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Abstract

In this current project I set out to critically read the practices and discourses which are invested in socializing women to be teachers in Early Childhood Education. In order to better understand the complex processes of identification within a community of shared practice, I have attempted to disrupt the text in a way which interrupts dominant academic discourses and which also fattens the scope of the focus. By mirroring my own participation in teacher-training within Early Childhood Education communities against my participation as a graduate student in the Faculty of Graduate Studies, I have tried to uncover the social and institutional relations which interact in the (discursive) production of self. While acknowledging, on the one hand, that identity is multiplicitous, there are undeniable ideologies which maintain a "logic of unity" in the construction and production of self. These oppositionalities are analyzed in this document as sites of struggle; specifically in the institutionalized practices of observation and in journalling.
The participation of women in the social/political arena of professionalism continues to pit gender/race/class against the traditional dominant discourses and practices of education. Working in opposition to these structures is both a performance and an interpretation of participation: how these conflicts manifest in issues of identification, affiliation, and community membership are critical issues for research and practice in education.
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[Creative practice] can be the long and difficult remaking of an inherited (determined) practical consciousness: a process often described as development but in practice a struggle at the roots of the mind - not casting off an ideology, or learning phrases about it, but confronting a hegemony in the fibres of the self and in the hard practical substance of effective and continuing relationships.

Williams, 1977, p. 212
Pre/text, and the positions of struggle

In the following text I am writing about Early Childhood Education (ECE) teacher-training programs. The practice of this writing is situated in a university community where I work as a graduate student. Within this context, I identify as a writer.

It is a paradoxical position because while I am writing about the politics of teacher-identity, I am speaking from the experience of refusing to identify as a teacher. I am also articulating the struggle to be a writer. The struggle to "be" anything within a dominant cultural order is not without its conflicts and contradictions; what binds these practices and positions together in this particular text is the way women are situated in these communities as subordinate to the theories, traditions, discourses which structure participation in the community. So, while there is a paradox in terms of the multiple reflections which inform this text, the parallel is reflected in my resistance to the traditions of these communities.

With this said, it is useful to elaborate here on how my textual and analytical performance is reflective of my struggle to identify within these communities' practices, and my struggle to contradict these practices at the same time. This project is both about and is this struggle - it is a performance and an interpretation of how the exhibition is informed through acts of resistance. These acts of resistance are not conjunctive acts of bridging contradictions with sensible explanations; rather, these are demonstrative
gestures which take textual form. My interest, in other words, is not in simplifying what is elusive, discursive, but is invested in rendering the complexities and contradictions visible; not to trap the fugitive ideas and dismember them for further study: rather, the task is to anticipate the appearance - however fleeting or distorted - of the insubordinated performance.

By speaking through diverse voices, by shifting the lines of the text in fragmentary and disparate arrangements, and, at times, sending what seems obvious into an oblique position, I am trying to bring the reader into the struggle. It would be more prudent, perhaps, to simply tell the tale: do the research: translate the difficult passages into something more basal: ease the reader in and out of the work I have done (and continue to do) so that the task of understanding what this is all about is effortless. Ideally, the reader here should only need to grapple with the complexity of the ideas, not the density and peculiarities of the text itself.

The purpose of this difficulty is critical to the strategy of understanding the politics of self-making practices. I have tried to write a text which both speaks about and represents the complexity and ambiguity of self-making practices. For example, this text is multitemporal, just as any identity-work is informed with multiple subjectivities. There is the naked surface of the text: a thesis, written in conformity to the strictures of academic responsibility, and written in compliance with the rules and traditions of graduate student relations to the university curriculum. My use of the discourses of these traditions is a speech which is speaking in and against the traditions, just as any self-making work (i.e.,
identity formation[s]) can involve both the discourses of the dominant culture and the
deviant interpretive practices of the sub-culture(s). Then there is the subtext, the
practices of self-making in relation to my own work as a writer, which is to say that I
invest my work with my practical history as a writer, a poet, playwrite, story-teller, and so
on. There is also the context of the ECE teacher-training community, which is the focus
of the work. This context is informed through readings and interpretations of
critical/historical literature, as well as memory-work (Frigga Haug, 1987, 1992), my own
experiences, all of which have affected me deeply and move me to write of these issues. It
is a reading of participation in the ECE community, but is performed through my position
as a writer in the university.

I am not presenting this thesis as a self-indulgent project: it is a political work, at
times, perhaps, a guerrilla interpretation of political work. It is, as well, a theoretical
resource, aimed at a critical feminist reading of the relation between identity and
participation in communities of practice (Jean Lave & Etienne Wenger, 1991), an initial
gesture towards understanding the political dynamics of performance as participation.
Writing in

One must imagine - here she was in the looking glass. It made one start.
...She came so gradually that she did not seem to derange the pattern in the glass, but only to bring in some new element which gently moved and altered the other objects as if asking them, courteously, to make room for her.

Virginia Woolf, 1944/1977, p. 8
Writing in turn

I saw that the university's definition of knowledge was not just racist or sexist, but ensured that marginalized voices could not speak in anything but previously defined roles. We cannot interpret the world in ways that represent our experiences if the criteria for what is worth knowing has already been set for us. Furthermore, if our interpretations and representations are categorically defined as unacceptable and other, then our otherness is also unacceptable.

Carol Schick, 1994, p. 3-4
The lens of this text is focussed on the ECE community of student-teachers and the contradictory practices which are structured into the curriculum. I am particularly interested in considering how the complexities of ECE community's practices and discourses, (specifically, but not exclusively, in diarizing and journalling), participate in teacher-identity issues. I am not wondering, simply, what does it mean to say "I am a teacher"; rather, what does it mean for a woman to identify in a community, where identification involves participation with traditions/practices/discourses which contribute to the subordination of women and children? Specifically, in ECE, what kinds of interactions and relations participate in a student-teacher's engagement in community practices; and what is the relationship between resistance to the traditions of the ECE community-of-practice, and practicing as a teacher in the ECE community?

My own role in the ECE community serves as an example of how the complexity of a student-teacher's participation is both performative and interpretive practice: this is to say that the student-teacher, as a politicized agent in a community of practice, negotiates her professional and personal space within the teaching practices and discourses. This participation is a process of actively constructing a sense of self within the community's practices, but this participation does not necessarily make it possible for the student-teacher to identify as a teacher within the community.
In an effort to organize these concepts of identity and practice within the parameters of a dynamic interpretation of this interaction between learning and participation, I will first discuss Jean Lave & Etienne Wenger's (1991) description and analysis of communities-of-practice as sites of learning and identification, and the political dynamics which structure community participation (eg., Frazer & Lacey, 1993, Williams, 1977).

Following this, I will explore the historical shifts which influence the practices and discourses of early childhood education, with a focus on how these shifts effect the relations of women and children to the ECE community.

