so for – for a long time I – I became very caught up in the – in the discourse about who controls, ah, the – the patenting of – of certain seeds and who controls the – who controls farmland, ‘cause whoever controls farmland really controls or – or – or wields a lot of power. (Interview#4a, p. 14)

Finally, Benet became engaged in vegetarian politics of veganism:

It – it – it became very clear to me that – that a meat-based diet was – was, um, was not very healthy for – for the environment and – and so I started reading a lot of that literature and – and became – became very aware of the relationship between, ah, pig farms and cow farms and what happens to soil and what – what happens to, ah, to – to the water systems. A – another argument that I became

aware of, too, was the – was the a – animal rights slash spirituality argument to – to veganism and I think this argument rest[s] primarily with some of the Buddhist, ah, and – and the Hindu, ah, philosophy. (Interview#4a, p. 16)

Ultimately, this political engagement led Benet to start The Vegetarian Society of West Texas, which held meetings and hosted speakers on different components of vegan politics. As represented in Benet’s life story, four participants recounted an engagement in radical politics during their university experience.

Illegal drugs. All participants’ life stories contained involvement in illegal drug use or drug scenes. Rudy and Jim’s life histories provided extensive discussions on illegal drug use and its meanings. Rudy’s life story presented an engagement in illegal drug use that he recounted as “kicks” that resulted in personal growth:

We met a fellow who was a chemistry major at UT and he had a – this is his story, but he was a very smart guy and I tend to trust him, but... he had researched and found out certain narcotics that JFK was taking at the – in the White House [laughs], he said, ‘This is X that JFK took.’ Anyway...he made this huge bag of – of X and that summer he made a great deal of money, and we had a great many parties, and I made a lot of friends, and eventually stopped going to school. I did a lot of acid, did a lot of X, did as much coke as we could find, speed, as much pot as we could smoke, liquor, just to sort – liquor and beer, just to sort of even things out. (Interview#2a, p. 9)

Jim’s involvement in illegal drugs provided an account of drug use as historically located (Mills, 2000 [1959]; Goodson, 1989; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Middleton,

1993) self-identification on margins or political resistance (Hall, Jefferson, Clark, Roberts, 1993 [1975]; Willis, 1993 [1975]; Hebdige, 1979). Regarding the Reagan Era's (Apple, 1993; Apple, 2000) policy of "Just say no" to drugs, Jim commented:

I mean Reagan was just totally.... I mean I must have been 20-21 when all that was happening and thinking all of that was total bullshit. I couldn't stand it. I was aware politically and totally oppositional to every aspect of it. I remember Nancy Reagan coming on TV and saying "just say no" to drugs and we lit up a huge spleef and smoked it during that speech [laughter]. (Focus group meeting, p. 1)

Although all of the participants engaged in illegal drugs, they differed recounting its meaning.

The meanings generated around illegal drugs split the group and provided for intense debate at the focus group meeting. While several of the participants remembered their drug use as "personal problems," others identified drugs as a political resistance (Hall, Jefferson, Clark, Roberts, 1993 [1975]; Willis, 1993 [1975]; Hebdige, 1979). Jack identified personal reasons for having used and continuing to use drugs:

Because my childhood fucked my head, fucked with my head. I used drugs because if I am not on something I am going to literally have panic attacks and I am anxious and I am high anxiety; or... I am going to drive my wife crazy or ...drive my kids crazy. It's completely useful to me. It's a medication. (Focus group meeting, p. 19)

A critical reading of Jack's illegal drug use might unpack ideological underpinnings of being fucked in the head, panic attacks, and high anxiety (Willis, 1993 [1975]; Hebdige, 1979).

In this focus group debate, Jake argued for a political dimension in understanding illegal drugs:

...I think it definitely reinforces the mind set of this government is corrupt, and the more positive experiences with drugs contradicts what you are hearing from the government or the media... Also it *is* a political statement, it's illegal [Jake's emphasis]. (Focus group meeting, p. 20)

Regardless of its possible meanings, illegal drugs emerged as a significant pattern in all participants' life histories.

Alternative media. Four of the participants' life histories reported engagement in alternative media. Gene reported, as part of his experiences living in LA, that he adopted a bohemian lifestyle—

...I graduated, I moved to California and continued this lifestyle. It was all in that, in that stretch of freelancing. I'm, I guess maybe three, three years after I graduated I moved to California. LA. So I moved out there and I went to a school, part time...A school called Cal Arts. ...When I wasn't in class and I wasn't working, it was just kick back Southern Cal time. And it was, you know smoking some ganja in the back yard underneath the, underneath the orange tree and pulling one or two off whenever you got a little thirsty or hungry and eating an

orange, spitting out the seeds and laying out in the sun, for days. (Interview#3a, p. 14)

As part of this bohemian lifestyle, Gene recalled the relation with alternative media, “It was nice. ...I was going to see a lot of alternative music, hanging out with musicians and artists and seeing lots of plays and experimental art shows...” (Interview#3a, p. 14).

As part of his life story, Jack reported an intense engagement in alternative media. Like Gene, Jack also reported this engagement as representative of his lifestyle:

So I was saying it’s hard to sustain, you know, when you make yourself or when you make like your self image that okay, ‘I’m going to be an alternative person...’ The thing that I bump against....I call it the corporate mentality of America that, you know.... (Interview#5a, p. 18-19)

This understanding of an alternative lifestyle grew out of contact with alternative music and film.

Well my friend Kevin, he was really into sort of the alternative music of the 1980s and, you know, that was a big bonding experience for us was that, you know, I had some exposure to some of those bands and I had liked some of those bands and we had that in common, like Depeche Mode and Joy Division in common and then we would spend sort of our free time listening to each other’s music or going record shopping, and going to concerts, you know, reading, and writing.

Eventually I wrote for the school newspaper, writing music reviews and film reviews. ...the alternative music thing was, I would say really significant and, you

know, the music also kind of ties into the film also and the literature at the same time. Although music was definitely the leader of the three. (Interview#5a, p. 7)

Jack, whose interest in alternative lifestyle grew out of alternative media, used the same term “alternative” to describe, alternately, the life he led and his cultural practices (Hebdige, 1979).

Cult of experience. The participants’ focused on gaining lived experiences during and directly after the university provided another significant pattern. Four participants’ life histories articulated the cult of experience. This cult of experience, which emerged from the data, meant placing primacy on gaining lived experiences to make for understanding and wisdom. Gene’s life story provided examples of this cult of experience.

In trying to get away from “the Big Easy,” Gene went to LA, traveled the United States for six months, quested for meaning in world religions, and ended up in Capitol City Texas. His emphasis on lived experiences, which appeared throughout his life story, took center stage in describing his experiences previous to coming to Capitol City:

I traveled for a whole summer, and this is, I was writing songs and playing my guitar a lot. This is where a lot of these thoughts finally came together, because I was able to lay out under the stars every night and just think. And so, when I came back, I took a [second] six month trip and that was about three months of it working on this ranch. I was all over the U.S. and wound up back in New Orleans deciding that I was ready to move on. And a friend of mine from LA was moving to Capitol City. And I had visited her on this six month trip, and we wound up

becoming a bit more than friends, and when she moved to Capitol City afterwards....[I followed]. (Interview#3a, p. 17)

Gene's life story represented participants' emphasis on the cult of experience in understanding and making life decisions.

Alternative lives, reshaping whiteness, and experiential masculinity. In the emerging life history patterns —radical politics, illegal drugs, alternative media, and the cult of experience— a re-shaping of whiteness emerged as counter or alternative lives. These alternative lives, representing an intersection with and (problematic) rejection of dominant white cultural practices (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998), retained aspects of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988) such as engagement in white knowledge and institutions (West, 1993b; Scheurich & Young, 1997; Scheurich, 2002), white individualism (West, 1993b; Scheurich, 2002), and to a lesser degree, the ideology of individual merit (Apple, 1979; Hall, 1981; Apple, 1993; Apple, 2000).

Nonetheless, a re-shaping of whiteness emerged in participants' counter or alternative lives. Inherent in this re-shaping of whiteness —marked by patterns of radical politics, illegal drugs, alternative media, and the cult of experience— resided an underlying experiential masculinity. This experiential masculinity, counter to an instrumental hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995), emerged inseparable from participants' reshaping of whiteness as alternative lives. Participants' alternative lives, understood as a re-shaping whiteness inseparable from experiential masculinity, left participants in the contradictory space of denouncing privilege (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995) and articulating cultural resistance (Hall, Clarke, Jefferson,

Roberts, 1975 [1993]; Willis, 1975; [1993]; Willis, 1977; Hebdige, 1979). This denouncing of privilege, similar to Connell's (1995) uncovering a feminist masculinity in his life history research, made for a nihilistic self-contradiction or negation (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995) left unexamined by participants. Interestingly, this reshaping of whiteness as alternative lives along with its inherent experiential masculinity, when lived out over a lifetime, emerged as and corresponded with several aspects of difference pedagogy. Participants' difference pedagogy is discussed in the next section.

Grown Up: Working with Diverse Students

Transition stories. None of the participants reported going directly into teaching upon graduation. On the contrary, all of the participants recalled working before going through post baccalaureate or alternative teaching programs. Jake recounted coming to teaching after having worked in a number of youth corrections camps. Rudy left restaurant work and took up teaching after meeting his wife, whose diligent study in the nursing school, inspired him to seek out a job in a helping profession. Jim reported coming to public school teaching in South Texas through route of a post baccalaureate program after having taught English as a Foreign Language in Mexico for five years. Gene reported taking up teaching through an alternative program after finding it difficult to find free lance art work in Central Texas. Benet also reported going through an alternative certification program after getting his masters in communications' studies. Jack recounted taking up teaching after struggling in the movie businesses in LA and San Diego. The participants' transition stories, uniformly through alternative or post baccalaureate programs, mirror and reflect alternative lives. In looking at participants'

life stories after they became teachers' of diverse students, white visibility, deficit thinking *and* structures, and difference pedagogy emerge as patterns.