I have tried to understand the complexities of two of the more common practices in teacher-training programs, observation and journalling, to explore the connectedness between participation and identification with community practices. By emphasizing the contradictions, I am hoping to enable a critical understanding of community membership.
In a daycare practicum, less than a year into the teacher-training program, I was asked by my cooperating teacher to perform the calendar routine with the children in her group, which consisted of eight four-year old children.

During this routine, one of the children was suddenly overcome with a fit of giggles. I knew I was being observed, evaluated on my ability to "manage" the group, but this girl's giggles were infectious: even I began to laugh.

The cooperating teacher instructed me, then, to direct this girl to the "silly chair" because she was being disruptive. While I thought that disrupting the calendar routine was a welcomed interruption, I complied with the instruction and, effectively echoing the authoritative voice of the observing teacher, I told the girl she would have to sit in the silly chair. (The silly chair is a chair positioned outside the circle area, the purpose being to isolate the child from the rest of the group).

The girl went to the chair and cried, while I continued with the obligatory monotony of naming week-days, the month, and so on.

Following this activity, I approached the girl and apologized to her, comforted her; and I was powerfully aware of a feeling that I identified more with the children than with the teacher. My sense of alliance with the girl was embarrassing to me, because I knew I was expected to perform as an authority figure, the teacher, the adult in charge of young children, and so on.
After my conversation with the girl, the cooperating teacher reprimanded me for apologizing, and explained to me, patiently, speaking to me as though I were one of her four year olds, that by apologizing I undermined my own authority.

What struck me profoundly was that I never spoke to the children in the manner that she spoke to me, and I was significantly offended by what I perceived to be condescending speech: I was both resenting the way she was communicating to me, and experiencing a sense of displacement, for I thought I could never talk to children that way, and I believed, as well, that it was a necessary practice for ECE teachers.
Participation is always based on situated negotiation and renegotiation of meaning in the world. This implies that understanding and experience are in constant interaction - indeed, are mutually constitutive. The notion of participation thus dissolves dichotomies between cerebral and embodied activity, between contemplation and involvement, between abstraction and experience: persons, actions, and the world are implicated in all thought, speech, knowing, and learning.

Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 52
Communities of practice

Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger's (1991) analysis of educative sites as communities-of-practice offers a compelling perspective for considering the shifting relations of power, struggle, and identity within a teacher-training curriculum. Critical to this analysis is the recognition of multiplicities in participation, that there "may well be no such simple thing as 'central participation' in a community of practice." (p. 35). For Lave & Wenger, participation is defined as ways of belonging, through membership and identity; and belonging is, "...therefore not only a crucial condition for learning, but a constitutive element of its content." (p. 35.) Because membership and identity change over time, [eg., as participation changes over time, as newcomers become full participants within a community, and potentially, in turn, participating as "old-timers" with other newcomers], learning is situated within the practices of the community in ways which are inseparable from community membership.

In the same way that membership in a community is inseparable from the practices of a community, identity is inextricable from membership. For example, students who participate in educative communities can, through increased and diverse participation, become student-teachers. They are still members of an educative community, but the possibilities for identification are subtly shifting in relation to the changes in their practices. Eventually, potentially, (ideally), student-teachers can become teachers who participate in educative communities with yet again different sets of practices: they are still members of the community, but are identifying differently within the community. In
turn, and over time, teachers may choose to become supervising teachers to student-teachers, or, in Lave & Wenger's terms, masters to apprentices, and so on it goes in an endless process of change in membership, identity, all related to differing sets of practices and different ways of participating.

This is a radical perspective of learning. What Lave & Wenger propose is that what is learned in educative communities is not necessarily knowledge, per se; rather what is learned - through participation - is an on-going process of identification within the social spheres of certain practices. So, here it is not so much that persons participate in social practices, but more that the way we participate determines what is learned, not as isolated pockets of knowledge but as who we are. The focus then shifts from the content of education to the quality of a person's participation within an educative community.

Specifically, within an ECE teacher-training community, newcomers can be positioned as first-year students who are introduced to the practices of early childhood education through interactions with various members of the early childhood education community. For example, in the program I participated in, we initially engaged in occasional, casual interactions with young children; over time, our participation became increasingly based on educative interactions with young children and early childhood educators. These opportunities took place in a variety of different settings, and with a variety of different educators who worked in the field.

As well, as first-year students, we consulted frequently with second- and third-year students to learn more about classroom experiences. Lave & Wenger acknowledge the
impact peer relations have on learning, emphasizing that the social relations within a community are not solely that of master to apprentice, "...but rather [are] the apprentice’s relations to other apprentices and even to other masters that organize opportunities to learn...It seems typical of apprenticeship that apprentices learn mostly in relation with other apprentices." (p. 92-93). As we moved to second- and third-year positions, newcomers to the program consulted us for advices, for examples of our experiences, and so on. Similarly, as we worked, or apprenticed, with early childhood educators in different classrooms, we moved from university-centered communities to public and private school communities, thus increasing our social interactions and relations with different kinds of practitioners. As such, a community of practice is not necessarily restricted to spatial intimacy, so much as the community is defined through shared, or common discourses and practices.

As we moved through the program over a three-year period, our participation increasingly moved from peripheral practices, eg., as observers or assistants, to supervised teaching experience, to unsupervised teaching opportunities. It is important to note that while our participation changed, we remained, in some aspect, always peripheral to an other kind of participation, always peripheral to some element of the social world of early childhood education community. The teacher-training community is comprised of students, student-teachers, university professors, professional teachers with varying years of experience informing their practice, as well as primary school principles, vice-principles, parents, administrative staff, and, of course, young children. The diversity and
fluidity of these changing social relations is integral to the notion of community membership always being situated in multiple sites, where members are always in some way peripheral to other kinds of practices:

Peripheral participation is about being located in the social world. Changing locations and perspectives are part of actors' learning trajectories, developing identities, and forms of membership.

(Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 36)

Here, learning activity can be understood as a socio-historical movement which takes place within a certain community. This movement occurs as newcomers in a community shift in relation to the persons and practices with which they are participating: thus, over time, and in the context of a social world, learning can be analyzed as a centripetal movement through a community, where participation and practices are always changing (p. 35-37).

Of particular interest for the analysis of early childhood education, specifically teacher-training practices, is the attention given to relations of power which are involved in social structures. Peripherality, for example, is regarded as an empowering position, as "a place in which one moves toward more-intensive participation" (p.36), and as well is a disempowering position, as one is kept from participating more fully in the community. Participation can be experienced as both a source of power and powerlessness, and as
such makes space for allowing the discursive, shifting relations of power to be included as integral to a early childhood education community of practice.