White visibility. To differing degrees, all the participants, articulated a white visibility. Instead of adopting color-power evasive (Frankenberg, 1993; Scheurich, 2002) or race resistant (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002) positions, the participants identified whiteness as a component of their background, interpreted it as source of continued oppression, and saw its presence in schooling.

In commenting on his race, Rudy remarked

I'm know I'm white. My students know I'm white. It's not a secret (Interview#2b, p. 1).

In commenting on his background, Jim recounted his life story emerged

within a totally white center of gravity (Interview#6a, p. 7).

In relation to his background, Jack described a white-centric culture:

it's almost like a superiority thing, it's almost like, you know, that we, the world revolves around dead white guys. As I refer to school, you know, the literature that we read in our schools in an English class, the history, the laws of our government were enacted by dead white guys so, you know, the white-centric attitudes that, not so much overt racism, but the kind of position that, like okay, well the white man is the top and everything trickles down from him.

(Interview#5b, p. 1)

In relation to his education, Jake recounted

I also started to realize from some of my history classes and growing up in it, everything was really kind of white-washed as far as, you know Columbus, he's great. You know, Cortez did this, and you know, in Texas, we[whites]'re heroes. (Interview#1a, p. 9)

In relation to racism in schools, Gene reported

It's just, it's just lingering, many, many years worth of repression by white people on minorities and it's all the fault of ... Europeans. I don't know, it's pretty obvious; I don't need to go into that, do I? It's just the way it is. The truth is that probably more than 99% of children identified special ed are minorities. (Interview#3b, p. 2)

In relation to working as a white teacher, Jim responded

My whiteness, and other teachers', is obvious. As whites, we represent an official message, even if that message is critical. This is damaging to the possibility of success of many white teachers. Somehow, they have to figure out a way to get across to students. (Interview#6b, p. 3)

From participants' interviews, a sense of historical and social whiteness emerges. Participants identify family backgrounds, history texts, literature in English classes, school environments, and themselves as bearers of whiteness (Hall, 1981; West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich, 2002). In contrast to previous research on white teachers (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002), this life history research on white male teachers of diverse students showed that the participants

developed an approximation of Frankenberg's (1993) race cognizant position. Teaching diverse students, it follows, required eschewing a color blindness or race power evasion.

Deficit Thinking *and* Structures. Complicating the participants' approximate race cognizance (Frankenberg, 1993), deficit thinking remained a component of participants' perceptions regarding diverse students (Katz, 1989; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999). All participants, to differing degrees, described their students using deficit thinking.

Gene provided a pointed example of participants' deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking:

Most of them don't have a dad or some of them don't even know their dad. Or some of them, a few of them, don't have a mother, for one reason or another. So it's one parent. Some of them have been abused, especially the emotionally disturbed children that I've worked with have been abused in one way or another. Many of them move from place to place quite a bit, sometimes more than once a year, which is fairly damaging to their learning. Most of them have seen a variety of people, as in mom's boyfriends come through the house, and are able to deal with many difficult situations. They're able to cope with a lot of stuff. Most of them don't apply much, they don't give education much weight in the worthwhileness of everything. They know it's important but when it comes right down to it, so what if they don't get one? They know it's important in theory but not in practicality. And a lot of them don't think they can do it anyway. They're, they've already given up on themselves by eighth grade. (Interview#3b, p. 8)

Gene provided an example of deficit (Valencia, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking that all participants, to differing degrees, exhibited in the interviews.

Contradictorily, an understanding of oppressive historical and social structures *accompanied* participants' deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking. Jake's descriptions of student difference provided a structural dimension to pathology:

there's a reason behind this external locus of control and it could be... growing up in neighborhoods where – in these tough neighborhoods, if they can, you know, expound that to their parents and show them, 'Well, I was just doing this, because...,' then the parents will – they – they do tend to side with – with the students. ...they can kind of unify against the school or against the police or against the, you know, whatever kind of obstacle they're up against. And – and that draws them together, something that they can relate to and something they can be unified on and they – I – I guess, it helps build their relationships at home, you know, builds a sense of community or pride. (Interview#1b, p. 4)

Jake sees structures (law enforcement, school, obstacles) that students and their families understand as antagonistic.

Jim, most conscious of deficit thinking as part of his PhD program, struggled with issues of deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking in the interviews. In discussing his students' association to gang culture

(which Jim understood as pathological [Katz, 1989]), Jim articulated pathology and structures:

it's hard to be relativistic about a kid getting involved in gang culture as part of his 'home culture.' Who would want a twelve year old girl to get gang-banged in?...Gang cultures, for the concerned academic, might appear as legitimate or in need of offering a viable school alternative, but for... me, [they] appear as the cruelest ruse perpetrated by the mass media. Thanks Nike for the Red Air Jordans [Bloods' symbol]! Yet, many of the most difficult students to reach take gang culture as 'true' learning and experience that contrast to official messages of any teacher. My position is that this position is also co-opted by mass media and clothing companies. (Interview#6b, p. 8)

In this description, Jim inverted the notion that his students' invented symbols of resistance (Hebdige, 1979), and instead, he argued that mass media, like hip hop industry and other clothing corporations, created and marketed students' resistance. Jim, in an act of deficit thinking (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999), described pathology—students' gang participation (Katz, 1989) *and* structures. Some students, ironically, were duped into being bearers of pathology (Katz, 1989).

Difference Pedagogy. Corresponding to their approximate race cognizance (Frankenberg, 1993), difference pedagogy emerged in participants' life histories. This difference pedagogy emphasized differences within difference, students' experiences, and teacher-student relationships. To differing degrees, all participants emphasized difference within difference, students' experiences, and relationships with students.

Regarding difference within difference, all participants refused a color blind position yet perceived subtle differences within difference in relation to students. Rudy exemplified this understanding of the subtleties of how differences played out in the classroom (Greene, 1988; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999):

J.Jupp: Would you say that your position is color blindness?

Rudy Smith: No. I mean I know a black kid is black and I know a Hispanic kid is Hispanic. But to some kids, the culture, the background means different things to them, you know, and you have to take that into account. You know, one kid wants to be called Monica, and the other kid wants to be called Monica [Sp. intonation]. And it's insulting to not say Monica [Sp.], and the other kid doesn't want to be called Monica [Sp.]. You know my name is Monica. And, each kid is different. You know, each kid has their own sort of experience with regard to their culture. And you gotta kind of have to take that into consideration too.

(Interview#2b, p. 2-3).

This understandings of differences within difference presented itself, to differing degrees, across participants.

Additionally, regarding the importance of students' experiences, all participants showed, to differing degrees, an emphasis on connecting instruction to students' experiences (Dewey, 1990 [1902]; Dewey, 1997 [1916]; Dewey, 1938 [1997]; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, 1992). Benet's understanding of the centrality of experience came out in the description of his unit *Canterbury Tales Unit*.

...how does Chaucer, um, show social structures within the *Canterbury Tales* or class differences within the – within the *Canterbury Tales* and we – we then proceeded to do a, um, sort of a closer reading of Chaucer’s general prologue, where he goes into, ah, goes into – to details about the different, ah, jobs, um, that existed within medieval Europe and – and from that reading assignment we then created a writing assignment called the “South Central tales” and that writing assignment began with the brainstorm of the different social structures within the South Central Middle School or within our school, um, and – and I started with a – asking students to – to brainstorm or generate a – a list of the different types of – of – of groups and the different, ah, levels of society within South Central and students generated things like, um, or, ah, yeah, they generated, ah, custodians, they generated teachers and – and counselors and secretaries, and parents, support specialists, they – they also talked about the security, ah, structure at – at South Central...It – it’s – it’s – it’s extremely important to relate to the students’, ah, experiences. Um, that – that to me is what – what allows a student to see you as a – as a genuine person or the genuine teacher and – and if – if they see you as that, I think they’re – they’re more willing to – to, ah, strive to do, ah, to want to come to your class....(Interview#4b, p. 10)

Finally, regarding student relationships, all participants showed, to differing degrees, an emphasis on developing relationships in order to make for learning (Goldstein, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1992; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1994; Valenzuela, 1999).

Rudy's understanding of relationships exemplified the common response among participants:

Well there's, at the beginning of the year I go out of my way to try to let them tell me about themselves. And while they're doing that I will tell them a little bit about myself in order to sort of I guess gain their trust. I, I, let them fill out surveys. They write poems and stories about themselves, and it allows me to, to learn about them...with regard to their, their school, what their plans are, what their hopes are, what their fears are, with regard to you know the new school year, because that always, the new school year always sort of brings all that stuff out. Curriculum wise I've tried to do a lot of individual reading conferences and if, if things were going well for that year I'm able to talk to each of my kids two or three times a week, usually about what they're reading in an individual reading conference, but that, you know just that minute and a half conversation a lot of times will, it doesn't even necessarily have to be about anything but what they're reading, but just those interactions garner trust and build that *relationship* [researcher's emphasis]. (Interview#2b, p. 9)

“Relationship” appeared across participants’ interviews as central in learning (Goldstein, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1992; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1994; Valenzuela, 1999).

Less apparent in participants’ discussion of difference pedagogy was critical thinking. While difference within difference, student experiences, and student-teacher relationships emerged as significant patterns, critical thinking emerged much less

emphatically which placed participants' pedagogies closer to the inclusive frame (Cummins, 1986).

White visibility, pathologies *and* structures, plurality of consciousnesses.

Participants' on-going lived intersections with difference appear to make color power evasion (Frankenberg, 1993) and race resistant (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002) positions impossible to sustain. As Rudy remarked, "I'm know I'm white. My students know I'm white. It's not a secret" (Interview#2b, p. 1). Maintaining on-going lived intersections with difference, it appeared, resulted in an *out-ing* participants' whiteness that explained, at least in part, participants' approximate race cognizance (Frankenberg, 1993). In both peer debriefing sessions, Mexican American participants re-enforced that conclusion. In presenting this finding regarding white visibility to Brenda Jimenez, she responded:

If you're [white] working at a school that's primarily minority and struggling students, behavior, you know, discipline issues and they're lashing out at the teacher if the teacher happens to be Anglo and using derogatory terms, you know, white man keeping us down...I think the teachers would be more self-conscious of their race (Peer debriefing#1, p. 13).