**Legitimate peripheral participation**

Lave & Wenger refer to participation in a community as "legitimate peripheral participation"). Legitimacy is not simply positioned as the opposite of illegitimacy, meaning that there may very well be no such term as "illegitimate peripheral participation"); rather, this expression for describing community practices is a conceptual unit: "each of its aspects is indispensable in defining the others and cannot be considered in isolation." (p. 35). "Legitimacy" speaks more to the presence of the participant, just as "peripheral" speaks to the participant's location - not spatially - but as a community member in relation to other members; "participation" invites involvement in social practices. The whole term, legitimate peripheral participation, is a combination of "shapes, degrees, textures" (p.35) which are constitutive of community membership. Because the emphasis here is on learning through participation in social practices, and not, eg., on direct instruction, the dynamics of the person's involvement in an educative community is perceived more discursively. The social world is described as a system of interconnected relations and activities, "of activity systems and communities, culture, and political economy" (p.122); and identity is regarded as a significant, dynamic process:
The person has been correspondingly transformed into a practitioner, a newcomer becoming an old-timer, whose changing knowledge, skill, and discourse are part of a developing identity - in short, a member of a community of practice. This idea of identity/membership is strongly tied to a conception of motivation. If the person is both a member of a community and an agent of activity, the concept of the person closely links meaning and action in the world.

(Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 122)

Artifacts and technology

The notion of community as historical is expressed in the way participation changes over time, and does not reach any sort of final stage or completion; similarly, the artifacts and technologies of a community of practice are historically signifying kinds of practices and community histories (Lave & Wenger, p. 101).

In the ECE teacher-training community, the use of a two-way mirror as a tool enabling the observation of young children is an example of how a community's artifacts can be more distorting than revealing. The technological history of this particular artifact, for example, is reflective of manipulative practices, covert surveillance, deception, and the historical shadows of these practices are embodied in the use of this mirroring device. Situating this technology in an educative setting unavoidably connects the practice of observing young children to the history of the practical uses of the two-way mirror, thus legitimating deception as an educative practice. Our participation with this tool in the context of the ECE community serves to confuse the relations of power and knowledge, as we "know" about the children by virtue of our powerful position on the window-side of the mirror. This experience with manipulation-as-knowledge is subtly structured into
ECE practices and, in effect, invites us to participate in the oppression of children. And so what this points to is the political dynamic of communities and social practices.

Communities as political sites

Lave & Wenger's analysis of communities of practice does not fully account for the contradictions and complications which can be structured into community discourses and practices. For example, the authors write that legitimate peripheral participation, ...crucially involves participation as a way of learning - of being both absorbing and absorbed in - the 'culture of practice'. An extended period of legitimate peripherality provides learners with opportunities to make the culture of practice theirs.

(p. 95)

If the "culture of practice" is structurally oppressive to the participants, however, the process of identification with the practice is fraught with complications. In order for me to identify as an early childhood educator, for example, I needed to deny/silence the legitimacy of my own childhood experiences. More often than not, my recollections of childhood contradicted the theories of child development being taught to us as student-teachers. As I wrote in the narrative at the close of chapter one, I frequently found myself in the position of identifying with the children, and dodging my relation with teacher authority.

As I discuss more thoroughly in chapter three, early childhood educative practices are historically structured in ways which are oppressive to women and girls: to make this
culture of practice my own, then, I must practice my own oppression, as well as perform the discourses and practices which are oppressive to children.

The artifacts and technologies of a community can be understood as structurally violent - an example of this is the use of a two-way mirror in observation practices, where student-teachers can stand on the window-side of a two-way glass, and covertly observe the interactions of young children in, eg., a nursery setting. Participation with these technologies is problematized as a process of participating with tools which are used for manipulative purposes, and are authorized by the teacher-training curriculum.

Furthermore, Lave & Wenger propose that "...mastery resides not in the master but in the organization of the community of practice of which the master is part..." (p. 94); however, the organization of a community, when examined from a critical perspective, can be read as deceptively oppressive. A community may be organized in ways which privilege certain persons and exclude others - in Western-based military organizations, for example, women participate in men’s traditions of military practice, and the organization of this community is determined by movements and modes of practice which have, traditionally, been exclusive to men’s participation.

It is necessary, then, to acknowledge how a community’s practices can contribute to, or legitimate the reification of structural inequalities which may be inextricable from the community’s organization, and to consider the impact on membership and identity.

So, what happens to persons who participate in communities which are structurally oppressive? Susan Heald (1991) writes,
Those of us who bring to academia any difference from the norm are faced with the work of combining those discourses and managing the contradictions among them. The struggle to fit into the definitions of "normal" are different for differently-located people, although they share some commonalities. It is possible to resist fitting in, but this brings its own set of problems. That these struggles are difficult - maybe impossible - and usually crazy-making is not the concern of those who "authorize" the discourses.

(p. 142, my emphasis)

Resistance to a community's practices thus invites a set of complications which contradict the community's process. Managing the contradictions and negotiating the struggle, as Heald writes, is the task of the dissenting practitioner. Identity and participation, under these conditions of struggle, invariably leads to a process of self-preservation, in conjunction with the practices of self-making; thus, identification is in relation to the oppositional position of the dissenting practitioner.

Certainly, it is possible to move through these communities without the struggle. Walkerdine (1990[1981]) writes of the "forgetting" which she observes in early childhood educators, when the lived relation between the student and educative experiences is somehow dismissed, forgotten, and the educator moves through her teacher-training practice as though she has never been there before, and as if she knows nothing about education, school, or the experience of being a student (p. 17). As Himano Bannerji, Linda Carty, Kari Dehli, Susan Heald and Kate McKenna (1991) write,

The way relations of power and knowledge are organized in and through the university make it possible to live these relations without reflecting on them...This "not seeing" participates in the ruling practices which regulate the social relations in which we live.

(p. 9)
By "not seeing, and "forgetting", then, it is indeed possible to participate in a community of practice unproblematically; although, it is not clear how this sort of resignation to the "inevitable and the necessary" (Williams, 1977, p. 118) weaves itself into identity-work within the community.

Lave & Wenger do acknowledge how contradictions are unavoidably structured into a community of practice, and they note,

...a major contradiction lies between legitimate peripheral participation as the means of achieving continuity over generations for the community of practice, and the displacement inherent in that same process as full participants are replaced (directly or indirectly) by newcomers-become-old-timers... This tension is in fact fundamental - a basic contradiction of social reproduction, transformation and change.

(Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 114)

According to this analysis, newcomers (novices) to a community of practice are invariably participating paradoxically as their positions within the community are constantly shifting, and as their movement is expressed as both the displacement from one position to another, and the continuity of their participation within the community.

Newcomers to a community engage in the traditional practices and discourses as a way of participating with the historical significance of these practices, in order to situate and contextualize their membership in the community. On the other hand, certainly, newcomers are invested in the development of the community's practice, "...as they begin to establish their own identity in its future." (Lave & Wenger, p. 115). Because communities of practice are spatiotemporal communities (i.e., situated in historical context), newcomers invest their participation with an eye to their own future; thus,
innovation, criticism, creativity, and so on, are involved in the newcomer's participation. As well, newcomers may find comfort in the stability of the traditions which inform their practice. Similarly, old-timers may be reformulating their own practices to accommodate historical change, or they may be resisting change to their practices in order to reify the traditions which inform their participation.