In presenting white visibility to Francisco Reyes, he responded:

I think they'll be conscience of it in a way that I think you would have... they would have to be in a place where there is, they're receiving some kind of feed back of it you know, from that, maybe from the kids (Peer debriefing#2, p. 3).

Participants' approximate race cognizance (Frankenberg, 1993), as it emerged, accompanied with working in majority-minority classrooms. In correspondence with participants' approximate race cognizance, participants developed understandings of difference within difference and pedagogies that emphasized experience and relationships.

This approximate race cognizance (Frankenberg, 1993), however, did not eliminate pathological (Katz, 1989) or deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) thinking. In lived intersections of difference participants saw pathologies *and* structures at the same time. Participants saw structures that made for inequalities and “problems” like gangs; contradictorily, they identified their students and families as bearers of these deficit or pathological structures (Katz, 1989; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999). Jim's tirade against gangs as pathology related to Nike and clothing corporations exemplified this contradictory intersection with difference.

Hall (2004a), in recalling Gramsci, discusses this apparent contradiction. Rather than manifesting the scrubbed-clean theory of concerned academics (Jim referenced), the participants exhibit a plurality of consciousnesses:

The personality is strangely composite...[an amalgamation] of Stone Age elements and principles of a more advanced science, prejudices from all past phases of history...and intuitions of a future philosophy. (Gramsci in Hall, 2004a, p. 433)

This position, which understands the subject as complicated set of discourses, complicates simplistic and moralistic “categories” of consciousness (e.g., Freire, 1998a

[1969]; Freire, 1998b[1970]; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor, 1992 Frankenberg, 1993; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997). In understanding difference within difference and developing difference pedagogies, white male teachers, although they uniformly see structures like whiteness, retain common sense dominant ideologies in describing particular circumstances (Apple, 1993; Hall, 1981). This plurality of consciousness (Gramsci in Hall, 2004a), as expressed in life history research, refuses that participants “think” strictly from one perspective or another (Cary, 1999). Rather, plurality of consciousness sustains that participants think, alternately and relationally, in several discourses simultaneously (Gramsci in Hall, 2004a; Cary, 1999). This plurality of consciousness explains how “critical” individuals make conservative choices in child rearing, for example.

Overview of Lived Intersections

This section presents, in concise form, an overview of lived intersections in this critical inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students. For purposes of clarity and brevity, this section departs from narrative formats of previous sections. Instead, this section presents lived intersections as they follow the historical and social structures relevant to this study: whiteness, masculinity, and difference. Whitenesses and white visibility; reshaping whiteness as alternative lives and experiential masculinity; pathology *and* structures, and difference pedagogy represent predominant lived intersections emerging from data patterns.

Whitenesses.

So I’m, yeah, all of this is from a very racist background I’m coming from an extremely racist place [the Deep South]. (Gene Johanson, Interview#3b, p. 3)

My dad left home when I was four and my sister and I, and my mom just kind of survived... We were poor, I guess, but we didn't know it. The house was a wreck, just falling apart literally, I was out of control, anger issues. (Rudy Smith, Interview#2a, p. 2)

I come from a white West Houston middle class background. (Jim Jupp, Interview#6b, p. 2)

Whiteness, as it emerged in participants' lived experiences, refused monolithic categorization as invisible privilege (McIntosh, 1988; Scheurich, 2002). Although whiteness *does* represent a set of cultural relations that provided participants with unearned invisible privileges (McIntosh, 1988; Scheurich & Young, 1997; Scheurich, 2002; West, 1993b), it became, however, increasingly apparent in the data that lived experiences with whiteness represented a plurality of experiences that required emphasis. Participants experienced whiteness relationally, in a number of ways, including white supremacist, working class whiteness, and contradictory self-negating middle class resistant experiences. Whiteness, based on participants' lived experiences, should be reconceptualized relationally as whitenesses.

Reconceptualizing whiteness as whitenesses, as supported by participants' lived experiences, allows for an articulation of differing relations to hegemonic whiteness. This position takes direction from masculinity literatures which pronounce masculinities in

relation to hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Beynon, 2002). In taking direction from literatures on masculinity, this critical inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students clearly articulated whitenesses in relation to hegemonic whiteness. Whitenesses, though complicit to differing degrees to hegemony, allow for a plurality of lived relations to whiteness.

White visibility.

I'm know I'm white. My students know I'm white. It's not a secret. (Rudy Smith, Interview#2b, p. 1)

It's just, it's just lingering, many, many years worth of repression by white people on minorities and it's all the fault of ... Europeans. I don't know, it's pretty obvious; I don't need to go into that, do I? It's just the way it is. The truth is that probably more than 99% of children identified special ed are minorities. (Gene Johanson, Interview#3b, p. 2)

Ah, it [white-centric]'s almost like a superiority thing it's almost like, you know, that we, the world revolves around dead white guys as I refer to school, you know, the literature that we read in our schools in an English class, the history, the laws of our government were enacted by dead white guys so, you know, the white-centric attitudes that, not so much overt racism, but the kind of position that, like okay, well the white man is the top and everything trickles down from him. (Jack Springman, Interview#5b, p. 1)

White visibility emerged in the data. Participants' saw race in themselves and in their students. Participants saw and interpreted structures of whiteness in their backgrounds, environments, school culture, and identity. Three of the participants mentioned that structures of whiteness represented obvious insights (Rudy Smith, Interview#2b; Gene Johanson, Interview#3b; and Jim Jupp, Interview#6b). In four of the participants' interviews, this race visibility approximated Frankenberg's (1993) race cognizant position that conceives of race as historical and social construction that provides for continued relations of oppression.

Reshaping whiteness.

Religion ended up being drugs and rock music, if they were going to make me choose. That's when you know that, by your junior year in high school, you're consciously placing yourself on the margins. (Jim Jupp, Interview#6a, p. 6)

They wanted me to go to A & M, so I choose Central Texas University. But that really opened my eyes. I started meeting people from not just of different ethnicities, but from different countries.... (Jake Baynes, Interview#1a, p. 5)

Let's see, the alternative music thing was, I would say really significant and, you know, the music also kind of ties into the film also and the literature at the same time. Although music was definitely the leader of the three. (Jack Springman, Interview5a; p. 6)

To differing degrees, the reshaping of whiteness as alternative lives emerged as a predominant lived experience. Participants reported contestatory relationships with white fundamentalist religion, virtual and lived excursions into difference represented by counter culture and expatriate experiences, struggles with white racist ideologies inherited from the Deep South, dropping scholarships in exchange for membership in a drug scenes, overcoming working class limitations with university experiences that led to radical politics. All participants, regardless of class backgrounds, reshaped whiteness as counter or alternative lives. This re-shaping of whiteness as alternative lives, when read through critical literatures on counter or alternative cultures (Hall, Clarke, Jefferson, Roberts, 1975 [1993]; Willis, 1975; [1993]; Willis, 1977; Hebdige, 1979), provided a problematic and contradictory resistance to whiteness based on self-negation of privilege (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995). The contradiction and self-negation of privilege inherent in alternative identities revealed these projects as limited in their emancipatory possibilities (Freire, 1998a [1969]; Freire, 1998b[1970]; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor, 1992)

Experiential masculinity.

I remember, when we left [to play]... a concert in San Antonio after smoking a huge spleef with David my guitar player, the immense satisfaction when he said, 'Dude, we're really doing it. Living like this, heading off for a show.' It was joyous, even reverent, at times. And there was politics in the messages of our songs, even leftist politics, but it was doing it and experiencing it that was the real deal. (Jim Jupp, Interview#6a, p. 14-15)

And, and so for my first year I really felt like I was getting more, I felt almost guilty for getting paid because of the therapy that I was receiving. It was really therapeutic to be out there and working and chopping wood. ... You know the deer and the birds and just the, the experiences out there was really a spiritual thing. So that's what made me realize I wanted to work with that specific [special education, minority] population. (Jake Baynes, Interview#1a, p. 17)

Experiential masculinity, inseparable from re-shaping whiteness in its enactment, emerged as lived intersection. Experiential masculinity, contrasting with instrumental hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Beynon, 2002), emerges as the middle class oriented version of working class protest masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1995) started in adolescence but became more pronounced during participants' university years. Experiential masculinity emerged from participants' lived patterns involving radical politics, illegal drugs, immersion into alternative media, and an emphasis on experience. Experiential masculinity, combining inseparably with reshaping whiteness in its enactment, made for what participants' referred to as counter or alternative lives.

Pathology *and* Structures.

Home life [is the students' problem]. I think parenting, well, I'm coming from a middle class perspective, but, as I told you before about my, the way I grew up, it was a very similar to poverty lifestyle....(Gene Johansen, Interview#4b, p. 7)

One of the things that I wanted to, um, to do as a – as – as a teacher at this Magnet School was to make sure that we pulled in a lot of the kids who would not get the opportunity, ah, to – to go this type of school ...the Hispanic and the – and the African American kids on the East Side. Um, I see – I see that population as a – as a, um, as a forgotten population of – population, um, who would not otherwise have an opportunity. (Benet Ferris, Interview#4b, p. 6)

Contradictorily, despite understanding social historical structures, participants retained deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking regarding their students. Participants saw social and historical structures, articulated to differing degrees through their comprehension of whiteness and other structures; however, this did not release them from ideologies (Gramsci, 2000; Hall, 1981; Hall, 2004a) inherent in deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking. Participants' understood their students not as deficient individuals; rather, they saw their students as bearers of deficient or pathological structures. This complicates many discussions of difference in education that often assume educators' ideological positions or "beliefs" as the source or component of the teachers' problems (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, 1992; Scheurich, 2002). Common sense ideological beliefs resist simple dismissal as wrong-headedness.

Participants' retaining of deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1993) thinking in constructing the 'other' (Apple, 1993) made for a contradiction with approximate race cognizant (Frankenberg, 1993) positions. The researcher, tentatively, approached this contradiction through a plurality of consciousnesses (Hall, 2004a), which posited that "consciousnesses" rarely presented scrubbed-clean categorical hierarchies critiqued, assumed, or prescribed in academic literatures (e.g., Freire, 1998a [1969]; Freire, 1998b[1970]; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor, 1992 Frankenberg, 1993; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997).

Difference pedagogy.

...it is tough and if you can't – if you can't relate to them [students], they have no reason to relate to you and if – if – if you're unrelated, you're not gonna work well together, they're not gonna work for you. (Jake Baynes, Interview#1b, p. 2)

...if there's not a good relationship between a student and a teacher you can tell when you go into the teacher's classroom ...Some kids will be just out and out disrespectful or disruptive. (Rudy Smith, Interview#2b, p. 9)

It – it's – it's – it's extremely important to relate to the students', ah, experiences. (Benet Ferris, Interview#4b, p. 10)

And then, you know, I figured out, specifically, but in an important part of the play, I tried to bring in their personal experience. (Jack Springman, Interview#5a, p. 15)

In correspondence with their approximate race cognizance (Frankenberg, 1993), all participants, to differing degrees, reported developing difference pedagogies that valued differences within difference (Greene, 1988; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999), students' experiences (Dewey, 1990 [1902]; Dewey, 1997 [1916]; Dewey, 1938 [1997]; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, 1992), and teacher-student relationships (Goldstein, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1992; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1994; Valenzuela, 1999). To differing degrees, participants valued students' backgrounds and cultures but also saw important differences within difference categories. Additionally, participants focused on relating material to students' experiences as necessary in creating lessons that worked with diverse students. Finally, participants stressed the values of relationships with their students as fundamental in maintaining functioning classrooms. This difference pedagogy that focused on difference within difference, student experiences, and student teacher relationship aligned, most closely, with inclusive pedagogies (Cummins, 1986). Nonetheless, these findings, reported in common sense and practical terms (Schwab, 1978a, Schwab, 1978b, Schwab, 1978c, Schwab, 1983; Reid, 1984; Reid, 1999; Reid 2001; Davis, 1997) provided support for the broad tenants of difference pedagogy in the literature review.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONVERSATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

Introduction

This conclusion provides a brief summary of findings, engages in public conversations, discusses implications for teacher training and education, reflects on the research process and findings, and presents a narrative exit path. The summary of findings recapitulates six lived intersections that emerged from the analysis in Chapter Four. The engagement in public conversations critically interacts with literatures on whiteness, masculinity, and differences in cultural studies, sociology, and education. The discussion on implications for teacher training and education relates findings to work with preservice teachers, teachers, and administrators in professional and university settings. The personal reflection on the research process, which returns to the first person, considers and further unpacks the problematic contradiction represented by counter or alternative lives and white opposition. The narrative exit serves as an *out-tro* and re-situates the study within my life history.

Summary of findings. In analyzing patterns in alternative lives as they intersect with whiteness, masculinity, and difference, six lived intersections emerged as findings: whitenesses, white visibility, re-shaping whiteness, experiential masculinity, deficit thinking *and* structures, and difference pedagogy emerged as the main findings. Each of

these lived intersections, described at length in Chapter Four, receives brief attention here.

1. *Whitenesses*. This critical inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students revealed, rather than a monolithic structuring of whiteness (Hall, 1981; West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich & Young, 1997; Scheurich 2002; and others), participants' varied experiences of whiteness, especially as they intersected with social class and regional backgrounds. This finding supports a modest tendency in the literature (Brodkin Sacks, 1997; Allison, 1998) to complicate whiteness through life history inquiry. The researcher suggests hegemonic whiteness in relation to whitenesses, paralleling Connell's (1987; 1995) hegemonic masculinity in relation to masculinities, to better describe varieties of lived whiteness as they relate to white hegemonic cultural practices.
2. *White visibility*. In reporting on lived experiences working with diverse students, participants articulated white visibility. White visibility counters a posited white invisibility (Hall, 1981; Dyer, 1988; McIntosh, 1988) underlying descriptions of white privilege (Dyer, 1988; McIntosh, 1988). Additionally, it counters findings of teachers' race resistant or evasive positions (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002). In reflecting on this finding with peer debriefers, a tentative explanation for white visibility among white male teachers of diverse students is their constant contact and interactions with difference. This white visibility articulated, in an approximate way, a race cognizant position (Frankenberg, 1993).

3. *Reshaping of whiteness.* This critical inquiry into white male teachers of diverse students, through participants' interactions with whiteness, articulated that participants engaged in re-shaping whiteness as counter or alternative identity (Hebdige, 1979). This reshaping of whiteness appears at the intersections of lived experiences and whitenesses emphasizing the importance of articulating participants lives within structures (Mills, 2000 [1959]; Willis, 1993 [1975]; Willis, 1977; Foley, 1990; Denzin, 1989; Middleton, 1992; Middleton, 1993; Goodson, 1992a; Goodson, 1992b; Goodson, 1995). This reshaping of whiteness as alternative did not release participants from many benefits and complicities of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988) and dominant ideologies associated with whites (Hall, 1981; West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich, 2002).
4. *Experiential masculinity.* Inseparable from re-shaping whiteness in its enactment, experiential masculinity emerged as lived intersection in participants' alternative lives. Experiential masculinity, which counters instrumental hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995), presents a masculinity focused on participants' "authentic" experiences. Experiential masculinity emerges as a middle class oriented version of working class protest masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Connell; 1987; Connell, 1995). Experiential masculinity took many lived forms including participants' identification with radical politics, illegal drug use, expatriate experiences, questing for meaning through reading and travel, and other emphases on experience. Experiential masculinity, inseparable from re-shaping whiteness, made for a general lived experience of counter or alternative lives

- (Hebdige, 1979). Seen through the literatures of whiteness and masculinity, participants' association with the alternative presents a contradictory and problematic self-negation of privilege.
5. *Deficit thinking and structures.* Contradicting participants' race visibility and approximate race cognizance (Frankenberg, 1993), participants displayed both deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking *and* structural thinking in relation to diverse students. Participants saw structural explanations of difference including class, race, neighborhood, language, region, and other difference markers; however, this did not release them from seeing their students as bearers of a deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathology (Katz, 1989) in constructing the "other" (Apple, 1993). A plurality of consciousnesses (Gramsci, 2000; Hall, 2004a) represents, tentatively, an interpretation of this contradiction. This plurality of consciousness discounted scrubbed-clean categorical hierarchies of consciousness critiqued, assumed, or prescribed in academic literatures (e.g., Freire, 1998a [1969]; Freire, 1998b[1970]; Shor, 1987 [1980]; Shor, 1992; Frankenberg, 1993; Valencia & Solórzano, 1997).
 6. *Difference pedagogy.* Corresponding to participants' white visibility and approximate race cognizance (Frankenberg, 1993), participants valued pedagogies that emphasized, to differing degrees, difference within difference (Greene, 1988; Nieto, 1999; Gay, 2000), student-teacher relationships (Goldstein, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1992; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1994; Valenzuela, 1999), and students'

experiences (Dewey, 1990 [1902]; Dewey, 1997 [1916]; Dewey, 1938 [1997]; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, 1992). This finding regarding difference pedagogies lends support to the general descriptions of equity pedagogy in Chapter Three, especially inclusive pedagogical strategies (Cummins, 1986).

Each of these findings emerged from a discussion of data patterns, presented narratively in the previous chapter, as they intersected with historical and social structures of whiteness, masculinity, and difference.

Public conversations: Literatures. This critical inquiry contributes to public conversations on whiteness, masculinity, and difference.

Conversations on whiteness. Regarding the conversations on whiteness, whiteness in educational institutions, and white teachers, the contribution from this inquiry emerges as one simple critique: Whiteness literatures in all three areas fail to describe, carefully, the emergence of the white subject inside social and historical structures (Hall, 1981; Dyer, 1988; McIntosh, 1988; West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich & Young, 1997; Scheurich, 2002; Frankenberg, 1993; Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002). Much of the literature simply describes whiteness as hegemonic structure with no reference to white subjects at all (Hall, 1981; Dyer, 1988; McIntosh, 1988; West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich & Young, 1997; Scheurich, 2002).

Alternately, when the critical inquiry articulates a subject, literatures weigh in top-down by re-writing participants' liberal language in critical terminology (Frankenberg, 1993; Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002). This over-

emphasis on the literatures in relation to participants' language results in formalist exercise in which white subjects appear as examples of hierarchical categories of consciousness. These category schemes (Frankenberg, 1993), which felicitously assume the researcher's consciousness as ultimate goal, present the researcher and a few participants on a critical-progressive path in relation to wrong-headed others rather than looking, with subtlety, at participants' life histories as they intersect with whiteness.

Even worse, whiteness in educational literatures often presents itself as multicultural intervention or action research project (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002). Interventions or action research projects, articulating political commitment, continue traditional hierarchies of teacher-student relationships inherent in positivist or pragmatic research recommendations. These interventions or action research projects ultimately ask the participants: Did you learn it (to be critical) or not? Interventions and action research projects carry the doubt as to whether teachers' race resistant or evasive positions (Sleeter, 1992; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2002; McIntyre, 2002) represent, in actuality, resistance to staff development or consciousness raising experiences (Lather, 1991). While university study emerged as important in forming approximations of race cognizance, none of the participants in this critical inquiry referred to staff development or consciousness raising experiences as enlightening. Instead, a race cognizant position appeared, in the analysis, as a privileged yet limited project under a broader understanding of alternative lives.

Conversations on masculinity. Regarding conversations on masculinity, this inquiry into white male teachers provides an understanding of experiential masculinity so

far lacking in the literature. Experiential masculinity articulates a middle-class orientated protest masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995) that rejects instrumental hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995). This adds to public typological descriptions of masculinities (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Beynon, 2002) as lived experience within historical and social structures. In this critical inquiry, experiential masculinity emerged as inseparable from re-shaping whiteness. This experiential masculinity, combining with participants' reshaping of whiteness, took the form of radical politics, illegal drugs, engagement in alternative media, and a cult of experience.