What is not clear in this discussion of contradiction and participation, however, is how these processes may complicate newcomer affiliation (membership), and the effect these contradictions may have on the process of identity-through-participation. Another element of communities of practice which is not sufficiently accounted for in Lave Wenger's analysis is the ways in which participation necessarily interacts with, and at times, contradicts community tradition. Obviously, processes of identification through participation cannot be removed from the politics of socialization:

The true condition of hegemony is effective self-identification with the hegemonic forms: a specific and internalized 'socialization' which is expected to be positive but which, if that is not possible, will rest on a (resigned) recognition of the inevitable and the necessary.

(Williams, 1977, p. 118, emphasis in original)

To affiliate with a community, to participate as a member, the newcomer performs in accordance with, (and at times in defiance of) the community's traditions. For Williams, tradition is transformed over time; however tradition is invariably reflective of the interests of the dominance of a specific class of persons. Furthermore, institutions which traditionally privilege certain persons (eg., white males) are going to be more resistant to
the transformative efforts enabled by non-whites, women, and so on, as opposed to the transformative gestures produced by, e.g., white male participants.

Similarly, change will occur in communities over a period of time due to these transformative practices; however, the kinds of change, and benefits or drawbacks resulting from change invariably tend to reflect the traditionally privileged persons' interests, as opposed to the radical/marginal interests.

Williams describes tradition as

...an aspect of contemporary social and cultural organization, in the interest of the dominance of a specific class. It is a version of the past which is intended to connect with and ratify the present. What it offers in practice is a sense of predisposed continuity.

(Williams, 1977, p. 116)

This perspective is congruent with the contradictory process of continuity/displacement as discussed by Lave & Wenger (1991). Tradition, in a community of practice, is not inert, nor is it merely a "historicized segment of a social structure...as the surviving past." (Williams, p. 115); rather, tradition is a selectively controlled version of the past, "...used to ratify the present and to indicate directions for the future..." (Williams, p. 116). Thus, traditions may change through on-going participation, but this is, nonetheless, informed through the practices of a dominant order. Tradition is a deliberately selective and connecting process which enables the reification of a contemporary order: identifying through practice and participation within the traditions of a community, then, involves identification with the dominant order.
The transformative participation which Lave & Wenger refer to seems only possible when the change serves the interests of the dominant/traditional population. If change threatens this tradition, it threatens the community's foundational existence. Newcomers to a community may not have the privileges of the dominant population, and may be historically excluded from a community's history and tradition; and so it is difficult to anticipate how the newcomer's transformative gestures and resistances will impact upon the community's practices.

This is not to suggest that non-dominant/marginalized persons (e.g., lesbians, nonwhites, and, of course, it is worth noting that within this particular community, male teachers represent a marginalized population) cannot participate in the ECE community. In lieu of the conflict of interests, it is still possible for those not reflected in the dominant interests to identify as a practicing member of that community. How identity is constructed and transformed in a community of practice, however, can be understood as reflective of and resistant to dominant interests.

As such, this necessitates an analysis of communities of practice as political sites in order to account for the structures of inequalities and the discursive shifts of power, powerlessness, oppression, resistance, protest, etc.
The politics of community

It is helpful to turn to Elizabeth Lacey and Nancy Frazer's (1993) interpretation of communities as political sites. In their analysis, the authors assume a position which attempts to recognize the impact patriarchal systems and structures have had on social relations within communities:

The feminist argument is that the social order is importantly, in all known societies past and present, a gender order, maintained by power relations. The argument that gender is socially constructed and maintained is an obvious challenge to the liberal conviction that the "private" or "personal" is or can be an area of freedom, for it is in our personal relations that our gender identities are forged and maintained.

(p. 33)

Specifically, if I frame ECE teacher-training practices as communities-of-practice, it is necessary, as Frazer & Lacey advise, to consider a theory of identity "...which acknowledges that within any single society the definitions and expectations of what it means to be a woman will vary greatly by race, by class, by status, by generation." (p.10). Clearly, and as I have discussed, identity is inextricable from practice; as such, given that ECE practices are historically gendered, racialised, classed practices, it is important to consider how these practices inform gendered, racialised, classed identity.

Frazer & Lacey's conception of "community" is particularly useful here for two significant reasons. First, the authors' revised conception of community is explicitly linked to subjectivities and identities as multiple sites which are inseparable from participation within a community's practices and discourses (eg., p. 30). In this way, there
is a compatibility with Lave & Wenger's (1991) conception of communities of practice. Second, Frazer & Lacey are specifically invested in understanding how power engenders resistances to practices and discourses, and how the personal self, eg., identity, is an outcome of these power struggles (Frazer & Lacey, 1993, p. 33). This second element of their analysis of communities allows for a political extension of communities of practice; by theorizing power concepts within communities, issues of membership, identity, and participation are necessarily politicized. As the authors state, "The individual is an embodied site of material forces." (p.33), and so it is necessary to consider how power relations are structured into these material forces.

A provocative example of these interactions of power and practice is available in my experience as a student-teacher with the two-way mirror. It was a powerful site, in one way, standing in the protected supremacy of covert observations, and as a student, I experienced this opportunity as empowering. Simultaneously contradicting this powerful position was my discomfort with the deception of the exercise, the reflection of my own childhood invisibility, the reflection of my own experiences with powerlessness as a child. Though I was participating as a powerful adult in this experience, I was similarly participating as a powerless child: effectively, by practicing one kind of power over children, I found myself to be experiencing the embodied familiarity of powerlessness. In a way, my position in this observation room was one of sanctioned oppression over children, and so was also a personal experience with being oppressed. I was not allowed
to choose whether or not I would participate with the two-way mirror: it was a curricular obligation, and I was being evaluated on my participation in this activity. This lack of choice is also an example of how, as a student, I was in a position of subordination to the teacher-training curriculum. Similarly, as a student-teacher, I was being evaluated on my ability to perform in a position which placed the young children in a subordinated site.

These intricate and complex relations of power serve to reinforce the concept of identity and community membership as being politicized sites, as embodied sites of material forces which are politically inscribed.

Frazer & Lacey's conception of "power" is relevant to this analysis of communities because of their explicit recognition of how "power engenders resistance" (p.34). Since the basis of this reading of early childhood education teacher-training practices is grounded in my own resistances to the program and the curriculum of this community, it is important to avoid romanticizing resistance as always progressive. As Frazer & Lacey remark, "Individuals resisting power may be themselves acting or attempting to act oppressively." (p. 34); thus, I am aware I need to position my own reflections and practices discursively.