This intersectional approach shed light on meanings of having lived a white yet alternative life. Experiential masculinity, with its white race component, differed from working-class protest masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995) in that it excluded a focus on violence and misogyny, yet it retained illegal drug use and media engagement. It also differed from feminist masculinity (Connell, 1995) in that it failed to articulate any consciousness regarding gender issues, yet it retained a focus on other political issues such as the environment. Experiential masculinity, a masculinity that emerged from intersectional analysis of race, gender, and difference provided a new direction in literatures on masculinity from an analytical standpoint in that it emerged from engagement in literatures on whiteness and masculinity. Literatures on masculinity, while providing discussions of class, operate from a race invisible standpoint, and more often than not, leave consumers of research guessing as to the race of participants (Tolson, 1977; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Beynon, 2002). Certainly, masculinities

emerge differently along race as well as class lines. Masculinity, as it emerges intersectionally with race, class, and other difference markers, needs more attention.

Conversations on difference. Regarding conversations on difference, this critical inquiry revealed participants' deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking. This deficit or pathological thinking that emerged *along with* structures blurred the distinctions between deficit thinking and structures as lived experiences rather than maintaining them as contrary understandings of the same phenomena. This blurring of deficit or pathological thinking *and* structures questions whether determining class, race, gender, and difference markers as historical and social structures represents an act of deficit or pathological thinking, inherently. It raises the question: Can deficit or pathological thinking really be extracted from identifying historical and social structures of difference? Further inquiry into alternative lives might provide direction into progressives, for example, who espouse critical politics but make conservative choices regarding housing, child rearing, or their children's education.

Regarding difference pedagogy, participants' practical (Schwab, 1978a, Schwab, 1978b, Schwab, 1978c, Schwab, 1983; Reid, 1984; Reid, 1999; Reid 2001; Davis 1997) understandings of how to reach diverse students provided support for broad tenets of equity pedagogy, especially inclusive pedagogy (Cummins, 1986). Because critical thinking received little attention in participants' descriptions, their practical understandings best approximated Cummins's (Cummins, 1986) framework for empowering minority students. Inclusive pedagogies appeared, in participants' understandings, as necessary and practical in reaching diverse students. Participants'

difference pedagogy, which focused on difference within difference, students' experiences, and teacher-student relationships, supports tenets of equity pedagogy from the point of view of participants' lived experiences rather than theoretical or research discussions, and in doing so, participants added a distinctly practical voice in the discussion.

Implications for Teacher Training and Education. This critical inquiry also provided implications for teacher training and educational institutions.

Implications re: whiteness. In light of findings regarding white male teachers of diverse students, three implications emerge. First, life history in relation to teacher and administrator coursework, preservice training, and staff development (Knowles, 1992; Cole & Knowles, 2000) appears as an important pedagogical stance in approaching and engaging educators in discussions on race. Educators should be allowed to articulate complex relations to whiteness in their lives and classroom settings. Life history as pedagogy presents an important role in guiding students through difficult intersectional discussions (Middleton, 1992; Middleton, 1993; Cole & Knowles, 2000) of lived experiences. Second, university professors should approach life stories of administrators and teachers of diverse students with sensitivity regarding their direct day-to-day contact with difference. What appears as deficit (Valencia & Solórzano, 1997; Valenzuela, 1999) or pathological (Katz, 1989) thinking, in this study, related to structures. Teasing out and making clear educators' structural thinking represents the important pedagogical goal rather than simply identifying front-line difference workers as part of the "problem." Third, university based scholars should take up a reflexivity (Foley, 2002a; Foley, 2002b)

regarding their own positionality. Although they play an important role in conscientizing teachers and administrators, their own privileged position in white institutions (West, 1993a; West, 1993b; Scheurich 2002) represents a credibility barrier due to their removal from direct contact with students' differences. Listening closely to practitioners and front-line difference workers presents classroom possibilities.

Implications re: masculinity. This critical inquiry, along with Skelton (1993), provides a starting point for discussing teachers' masculinities using life history. While literatures reference students' masculinities within historical and social structures (Hargreaves, 1967; Tolson, 1977; Willis, 1977; Foley, 1990), little inquiry exists into teachers' masculinities. Of importance in this continuing conversation is continuing Connell's (1996) and Pinar's (2002a; 2004a; 2004b) direction which reveals educational institutions and discourses as gendered. Discussion of gender appear especially important amidst popular reports of "boys'" difficulties in schools. Of note in this critical inquiry, though not a formal pattern, was participants' incoherence regarding school and school roles as gendered. Participants answered, in an inchoate manner, the question: "Tell me about being a male teacher." In contrast, questions: "Tell me about being a white teacher?" "Tell me about your [diverse] students?" or "Tell me about how to reach [diverse] students?" provided pages of rolling text. Regarding discussions of gender in institutions and discourses, there were no recognizable patterns, as direct questions regarding gender in institutions threw participants off balance.

Regarding the lack of literatures on teachers' masculinity and male teachers' inability to discuss gender, a need emerged to re-focus on gender as social construct

inherent in educational institutions (Connell, 1996; Pinar, 2002a; Pinar, 2004a; Pinar, 2004b). Inserting this work into preservice and graduate level course work and staff development as readings for discussion represents an important goal. The literature is rich in its implications, but so far, very little research on lived experiences in relation to school structures exists. Pedagogically, engagement in this literature might follow life history inquiry as recommended with classroom inquiry into whiteness (Knowles, 1992; Cole & Knowles, 2000).

Implications re: difference. The centrality of direct contact with diverse students emerged as the main implication regarding difference in this inquiry. In understanding students' differences as they related to their own backgrounds, participants' day-to-day contact emerged as key. Participants' difference pedagogies emerged in relation to practical (Schwab, 1978a, Schwab, 1978b, Schwab, 1978c, Schwab, 1983; Reid, 1984; Reid, 1999; Reid 2001; Davis, 1997) discussions of day to day work rather than abstract academic discourses. Participants' descriptions of difference pedagogy, which emerged from alternative programs and years of teaching practice, argues for a continued engagement in observations and student teaching as important parts of teacher development, especially in relation to teachers of diverse students. These exposures to lived intersections with difference might accompany readings that help pre-service teachers understand differences as they play out in schools. This, of course, supports current conceptions of pre-service teaching; however, direct contact with students and reflections on difference take on greater importance as a result of this inquiry. A greater exposure to diverse students argues for expanding traditional pre-service training with

more experiential components along with reflections. This direct contact with difference allows preservice teachers to move from virtual to lived understandings of difference and practical difference pedagogies. This movement from virtual to lived understandings of difference emerged in each of the participants' life histories.

Yet this position of extending direct contact in preservice programs is increasingly under attack by vocationalists who would cut traditional university pre-service training in favor of alternative programs. The expansion of traditional teacher programs, however, emerges as ironic in light of all participants' experiences with alternative or post-baccalaureate programs. Nonetheless, an understanding of difference within difference and uncovering practical difference pedagogies emerged in the data as inseparable from contact and work with diverse students. Participants' understandings of difference or difference pedagogy emerged with a marked absence of academic literatures or discussions.

Reflecting on the research. In writing up this critical inquiry, I frequently took walks through the Central Texas University where I studied my undergraduate in sociology and literature and returned to do my doctorate work. I took the bus to campus from our apartment on Saturdays and Sundays. I rode toward downtown, got off on the West Mall. I walked east past the Architecture Library and by the North Mall. I visited my favorite corners of the science library in the Central Building. I walked down around the Tower and headed east toward the Latin American Collection—one of the best in the world. I recalled my initial reverie in the stacks in that collection at the beginning of my doctoral studies before all my reading time was taken by the degree. I found a place to

plug in my laptop in the Latin American Collection, and I wrote my dissertation until I blocked or became exhausted, thinking vaguely of chronicles of Franciscan monks or texts by German trained Mexican phenomenologists I used to read. I reflected and continue to reflect during these walks.

After having worked on the research question and collected the data, a second question emerged, overlapping with the research question, that became even more personal than the original question. I still asked the first question: What are the life histories of white male teachers of diverse students, and how do intersections of whiteness, masculinity, and difference emerge in the stories? After collecting data, analyzing, writing up, and presenting alternative lives and their intersections with historical and social structures, I started to ask a second more personal question.

What does it mean to be a white male and to have lived an alternative life? This is the question I reflected on in my walks over the university grounds past my favorite places. In relation to this ending question, the findings of this critical inquiry emerged as two halves of the same phenomenon that didn't fit together. One half, the contradictory and problematic self-negation of white and masculine privileges, surged forth as reflexive self-critique and cast doubt over critical or progressive projects. The other half, practical understandings of difference and difference pedagogies, emerged, not as transformative or emancipatory in the telling, but rather as pragmatic and hopeful in dealing with difference in schools. In looking at these two oddly shaped halves, I returned in my thinking —alternately— to Coetzee's (1980) *Waiting for the Barbarians* or West's "Theory, Pragmatism and Politics" (1993c).

Coetzee (1980) presents Fanon's privileged "colonizer who refuses." As colonial administrator on a virtual frontier, the colonizer who refuses studies the signs on the body of his indigenous mistress but refuses to copulate with her. He studies the lore and history of the indigenous but is impotent to commune. When the military contingent from the Colonial Center visit the frontier, they find the indigenous population in unrest, and they design a plan to quash the rebellion. Coetzee's narrator refuses to offer aide, and the military contingent imprisons, tortures, and jails him for a time. After the military contingent returns battered, beguiled, and tattered from the far reaches of the province without finding the indigenous rebels, they return the colonizer who refuses to his administrative post. Coetzee's colonizer who refuses becomes complicit, once again, in business as usual. This is the contradictory and problematic self-negation of privilege represented in alternative life self-identified on the margins in novel form, articulated most pointedly as impotence.