By this I mean it would be much easier to situate my experiences in a "heroic" frame, or as a "victim-story", and use this text as a tale of my struggle with experiences of being oppressed. My tendency to identify with the children exemplifies this contradiction.
While I was exercising my frustration with authoritarian teaching practices, I was also denying that my status as an adult is culturally-determined as a powerful position. In this sense, the children were never in a position to negotiate with me. Thus, as an adult, I was in the position to initiate acts of resistance in a context where children have no authority to do so; and I was using this power to pursue my own agenda. The authority here was not actually displaced, then, so much as it was disguised.

I share the view that "...the analysis of the exercise of power cannot be confined to an analysis of the relation between the parties directly involved - those actually present in the discussion, for example." (Frazer & Lacey, p.35); rather, it is more useful to consider the participatory practices within a community as both structural and voluntary practices:

It is important that recognizing that power cannot be seen purely as a possession or attribute of individuals does not result in our locating it in 'structures' where these are completely beyond our understanding or control. All exercises of power presuppose a network of social relations which make the exercise... [or more properly an action, or practice]... possible and significant.

(p. 35)

This comment on voluntary and structural conceptions of power further strengthens the connection between socio-cultural perspectives of educative communities as communities-of-practice, and socio-political notions of communities as political sites. Again the emphasis allows for the historical structures (eg., practices and discourses)
which persist in a participation; however, participation, resistances, performances, etc.,
are voluntary, and are taking place within the social relations of a community. The
combining of these analyses allows for an understanding of the power of social structures
as something more than monolithic; rather, the processes of human agency are
participating in ways which are constitutive of the social structures and the social
relations within these. Power, exercised through social practices, "...infuses our lives
rather than staying in manageable locations where we can reify, identify, and control it." (p. 197).

It is important to note that human agency, as an ability to initiate change and, or,
transcend the illusions of staticity in social organizations is differently exercised in
various socio-political contexts (eg., Maude L. Eduards, 1994). As Eduards points out,
Some people get better training than others in bringing something about, due to class,
race, sex, location, and other factors. Women's agency, for example, is much less used
and applied than men's. (p. 182).

Returning to the ECE community, and the overwhelming dominance of women
participants in the teacher-training community, the ways agency manifests in
performances of accommodation, resistance, compliance, and so on, needs to be
considered in the context of the structurally-oppressive practices of ECE to women and
children. As well, the consequences of and reactions to the acts, from other community
members, also serve to reveal structural elements of the community; for example,
pedagogical expectations of what appropriate behaviour might be - for student-teachers,
for the children at a certain age, for teaching practices, and so on - are unavoidably informed by expectations which are structured in the community norms, discourses, practices, etc.

It is these expectations and assumptions which interest me: the shifting positions of power carry with them certain performative elements. The student-teacher's appearance of being in control, for example, is evaluated as a performance in a classroom setting. Whether the student-teacher is experiencing this sense of being in control is immeasurable: and so the necessity of behaving as though she is in control of a classroom's activities can become the student-teacher's focus. This can be a performance which is informed through ideas and beliefs about what a teacher looks like when she is in control. It can be informed by beliefs about what a classroom looks like when the teacher is in control, what the children do, how the lesson progresses, and so on. But the relationship between this ability to appear as a teacher, and the process of identifying as a teacher can be, at times, so contradictory that participation becomes impossible. This experience is echoed in Deborah Britzman's (1991) account of student-teachers performing in classroom settings. The contradiction between struggling with a semblance of control and the inner-conflict of resisting the position of control, for example, can be irreconcilable.

It is this element of beliefs about teaching, education, children and so on, which needs to be theoretically incorporated into a conceptual frame of communities-of-practice as political sites.
Social representations

Social representations [are] a set of concepts and explanations originating in daily life in the course of inter-individual communications. They are the equivalent, in our society, of the myths and belief systems in traditional societies...

(Moscovici, 1981, p.181)

Social representations describe a social reality that is constructed through the interactions with and communications about the social and physical world. They are regarded, in this theory, as both symbolic and material representations which manifest in conversations, media, texts, entertainment, etc., and refer to the social significance of objects and events. These representations are dependent upon the common meanings in verbal and non-verbal gestures by members of any particular community (Purkhardt, 1993). These common meanings are, in turn, dependent upon a community's social norms, values, and their common history, and are located within the social activity of a community - language, experience, practices, knowledge shared within a community - as well as representations which manifest in individual readings and participation in a community. As such there is a two-way movement between social representations and social action: the structure and content of social representations determine our social actions, and communications and social interaction determine our social representations. These are not static phenomenon, then, but are an ongoing and dynamic process.

An example of this can be found in the ways early childhood educators are encouraged to think about young children, and child development. In a teacher-education environment, "children" are represented through various texts, lectures, theories, narratives of "personal experience", memory, and practical experience working with
young children (which is informed by the representations of children which dominate the ECE curriculum). Within this community, young children are both symbolically represented and materially present, and it is the interactions in this community of teachers, teacher-educators, and young children, that representations of children and childhood are cultivated, promoted, constructed, and transformed.

Kum-Kum Bhavnani's (1991) contribution to this theory of social representations brings attention to the power relations which structure social interactions, "the relations of domination and subordination within communication..." (p. 66). Her argument is that as a process of interaction, social representations are constantly moving in ways which reproduce both the representations and the power relations within which social representations are transmitted.

In the early childhood education community, student-teachers are both subordinated knowers in the professor-student relationship, and are encouraged to assume positions of power in their educative performances with young children. Interestingly, both of these positions are informed with ideas or beliefs which represent the relation between student and teacher. The student-teacher's beliefs about her own ability to be a teacher is, in many ways, contingent upon the professorial evaluations of her teaching performances: and this evaluation invariably seeks to determine how much control the teacher has in a classroom, and how much control she exercises in her teaching. Here, then, the inequalities which structure student-teacher relations are doubled in contradictory ways: for the student-teacher to be successful, she must adhere to the curricular expectations
which depend on her role as a subordinated learner; yet she is regarded as a successful teacher only when she can perform in a role of domination with young children. Thus the social relations in this community reinforce beliefs about teacher authority, but deflect the problem of student-subordination in educative communities. This power shift renders the oppressive practices of ECE invisible by emphasizing instead the dominant ideologies which inform teacher identity.

Bhavnani's (1991) work brings ideologies into view when attempting to understand social representations: "[Ideologies]...are better understood as being regulatory in the process of domination and subordination..." (p.66), and are "...elements which are rooted in political, economic, and social relations." (p. 67). Ideologies, understood as shared systems of beliefs (eg., Thompson, 1984), unavoidably find expression in social representations. Bhavnani argues that social representations can be conceptualized as ideological elements which occur in different (discursive) configurations, "...with different aspects foregrounded in different contexts or discussions, and that they both shape and are shaped by the relationships of domination and subordination in which they are embedded." (p. 68).

In order to account for the ways, eg., racialisations structure and are structured into discourses and practices in the ECE community, the social representation theory outlined here allows for an analysis of the power shifts which are structured by and structured into the communication and practice which take place in the community.
As a student-teacher, I was encouraged to think of racisms as personal beliefs which could be countered with classroom activities which would emphasize that "we" are all the "same". That all the student-teachers in the program at this time were white women, that the faculty with whom we interacted most often were all white women was never explicitly considered as a contributing element to our own privileges. Furthering this racist practice was the implied assumption that "we", as white teachers, could take responsibility for removing racisms from our classroom by bringing images of black children into our curriculum. The use of posters, photographs, children's books, etc., was advocated in our curriculum as a method for confronting racism in the classroom; however, this emphasis on supplying visual representations of black children simultaneously neglected the probability that black children would be present in the classroom. In this way it is the dominant ideology of white privilege which informed our practices as student-teachers, represented the belief that "we", as white women, would be able to eliminate racism.

While racism can be structured into the practices and discourses which inform teacher-identity, these unexamined assumptions about privilege contribute to enforcing the dominant position of white professionals in education by ignoring the way racialisations participate in a community. Ruth Frankenberg (1993) refers to this as "...the production of a white self innocent of racism." (p.188), an evasive practice which is structured in such a way that "...the idea of crossracial common humanity" (p. 188) is asserted without recognition of this idea being presented on white-centered terms. This
uncritical representation of white innocence, as Frankenberg writes, "...averts the white gaze from the harsh realities of power imbalance." (p. 189). By distinguishing the dominant representations (which representations? who is represented, and how?) within a community's practices, a dynamic reading of participation emerges. A critical scrutiny of how representations are socially constructed, reified, transformed, and so on, allows for the inclusion of the more discursive configurations which, as with artifacts and technologies, are historically significant in a reading of participation.

A critical aspect of understanding the ECE community, then, requires a consideration of how the representations of young children, teachers, authorized concepts of ECE curriculum practices, etc., participate in the practices of teacher-training. Identification with, eg., teacher-authority, is doubtlessly informed - in part - through interactions with beliefs about how authority is practiced: these beliefs are inextricable from the representations of authority available in the ECE curriculum.

Beliefs about children, as well, are represented in conjunction with images of authority.

*I vividly recall a film we were shown in a course on child development. We watched as a white male doctor manipulated the limbs and body of a newborn (white male) in order to demonstrate the performative aspects of certain "innate" child behaviours: for example, the "startle reflex" was performed for the viewer by grasping the infants arms, lifting him
off the examining table, and dropping him suddenly. Of course, the infant reacted predictably, startled, trembling uncontrollably, and crying.

Within this series of images are presences of white privilege and professionalism, male dominance and authority, and, again, manipulative practices which are uncritically represented with the intent of informing ECE theory. It is not enough, however, to simply point out which images were offensive to me, which representative practices were violent or oppressive; rather, it is the interactions of practice, informed with these representations, which may reveal how identification and community membership involve participation with ideological processes.

By threading social representation theory into the analysis of communities of practice as political sites, it becomes possible to explore how the discourses and practices of the ECE community can complicate teacher-identity through the contradictions of student-teachers' participation. Practices which are oppressive, violent, and which attempt to reify beliefs about authority and control can be mapped by following the discursive shifts of power which filter and infuse the processes of community membership.

My own resistance to the ways representations of young children dominated the curriculum, and my refusal to accept the dominant beliefs about child development, are experiences which strike me as critical issues for inquiry. As I have written, my reluctance to identify as a teacher in this ECE community seems to be connected with my struggle to transcend the mythological representations of children in early childhood.
education curriculum, and the possibility for establishing a space for my own reality in this curriculum seemed to be contingent upon my ability to perform in contradictory ways.

The three major theoretical frames I have discussed here, (communities-of-practice, the politics of communities, and social representations) contribute to an analysis of community participation which may reveal the more complex, political processes which inform and are informed through participation and community identification.

In order to better understand the political dynamics which inform early childhood education, it is advantageous at this point to read more critically into the historical dimensions of ECE, and examine how the structures of violence and oppression can be incorporated into participation and performance.
I was a teacher. The headmaster followed me home, he divided his face and body into three in order to threaten me with triple peril, so that three headmasters followed me, one on each side and one at my heels.

Janet Frame, *Faces in the water*, 1961
In order to make the presence or absence of the inspector unverifiable, so that the prisoners, in their cells, cannot even see a shadow, Bentham envisaged not only venetian blinds on the windows of the central observation hall, but, on the inside, partitions that intersected the hall at right angles and, in order to pass from one quarter to the other, not doors but zig-zag openings; for the slightest noise, a gleam of light, a brightness in a half-opened door would betray the presence of the guardian.

(Michel Foucault [1979], in Varga, 1992, p. 21)

Through the looking glass

Two mornings a week, as student-teachers in an early childhood teacher-training program, we were required to spend two hours in the Observation Lounge, a narrow corridor sealed off from, and serving as the divide between the university nursery school and the seminar room. In the nursery and in the seminar classroom microphones dangled from the ceilings and video cameras were mounted in corners: the operation of this surveillance equipment was monitored in the Observation Lounge, where we would stand in the dimly lit corridor and watch through the wall-length, two-way mirrors which looked into each room. From this concealed site we were able to observe both the nursery activities and the parents' meetings on the opposite side of the lounge.

eerie, to spend so many hours watching them the way folks gawk at beasts in the zoo, they were only children of course but the looking glass deformed their presence,
the tain was grimy, streaked with the glances and stares of all the student-teachers preceding us;
and the children on the other side,
they often walked up to the mirror and pressed their faces and hands to the glass,
smearing our window with their sweat and saliva...

Now, so many years later, I look back in that room, through the window which was a mirror, at the surveillance equipment, I hear the disembodied voices of the children descending into the room through mounted speakers,

sometimes one of the student-teachers would turn the volume down so low that the children's voices were not much more than a distant echo of static;
the sounds of their play and interactions manipulated
so effortlessly,

we would watch them move

around the nursery in a peculiar silence,

some of us

ventriloquating the activities,

assuming the voices of children,

as we performed a surreal theater.