In a different walk, I thought of West's (1993b) reading of Dewey's pragmatism. In "Theory, Pragmatism and Politics," West (1993c) salvages Dewey's pragmatism in arguing for experience, reflection, and growth as on-going dialectic. West (1993c) provides a critical orientation for Dewey in finding similarities between Gramsci's praxis-oriented organic intellectual and Dewey's experimentalism. West argues that the organic intellectual, who often works from a privileged frame, take on a committed critical orientation in cultural work, develop close community contacts, teach and learn as a member of community, among other tasks that revitalize the American progressive tradition. This position inspires me in my work at Central Eastside Middle School. I

strive to be an engaged intellectual working in the community. However, this position in tension-filled and privileged.

Exit path. Today, I'm packing up my stuff, getting on the elevator, and leaving the Latin American Library. I'm done for today, after six hours of writing. "I'm really going to finish this project," I think to myself. I have only a few pages left to write.

I walk past the Presidential Library and by the fountain. I'm thinking to myself: how do resolve the tensions of the findings? I walk past the Arts Theatre and over past the Geology Building and down through Science and Engineering Complex. In thinking of the two halves that don't fit, I'm not sure I want to make a heroic swooping dialectical argument, or even offer up diplomatic negotiation between the halves. I walk past the Pharmacy Building, and solutions to end this journey offer themselves up — "It's in the dialectic... West's (1993c) pragmatic politics is the real deal... Cary's curriculum spaces (2003) allows for self-conscious uses of privilege... Said's worldliness (1989) teaches us to reflexively take up our disciplines as political...." Life history work, I think, has made me wish not to reduce everything down to a few sentences, as Mills (2000 [1959]) taught me, drunk on the syntax of grand theory. As if we could just simply tie it all together in a few sentences.... I think I need to work with this tension rather than ameliorate it.

I walk by the Social Sciences Building next to the old Health Center they are tearing down. "This place is rich," I think to myself, and alternately, "I wonder if Dr. Kennedy still works here." I go to the third floor and check the sociology faculty roster. I can't believe she's still here! It's been twenty years. I go to her office, and there she is. I

re-introduce myself —“I am the kid who did the participant observation on the punk scene as my honors thesis, remember me?”

Notes

ⁱ Starting here, all city names and institutions relating to participants' present work sites are pseudonyms.

ⁱⁱ Before discussing the constructivist paradigm, and subsequently, the critical paradigm, it becomes important to interpret paradigms as systems of influences and confluences rather than impermeable territories representing academic brand names. As systems of influences and confluences, discussions of paradigms are "essentially formative. As researchers, we have to devise for ourselves a research process that serves our purposes best, one that helps us more than any other to answer our research question" (Crotty, 2003, p. 216). The purpose of discussing the constructivist paradigm, and subsequently the critical paradigm, provides clarity of intention that addresses and is embedded in the research question and the project as a whole.

ⁱⁱⁱ The criteria for judging life history will be discussed again in Chapter Three.

^{iv} Identifying predominant strands of life history in education presents a complicated task since major methodologists and practitioners using life history develop particular phraseologies that serve individual researcher's concerns. See, for example, Denzin's *Interpretive Biography* (1989); Goodson's compilation *Studying Teachers' Lives* (1992); Cole & Knowles's guidebook *Lives in Context* (2001), or Pinar et al's "Chapter 10: Understanding Curriculum as Autobiographical/ Biographical Text" (2002). Sorting out what is life history versus what is not requires a note here. In identifying predominant strands of life history in education, this study adopts Denzin (1989), Goodson (1995); Hatch & Wisniewski (1995), and Cole and Knowles's (2000, 2001) understanding that life history elaborates on life stories [biographies, autobiographies] in articulating contexts or structures. By elaborating on life stories in articulating contexts or structures, these life stories are transformed into life histories (Denzin, 1989; Goodson, 1995; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Cole & Knowles 2001). This understanding delimits life history and excludes, for example, more generalized uses of narrative inquiry (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Schubert, 1989). This understanding does not exclude, on the other hand, autobiographical applications of life history in which the researcher uses her own life story as data source in articulating contexts or structures (Middleton, 1992; Cole, 1994; Cole, 2001; Knowles, 2001a; Knowles, 2001b; Rose, 2001). This position, though more specific and pointed here, corresponds to and further articulates the delineation of "Life history" in Chapter Three.

^v Many gender studies in education begin, unproblematically, with naturalized biological "boys" or "men" thereby side-stepping the standard sociological frame of gender construction assumed in this study (for summary, see Scott & Jackson, 2002). See Bailey's (2002) voluminous edition, *Gender in Education*, for numerous studies that assume the primacy of naturalized biological gender categories. As this critical study assumes masculinity as social construction, literatures assuming "boys" or "men" as natural gender categories will not receive attention here. They belong to positivist or realist inquiry into gender rather constructivist or critical inquiry that works with gender

as a social construction (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995; Connell, 1996; Scott & Jackson, 2002; and others).

^{vi} Although a small but emergent critical “canon” exists detailing male students’ practices of local masculinities (Hargreaves, 1967; Willis, 1977; Tolson, 1977; Foley, 1990), teachers’ masculinities represent the key focus in this critical study.

Appendix A: Consent Form

Title: White male teachers of diverse students on whiteness, difference, and equity pedagogy.
IRB PROTOCOL # 2005 06 0055

Conducted By: James C. Jupp (Sponsored by Lisa J. Cary, PhD)
Of University of Texas at Austin, Curriculum and Instruction Department, Curriculum Studies Area;
Telephone: 512/414-3078 (wk); 512/374-9388 (hm); 512/320-0125 (wk fax).

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The person in charge of this research will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can stop your participation at any time by simply telling the researcher. You may also waive any question in the research process by simply telling the researcher.

The purpose of this study is to understand white male teachers' lives and their perspectives on race (including their own), difference, and instructional teaching strategies designed for reaching students from diverse backgrounds.

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to do the following things:

- Participate in two (audio) tape recorded semi-structured interviews lasting (approximately) one hour each.
- Participate in one (audio) tape recorded focus group meeting lasting (approximately) three hours .

Total estimated time to participate in study is five hours.

Risks and Benefits of being in the study

• **Risks:** The minimal risk in this study is represented by possible loss of data confidentiality. This risk is reduced by transcribing (audio) tape-recorded data on a pass-worded computer, using pseudonyms to protect participants' anonymity in the transcription of data, destroying audio tapes after their transcription, and disposing of all data when the researcher is finished with it.

- **Benefits:** N/A

Compensation:

- **Participants** will receive a gift certificate to a local book store for an amount of sixty dollars.

The **records** of this study will be stored securely and kept private. Authorized persons from The University of Texas at Austin and members of the Institutional Review Board have the legal right to review your research records and will protect the **confidentiality** of those records to the extent permitted by law. All publications will exclude any information that will make it possible to identify you as a subject. Audio recordings of interviews and focus group meetings will be destroyed after they are transcribed. All data will be destroyed when the researcher is finished with it.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have any questions about the study please ask now. If you have questions later or want additional information, call the researchers conducting the study. Their names, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses are at the top of this page.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact Clarke A. Burnham, Ph.D., Chair, The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, (512) 232-4383.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and have sufficient information to make a decision about participating in this study. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

Date: _____

Signature of Investigator: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B, Interviewing Round One: Semi-Structured Life Story Interview Questions

The *inclusion of, sequencing, and wording* to these questions will vary depending on participants' responses. As interviews are semi-structured, participants will collaborate with the researcher regarding the direction and content of the interviews.

1. Tell me about yourself, in terms of what you recall growing up, going to school, studying in college?
 - a. What was growing up like for you?
 - b. What was going to school like for you?
 - c. Tell me about your college experience.
2. When did you start thinking about becoming a teacher?
3. Tell me how you got into teaching?
4. What was learning to teach (diverse) students like?
5. How would you describe life as a teacher? What do you see as important to your teaching, why?

The interviewer takes notes during the interview and conducts member checking after the interview.

Estimated time to conduct this interview: one hour.

**Appendix C, Interviewing Round Two:
Semi-Structured Interview on Whiteness, Difference, and Equity Pedagogy**

The *inclusion of, sequencing, and wording* of these questions will vary depending on participants' answers in the first round of interviews. The wording of these questions will follow the participants' wording of issues from the initial round of interviews as closely as possible. As interviews are semi-structured, participants will collaborate with the researcher regarding the direction and content of the interviews.

1. Tell me about being a white teacher (of diverse students)?
2. How does your school experience compare with that of your students?
3. Tell me about your experience working with (diverse) students.
4. Tell me about the students (from diverse groups) you teach.
5. Tell me about your most successful students. Which groups of students are most successful academically? What factors make a student successful?
6. Tell me about students who don't do so well. Which groups of students are not so successful? What factors make a student fail?
7. How do you go about reaching the students' in your class?
8. Tell me about some lessons you developed that really work for you? Why do those lessons work?
9. Tell me about some lessons that didn't work out so well? What happens when lessons don't work out?
10. What have you learned about how classrooms work (with diverse students)?
11. From your point of view, what makes for a successful teacher of diverse students?
12. What advice would you have for a first year teacher?
13. What about the school environment helps you accomplish your work?
14. What about the school environment gets in the way of your work? What makes success difficult?
15. What does it mean (for you) to be white and teach diverse students?

Appendix D: Flexible Agenda for the Focus Group Meeting

This agenda will vary in its direction depending, in part, on the input of the participants; however, the overall process of reviewing transcripts, reflecting on the research process, and engaging findings will stay in place.

1. Review interview transcripts
2. Reflect on the process
3. Review researcher findings: What do you think about the findings of this research?
4. Discuss/question/critique emergent patterns
5. Discuss/question/critique the researcher's interpretations of the patterns.
6. General comments

Appendix E: Flexible Agenda for Debriefing Sessions with Peers of Color

This agenda will vary in its direction depending, in part, on the input of peers; however, the overall process of shared reflections on the research process and emergent findings will stay in place.

- 1) Researcher shares emergent findings
- 2) Peer responds, reflects, questions, and critiques
- 3) Researcher shares perceptions of the research process
- 4) Peer responds, reflects, questions, and critiques
- 5) General Reflections, perceptions, conclusions, or comments on the research process or the emergent findings

Bibliography

Allison, C.B. (1998). Okie Narratives: Agency and whiteness. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, N.M. Rodriguez, & R.E. Chennault (Eds.) *White reign: Deployng whiteness in America* (229-244). New York, NY: St Martin's Press.

Anderson, J.D. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Anyon, J. (1997). Chapters 1& 2. *Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform* (pp. 3-38). New York, N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

Anyon (1995). Race, social class, and educational reform in an inner-city school. *Teachers College Record* 97(1), 69-94.

Apple, M. (1993). Constructing the "other": Rightist reconstructions of common sense. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (24-39). New York, NY: Routledge.

Apple, M. (1998). *Forward*. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, N.M. Rodriguez, & R.E. Chennault (Eds.) *White reign: Deployng whiteness in America* (ix-xii). New York, NY: St Martin's Press.

Apple, M.W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Atkinson, R. (1998). *The life story interview*. London: Sage.

Barone, T. (1995). Persuasive writings, vigilant readings, and reconstructed characters: The paradox of trust in educational story sharing. In J.A. Hatch & R.

Wisniewski's (Eds.) *Life history and narrative* (pp. 63-74). New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Beynon, J. (2002). *Masculinities and culture*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Bloom, L.R. & Munro, P. (1995) Conflicts of selves: Nonunitary subjectivity in women administrators' life history narratives. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.) *Life history and narrative* (pp. 99-112). New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Blumenfield-Jones, D. (1995). Fidelity as criterion for practicing and evaluating narrative inquiry. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.) *Narrative and life history*. New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Britzman, D. (1997). Difference in a minor key: Some modulations of history, memory, and community. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L.C. Powell, & L. Mun Wong (Eds.) *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brodin Sacks, K. (1997). How did Jews become white folks? In R. Delgado and J. Stephancic (Eds.) *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 395-401). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1985). Narrative and paradigmatic modes of thought. In Elliot Eisner (ed.), *Learning and teaching the ways of knowing* (pp. 97-115). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Butler, J. (1999). One: Subjects of Sex / Gender / Desire. In J. Butler *Gender trouble: Feminism and the inversion of identity* (2nd ed.) (pp. 3-33). New York, NY: Routledge.

Butt, R. et al (1992). Collaborative autobiography and the teacher's voice. In I.F. Goodson (Ed.) *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 51-98). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Capello, M. (1997). Useful Knowledge. In R. Delgado and J. Stephancic (Eds.) *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 381-386). Philadelphia, PN: Temple University Press.

Cary, L.J. (2003). In-between curriculum spaces: The effects of power in a post 9/11 world. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 19(3), 85-95.

Cary, L.J. (1999). Unexpected stories: Life history and the limits of representation. *Qualitative Inquiry* 5(3), 411-427.

Chubbock, S.M. (2004). Whiteness enacted, whiteness disrupted: The complexity of personal congruence. *American Educational Research Journal* 41(2), 301-333.

Clandinin, D.J. & Connelly, F.M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coetzee, J.M. *Waiting for the Barbarians*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Cole, A.L. & Knowledge, J.G. (2001) *Lives in context: The art of life history research*. New York, NY: Altamira.

Cole, A.L. & Knowles, J.G. (2000) *Researching teaching: Exploring teacher development through reflexive inquiry*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Collins, P.H. (1990). Toward an Afrocentric feminist epistemology. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (pp. 201-220). New York: Routledge.

Collins, P.H. (2000). What's going on? Black feminist thought and the politics of postmodernism. In E.A. St. Pierre & W.S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 41-73). New York, NY: Routledge.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. W. (2002). Hegemonic masculinity. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.) *Gender: A sociological reader* (60-62). New York, NY: Routledge

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. (1996). Teaching the boys: New research on masculinity, and gender strategies for schools. *Teachers College Record* 98(2), 206-235.

Cremin, L. (1964). *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957*. Vintage Books: New York, NY.

-
- Crotty, M. (2003). *The Foundations of Social Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review* 56 (1), 18-36.
- Davis, O. L. (1997). Beyond best practices toward wise practices. *Journal of curriculum and supervision* 13(1), 1-5.
- Delphy, C. (1993). *Women's Studies International Forum* 16(1), 1-9.
- Denzin, N.K. (1989). *Interpretive biography*. London: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1997 [1916]). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997 [1938]). *Education and experience*. New York, NY: Touchstone Books.
- Dewey, J. (1990 [1902]). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Doyle, W. and Ponder, G. (1977/78). The practicality ethic in teacher decision-making. *Interchange* 8(1), 1-12.
- Dyer, R. (1988). White. *Screen* 29 (4), 44-64.
- Emerson, et al. (1995). *Writing ethnographic field notes*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Emihovich, C. (1995). Distancing passion: Narratives in social science. *Qualitative Studies in Education* 8(1), 37-48.

Foley, D. (2002a). Critical ethnography: The reflexive turn. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(5), 469-490.

Foley, D. (2002b). Critical ethnography in the post critical moment. In Y. Zou & E.T. Trueba (Eds.) *Ethnography in schools: Qualitative approaches to the study of education* (139-170). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Foley, D. (1995). *The Heartland chronicles*. Philadelphia, PN: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Foley, D. (1990). *Learning capitalist culture deep in the heart of Tejas*. Philadelphia, PN: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *The social construction of whiteness: White women, race matters*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, P. (1998a [1968]). *La educación como práctica de la libertad* (47th ed.). México, D.F.: Siglo Vientiuno Editores.

Freire, P. (1998b [1970]). *Pedagogía del oprimido* (51st ed.). México, D.F.: Siglo Vientiuno Editores.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Goldstein, L. (1998). More than gentle smiles and warm hugs: Applying the ethic of care to early childhood education. *Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, 12(2), 244-261.

Goldstein, L. (2002). *Reclaiming caring in teaching and teacher education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Goodson, I.F. (1992a). Studying teachers' lives: An emergent field of inquiry. In I.F. Goodson (Ed.) *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 1-17). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Goodson, I.F. (1992b). Studying teachers' lives: Problems and possibilities. In I.F. Goodson (Ed.) *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 234-249). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Goodson, I.F. (1995). The story so far: Personal knowledge and the political. In J.A. Hatch and R. Wisniewski (Eds.) *Life history and narrative*. New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Goodson, I.F. & Walker, R. (1990). *Biography, identity, & schooling: Episodes in educational research*. New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

Gramsci, A. (2000). *The Gramsci reader* (Ed. D. Forgacs). New York, NY: New York University Press.

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

Hall, S. (2004a). Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity. In D. Moreley & K.H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 411-440). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hall, S. (2004b). New ethnicities. In D Moreley & K.H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 441-450). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1981). The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In G. Bridges & R. Brunt (Eds.), *Silver linings: Some strategies for the eighties* (pp. 28-52). London: Lawrence And Wishart.

Hall, S.; Clark, J.; Jefferson, T.; & Roberts, B. (1993 [1975]). Subcultures, cultures, and class. In S. Hall & T. Jefferson (Eds.) *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britian* (pp. 9-74). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hargreaves, D.H. (1967). *Social relations in a secondary school*. New York, New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hatch, J.A & Wisniewski, R. (1995). Life history and narrative: questions, issues, and exemplary works. In J.A. Hatch and R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp. 113-136). New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Hebdige, D. (1979). From culture to hegemony. In D. Hebdige *Subculture: The meaning of style* (pp. 5-19). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hernstein, R.J. & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Hirsch, E.D. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Hobsbawm, E.J. (1999). Introduction. In D. Forgacs (Ed.) *The Antonio Gramsci reader*. New York, NY: The New York University Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Horsman, R. (1975). Scientific racism and the American Indian in the mid-nineteenth century. *American Quarterly XXVII* (2), 152-168.

Horsman, R. (1997) Race and manifest destiny: The origins of American racial Anglo Saxonism. In R. Delgado and J. Stephancic (Eds.) *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 139-144). Philadelphia, PN: Temple University Press.

Ignatiev, N. (1997). Treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity. In R. Delgado and J. Stephancic (Eds.) *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 607-612). Philadelphia, PN: Temple University Press.

Jackson, S. & Scott, S. (2002). Introduction: The gendering of sociology. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.) *Gender: A sociological reader* (pp. 1-26). New York, NY: Routledge.

Jennings, F. (1976). *The invasion of America: Indians colonialism, and the cant of conquest*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Julien, I & K. Mercer. Introduction: De margin and de centre. *Screen* (29)4, 2-10.

Katz, M.B. (1989). *The undeserving poor: From the war on poverty to the war on welfare*. Pantheon: New York, NY.

Kincheloe, J.L. & McLaren, P. (2002). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In Y. Zou & E.T. Trueba (Eds.) *Ethnography in schools: Qualitative*

approaches to the study of education (87-138). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Kincheloe, J.L. & Steinberg, S.R. (1998). Addressing the crisis of whiteness: Reconfiguring white identity in a pedagogy of whiteness. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, N.M. Rodriguez, & R.E. Chennault (Eds.) *White reign: Deployng whiteness in America* (pp. 3-30). New York, NY: St Martin's Press.

Knowles, J.G. (1992). Models for understanding pre-service and beginning teachers' biographies: Illustrations from case studies. In I.F. Goodson (Ed.) *Studying teachers lives*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Knowles, J.G. (2001). Writing the professor: Thomas. In A.L. Cole & J.G. Knowles *Lives in context: The art of life history research* (pp. 230-232). New York, NY: Altamira.

Knowles, J.G. & Thomas, S. (2001). Insights and inspiration from an artist's work, Envisioning and portraying lives in context. In Cole, A.L & Knowles, J.G. *Lives in context: The art of life history research* (pp. 208-214). New York, NY: Altamira.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, NY: Harper.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, (32)3, 465-491.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Lincoln, Y.S. (1996). Curriculum studies and the traditions of inquiry: The humanistic tradition. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.) *The handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 79-97). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster MacMillan.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1998). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (pp. 195-220). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Mahony, P., Hextall, I, & Menter, I (2004). Threshold assessment and performance management: Modernizing or masculinizing teaching in England. *Gender & Education 16*(2), 132-149.