...and I think that what happened for me during those 13 weeks, and over the course of the three years I was in this particular program, was that I refused to become a teacher. I completed the program, graduated, received my teaching certificate, but I never taught. I refused to. It was not simply resistance to the profession, but an absolute act of dissension. I realize now, too, that I resisted more than the practices and discourses of the early childhood education curriculum: I struggled against the institutionalized denial of my own childhood experiences, I confronted and contradicted the dominant interpretations of child behaviour in a relentless, albeit futile, search for a space where my beliefs, my memories, my questions, my practices could be credible ...and all of it blurred into an unspeakable rage of resistance.
Positions of struggle

Disentangling the complex subjectivities of teachers and children in early childhood education is, at times, a messy task: particularly when these threads are picked apart by women who have taught young children, women who look back on their experiences with a critical, feminist perspective (e.g., Valerie Walkerdine [e.g., 1984, 1986/1992, 1991], Carolyn Steedman [1982, 1987], Alison Kelly [1994], Sue Smedley [1994] and Donna Varga [1991, 1993]. Not only does this sort of scholarly work entail a critical reading of institutional practices, it necessitates a critical re-reading of our own practices, our own participation in the institution's practices and discourses, our own investments and sacrifices in early childhood education. But Ruth Frankenberg (1993), expressing the Gramscian view (Gramsci,1977/1993) has pointed out, "Any system of domination can be seen most clearly from the subject position of those oppressed by it." (Frankenberg, 1993, p.5).
Early childhood education is specifically and historically gendered. Sue Smedley (1994) writes, "Positioned as mothers and nurturers, women have been and are deemed suited to teaching, and are inserted into a discourse where they operate with a pastoral, supportive, responsible role." (p. 46). This responsibility of teachers (women) is fraught with impossible contradictions:

Teachers are responsible for the normal development of all children... This impossible task is likely to produce considerable guilt at inevitable failure. It has particular gendered consequences for women teachers.

(Walkerdine, in Smedley, 1994, p. 51)

Labaree (1992) also discusses the impact of this compulsory femininity by exploring the genealogy of teaching as a profession, noting that, historically, "...teaching has been ideologically congruent with notion of female domesticity..." (p. 132). Not only do women dominate early childhood educative practices, it puts women in a situation that mimics both the nurturing role of the mother and the subordinate role of the wife (eg., Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Lortie, 1973; Partick, Griswold, & Robertson, 1985; Weiler, 1988).

What interests me is the initiation process, the training of women, the socialization of women as students into the teaching profession. A critical scrutiny of ECE teacher-training practices is useful for clearing a space where I might better understand how the
socialization of women as educators can encourage participation in practices which are 
oppressive, violent, and, as Walkerdine states, "an impossible fiction" (1986/1992, p.20).

**Developmentally appropriate practice**


*Developmentally appropriate practice* describes an educative mechanism which determines, through the application of psychologically-grounded child development theory, what children may be capable of doing at any given stage in their development. DAP advocates that teachers be knowledgeable of various theory which specializes in cognitive, social, emotional, physical, and language development. Teaching practice
which conforms to DAP considers each child's developmental level with the realm of these areas and establishes the educative activities for each child accordingly. The basis for determining a child's "readiness" is informed through dominant child development theories, specifically the authorized work attributed to Erik Erikson (1968), and Jean Piaget (1962), and in many cases, the theories of Sigmund Freud, B.F. Skinner, and Arnold Gesell are included as historically significant to DAP (in eg., Spodek, et. al, 1991)

According to DAP, the age of the children to which the activity is aimed is a determinant for establishing which areas of development will be stimulated. Thus, it would be deemed inappropriate to present a formal math lesson to preschool children, since, according to cognitive-development theory, (Piaget, 1962) they are not capable of manipulating abstract concepts. Similarly, it is appropriate for eight-year old children to work in cooperative groups, since, according to emotional and social development theory (Erikson, 1968), they are no longer egocentric, and actively seek stimulation from peer interaction.

The unavoidable paradox inscribed in these discourses is positioned between the expressed expectation that all curriculum and teaching practices conform to the expectations of developmentally appropriate practice, and that all curriculum and teaching practices be adapted to children's individual needs (eg., NAEYC (1991) Position Statement, p.27). On the one hand, student-teachers are required to learn age-specific stages of "normal" child development to enable a knowledge-base which describes for the
teacher kinds of normalcy. On the same hand, however, student-teachers are evaluated on their ability to recognize and meet children's individual needs, to assume the role of someone who will be "held responsible for the development of each individual."

(Walkerdine, 1986/92, p. 20).

Difference, in DAP, is both the exception...

It should...be noted that developmental research has provided us with a picture of normal development of children. While this picture represents the central tendencies of development, with half the children developing at a somewhat faster rate and the other half at a somewhat slower rate, it does represent the characteristics of most children at particular points in their lives. Teachers can plan for appropriate activities knowing about how most children mature, then making modifications for the individual differences that are found in a particular class.

(Spodek et al., 1991. p. 84)

...and the expectation:

Developmental appropriateness ... incorporates two central tenets: 'there are universal, predictable sequences of growth and change that occur in children during the first 9 years of life', but 'each child is a unique person with an individual pattern and timing of growth, as well as individual personality, learning style, and family background.' (p.2). (Sally Lubeck, 1994, p. 31)

Here, "normal" is colluding with "difference" to produce an institutional gaze which can only struggle in the vague perspectives of "children", as "students": vague, at best, and unavoidably irrational. Individual differences are contradicted constantly by the expectation of normalcy, just as ideologies about normalcy are countered by individual differences. Trapped between these polarities, a student-teacher is, nonetheless, evaluated on her ability to perform within the fictions, as opposed to how she might negotiate or
collapse these oppositional ideologies. By positioning the teacher as the adult with the dominant gaze, as the person who is expected to "see" what is not there, the institutionalized perspective provides an impossible vision. And, as Walkerdine notes, it is the female teacher who is to contain this irrationality and to transform it into reason, where it can do no harm - a transformation of physical violence into the symbolic violence of mastery, the law. And in each case, the woman as container soaks up and contains the irrationality which she best understands.

(1986/92, p. 21)

As an ideology, developmentally appropriate practice can be seen as thriving because it is a practice grounded in the political strength of the dominant culture, informed by modern science. ECE has traditionally been dependent upon the scientization of children for informing its practices (Varga, 1991), and because DAP is empirically defensible, it is more easily naturalized into the community of practice, and more solidly positioned as ideologically profound.

Donna Varga (1993), referring to Raymond Williams (1977), remarks that...dominant ideologies are never permanent and static, but require continuous struggle on the part of their supporters, to be 'renewed, recreated, defended, and modified' (p. 112)

(Varga, 1993, p. 138)

The struggle for the student-teacher, then, is sandwiched somewhere between the dominant ideologies about children's development, and the impossible practice of teaching children as individuals with individual differences. And whether or not she explicitly supports the ideology, she is, nonetheless, perpetuating its dominance as she attempts to perform in the irrational, impossible spaces provided:
...teachers must be knowledgeable about what constitutes developmentally appropriate curriculum...Once teachers have a reasonable knowledge of what young children are like, they need to understand how to teach them effectively, since the more easily children learn, the more competent they will feel...[T]here are some basic principles about how all young children learn that are generally regarded as true.