McCarthy, C. & Crichlow, W. (1993). Introduction: Theories of identity, theories of representation, theories of race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (xiii-xxix). New York, NY: Routledge.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. Wellesley Center for Research on Women. Wellesley, MA. Working Paper 189.

McIntyre, A. (2002). Exploring whiteness and multicultural education with prospective teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry* (32)1.

-
- Mertens, D.M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Middleton, S. (1992). Developing a radical pedagogy: Autobiography of a New Zealand sociologist of women's education. In I.F. Goodson (Ed.) *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 18-50). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Middleton, S. (1993). *Educating feminists: Life histories and pedagogy*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Mills, C.W. (2000 [1956]). *The power elite*. New York, NY: Oxford Press.
- Mills, C.W. (2000 [1959]). *The sociological imagination*. New York, NY: Oxford Press.
- Moll, L. C. (1992). Bilingual classroom studies and community analysis: Some recent trends. *Educational Researcher*, 21:2, 20-24.
- Monasta, A. (1993). Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937). *Prospects: The Quarterly Review of Comparative Education XXIII*(3/4), 597-612.
- Muchmore, J.A. (2001). A life history as artistic interpretation. In A.L. Cole & J.G. Knowles (Eds.) *Lives in context: The art of life history research*. New York, NY: Altamira.
- Nespor, J. & Barber, L. (1995). Audience and the politics of narrative. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.) *Life history and narrative* (pp. 49-62). New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Nieto, S. (1999). Chapters 3 & 4: Culture and learning and Who does the accommodating? *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities* (pp. 47-71; pp. 72-102). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

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

Ogbu, J. (1987). Opportunity structure, cultural boundaries, and literacy. In J. Langer (Ed.), *Language, literacy, and culture: Issues of society and schooling* (pp. 149-178). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Ogbu, J. & Simmons, H.D. (1998). Voluntary and involuntary minorities: A cultural-ecological theory of school performance with some implications for education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* (29)2, 155-188.

Omi, M., & Winnant, H. (1993). On the theoretical status of the concept of race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Ed.s) , *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 3-10). New York, NY: Routledge.

Omi, M. & Winnant, H (1994). *Racial formation in the United States* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Paley, V.G. (2000[1979]). *White Teacher*. Cambridge MS: Harvard University Press.

Pinar, W.F. (1975). Currere: Toward reconceptualization. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.) *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 396-414.

Pinar, W.F. (2004a). Introduction and the miseducation of the American public. *What is curriculum theory?* (pp. 1-34). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Pinar, W.F. (1993). Notes on understanding curriculum as racial text. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Ed.s) , *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 60-70). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pinar, W.F. (2004b). The primal scene: "Mortal educational combat." *What is curriculum theory* (pp. 65-92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Pinar, W.F. et al (2002a). Understanding curriculum as autobiographical text. *Understanding curriculum* (pp. 515-566). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Pinar, W.F. et al (2002b). Understanding curriculum as gender text. *Understanding curriculum* (pp. 358-403). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Polkinghorne, D.E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Rains, F. (1999). Dancing on the sharp edge of the sword: Women of color in white academe. In L. Christian-Smith & K.S. Kellor (Eds.), *Everyday knowledge and uncommon truths: Women of the Academy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Reid, W. A. (1984). Curriculum community and liberal education: A response to 'The practical 4.' *Curriculum inquiry* 14(1), 103-111.

Reid, W. A. (1999). *Curriculum as institution and practice: Essays in the deliberative tradition*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Reid, W. A. (2001). Rethinking Schwab: Curriculum theorizing as a visionary activity. *Journal of curriculum and supervision* 17, 29-41.

Riessman, C.K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. London: Sage.

Rodriguez, N. (1998). Emptying the content of whiteness: Toward an understanding of the relation between whiteness and pedagogy. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, N.M. Rodriguez, & R.E. Chennault (Eds.) *White reign: Deployng whiteness in America* (pp. 31-63). New York, NY: St Martin's Press.

Roediger, D. (1994b). Introduction: From the social construction of whiteness to the abolition of whiteness. *Toward the abolition of whiteness: Essays on race, politics, and working class history* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Verso.

Roediger, D. (1994a). Whiteness and ethnicity in the history of 'white ethnics' in the United States. *Toward the abolition of whiteness: Essays on race, politics, and working class history* (pp. 181-198). New York, NY: Verso.

Said, E. (1989). Representing the colonized: Anthropology's interlocutors. *Critical Inquiry* (15) 2, 205-225.

Said, E. (1993). The politics of knowledge. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Ed.s), *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 306-314). New York, NY: Routledge.

Sauvageau, J. (1989). *Stories that must not die*. Los Angeles: Pan American Publishing Company, Inc.

Scheurich, J. (2002). Toward a white discourse on white racism. In J. Scheurich (Ed.), *Anti-racist scholarship: An advocacy* (pp. 25-36). New York: State University of New York Press.

Scheurich, J. and Young, M. (1997). Coloring epistemology. *Research method in the postmodern* (pp. 132-158). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Schlesinger, A. M. (1953). *The Age of Jackson*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Company.

Schwab, J. J. (1978a). The practical: A language for curriculum. In I. Westbury and N.J. Wilkof's (Eds.) *Science, curriculum, and the liberal tradition* (pp. 287-321). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Schwab, J.J. (1978b). The practical: Arts of the eclectic. In I. Westbury and N.J. Wilkof's (Eds.) *Science, curriculum, and the liberal tradition* (pp. 322-364). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago

Schwab, J.J. (1978c). The practical: Translation into curriculum. In I. Westbury and N.J. Wilkof's (Eds.) *Science, curriculum, and the liberal tradition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 365-384.

Schwab, J.J. (1983). The practical 4: Something for curriculum professors to do. *Curriculum inquiry* 13(3), 240-265.

Shor, I. (1987). *Critical teaching and everyday life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

-
- Shor, I. (1992) *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review* 57(1), 1-22
- Semali, L. (1998). Perspectives on the curriculum of whiteness. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, N.M. Rodriguez, & R.E. Chennault (Eds.) *White reign: Deployng whiteness in America (177-192)*. New York, NY: St Martin's Press.
- Skelton, A. (1993). On becoming a male physical education teacher: The informal culture of students and the construction of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Education* 5(3), 289-304.
- Sleeter, C. (2002). Advancing a white discourse: A response to Scheurich. In J. Scheurich (Ed.), *Anti-racist scholarship: An advocacy* (pp. 42-45). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Sleeter, C. (1993). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Ed.s) , *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 157-171). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools. *Journal of teacher education* 52(2), 94-106
- Sleeter, C. (1992). Resisting racial awareness: How teachers understand the social order from their racial, gender, and social class locations. *Educational foundations*, 6(2), 7-32.

Sleeter, C. (1995). Teaching whites about racism. In R.J. Martin (Ed.), *Practicing what we teach: Confronting diversity in teacher education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Spring, J. (2000). *The American school 1642-2000*. (5th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Stanley, L. (1987). Should 'sex' really be gender – or 'gender' really be 'sex'. In R. Anderson and W. Sharrock (Eds.) *Applied sociology* (pp. 115-133). London: Allen & Unwin.

US Census Bureau. Teachers by race (2005). www.uscensus.gov

Tyack, D. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tolson, A. (1977). *The limits of masculinity: Male identity and women's liberation*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Valencia, R. & Solórzano, D.G. (1997). Contemporary deficit thinking. In R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking* (pp. 160-210). London: Falmer Press.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). Subtractive schooling: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Villenas, S. (1996). The colonizer/colonized Chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field. *Harvard Educational Review* 66(4), 711-731.

Villenas, S. (2000). This ethnography called my back: Writings of the exotic gaze, “othering” Latina, and recuperating Xicanisma. In E.A. St. Pierre & W.S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 74-95). New York, NY: Routledge.

West, C. (1993b). The dilemma of the Black intellectual. In *Keeping the faith: Philosophy and race in America* (pp. 67-88). New York: Routledge.

West, C. (1993a). The new cultural politics of difference. In *Keeping the faith: Philosophy and race in America* (pp. 3-32). New York: Routledge.

West, C. (1993c). Theory, pragmatisms and politics. In *Keeping the faith: Philosophy and race in America* (pp. 89-105). New York: Routledge.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). *Gender and Society* 1(2), 125-51.

Willis, P. (1977). Elements of a culture. In P. Willis *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs* (pp. 11-51). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Willis, P. (1993 [1975]). The cultural meaning of drug use. In S. Hall & T. Jefferson (Eds.) *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain* (pp. 106-118). New York, NY: Routledge.

Zeller, N. (1995). Narrative strategies for case reports. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.) *Life history and narrative* (pp. 75-88). New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Zinn, H. (2003). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-present*. New York, NY: Perennial Classics.

Vita

James Cropsey Jupp, the author of this dissertation, was born on June 30th in 1964 in Morristown New Jersey. Son of William Bradford Jupp, Jr. and Jean Lott Jupp, the author moved to Houston, Texas when he was eight, and since then, he spent all of his years in Mexico or Texas. Living in Mexico for ten years, in Mérida, Yucatán and Matamoros, Tamaulipas provided lived experiences with cultural difference that influenced the author's understandings.

The author received his BA in sociology and English in December 1988, and soon after that began working as a teacher. In August 2000, the author received his masters in literature and curriculum and instruction from the University of Texas at Brownsville. In May 2006, the author completed his doctorate in curriculum studies at the University of Texas at Austin.

The author as spent the last fifteen years as an educator of diverse students. During his time as an educator of diverse students, the author initiated and brought to fruition two advanced academics programs in Austin, Texas: The Austin ISD Magnet for Humanities, Law, and International Studies and the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program at Martin Middle School. Additionally, the author has eight peer-reviewed publications in different professional journals including *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *The Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *The Multicultural Review*, and *The English Journal*.

Permanent address: 610-B Franklin Blvd. Austin, Texas 78751

This dissertation was typed by the author.