(Joanne Hendrick, 1990, p. 5-6)

Ideologies concerning developmentally appropriate practices have been traced to the scientization of child care which burgeoned in the late 19th century (Varga, 1991). In her analysis of The University of Toronto Institute of Child Study (from 1925 - 1960), Varga argues that scientific observation and record-keeping, as technologies of child study and as apparatuses for recording children's behaviour, perform as a process which "defines structures of proper development and constructs social forms of caregiving." (1991, p. 71). Varga points out that, given the cultural parameters of scientific child study, the idea of the "natural" child developing "normally" is a cultural artifact and not a biological truism.

As a practice and a technology, the scientific observation of children was enabled through the construction of the "observation alcove" in or around 1929 (Varga, 1991, p. 75):

To ensure the 'cloak of invisibility' intended by the alcove, the already enclosed area was draped in black denim, was thickly carpeted, and had an entrance separate from the nursery room. The child was watched through a screened wall that allowed the gaze of the observer to go out, but did not allow the sight of the child to enter in...These one-way screens were designed by [Arnold] Gesell, and became a mandatory piece of equipment in child study. In the contemporary period the materials of the screens have been replaced by [one]-way mirrored glass.

(Varga, 1991, p. 75-76)
The connection here between developmentally appropriate practice, and the covert practices of surveillance is one which effectively structures the authoritative gaze. Developmental theory informs the observer on what to look for, and the privacy and power structured into the observation practice enables the construction of children through the penetrating, unobstructed gaze of covert observation. This technology of observation, as a deceptive and manipulative gaze which is engendered by modern science, is structured into the student-teacher's practice in ECE communities.

An example of how this manifests is offered in the Suggested Activities which are listed for student-teachers in Spodek et al. (1991):

2. Observe a pair of young children of different ages and record how they perform tasks such as holding a cup, painting a picture, and building with blocks.

3. Observe a three- to five-year old child during the self-selected play period. Describe the social contacts the child has. Compare your observations with those of other students who observed children who are different in age, culture, social class, and/or who are handicapped.

(Spodek, et al., 1991, p. 98-99)

Through her participation, the women student-teacher is subjected to the watchful dominance embedded in the historicity and materiality of the authoritative gaze, and is evaluated on her ability to perform within this duplicity. Her participation with scientific observation, furthermore, is framed through the objectification of women and children: the theories and technologies of modern science construct the gaze in such a way that the practice of observation is effectively controlling.
Historically, it is at around the same time that scientific observation was being used for the establishing of normal (natural) development in children (i.e., the late 19th-, early 20th century), that the dominant population of early childhood educators was swinging from male to female. Carolyn Steedman has pointed out that there was a significant shift which took place in the teaching profession: in the early nineteenth century the majority of teachers of infants were males; and by 1914 women made up about 70% of the teaching force (Steedman, in Lawn & Grace (eds), 1987, p. 120). Steedman notes the influence of:

...the establishment of the psychological notion of stages of development, the detailed psychological accounts of physical growth that became available, and work on the process of language acquisition. All this scientific work established the general understanding of childhood growth as a natural unfolding of a preordained sequence. (Steedman, in Smedley, 1994, p. 42)

As Valerie Walkerdine (1983) writes, it is "[t]he servicing labor of women [which] makes the child, the natural child, possible." (1983/92, p. 21). What Steedman, Walkerdine, Varga, and Smedley all point to is this "discovery" of the "natural" child, and the increase of women teachers in early childhood education: the construction of woman-as-nurturer here effectively overwhelmed the possibility of any acceptance of woman-as-intellectual.

In On being a primary school teacher, Smedley (1994) discusses how the procedure for putting theory into practice clearly subordinates the woman as an intellectual. "Theory is seen as dominant," (p. 50) and students are expected to bring theory into the classroom, that is, transport educational theory into appropriate curricular practice. The task of the
students is to insert the theory into her curriculum, to insert the children into the theory, and somewhere, insert herself into the role of teacher.

Hendrick (1990) includes abbreviated research studies in her text for student-teachers, and writes:

I hope that these summaries will convince the reader that research can be fascinating, and that teachers need to pay attention to it because it can produce results that are directly relevant to what happens every day in the early childhood classrooms.

(p. 7-8, my emphasis)

In this instance, the agent of change is displaced from the teacher to the research, where “it” can produce results in the classroom.

Jane Miller (1992) describes this situation as follows:

Something called a training is simply to be inserted, it sometimes appears, between a girl’s own schooling and her adult working life, when she will be responsible all day for at least thirty children and for important aspects of their future lives. 'Theory' in this scenario becomes a culprit, distracting and irrelevant - other people's theory, that is dryly dealt out to these young women.

(Miller, in Smedley, 1994, p. 50)

A precise example of how this subordinating practice plays out in teacher-training can be found in an excerpt from a text on child development. In Developmental Profiles:

Prebirth to eight, second edition, Allen & Marotz (1994) write:

The development of children from prebirth through age eight is described in a nontechnical fashion that provides basic knowledge, informing students about what they should expect and how they can provide appropriate learning experiences at each successive stage of development.

(p. ii)
This practice of "dumbing down" theory for student-teachers strengthens the relationship between ECE teachers and children, and Miller (1992) expresses it as a conjoining of feminisation and infantilisation:

It is not far-fetched, in my view, to see the current frenzy of revision and legislation as a response... to what can seem like the feminisation of education and, by extension, its infantilisation as well.

(Miller, 1992, p.1)

Referring to the "brain/womb polarity" (Walkerdine, 1988/92, p.18), Walkerdine discusses how, historically, women were to be educated "to amplify their capacities for maternal nurturance." (p. 18); thus ensuring that the role of the women learning to be teachers remain one of subordination - whether to the gendered legacy of professionalism, or the theory which informs and constructs the profession.
Watch closely the next time you teach.
See if you can spot any circumstances in which a child feels incompetent.

How did you cope with this circumstance?

Was there some way you could have helped him cope more satisfactorily?

(Hendrick, 1990, p. 14)
Racing ECE

Largely absent from these critical discussions of early childhood education are the privileges of whiteness, middle-class, able-bodiness, heterosexuality, and so on. Ironically, while ECE seductively advocates the importance of individual differences in a classroom, the politics of difference are blatantly absent from the discourses on the profession of teaching. The unacknowledged privileges inscribed in whiteness/middle-class/heterosexuality, and so on, effectively shadows individual difference amongst teachers.

Patricia Hill Collins (1990) analyses how access to privilege informs its invisibility, and quotes Peggy McIntosh:

I think whites are carefully taught not to recognize white privilege, just as males are taught not to recognize male privilege. I have come to see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets which I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was 'meant' to be oblivious.

(in Hill Collins, 1990, p. 190)

The quiet command which white women have historically held in the classrooms can be read several ways: certainly white women, as early childhood educators, are expected to 'follow the rules' and practice in adherence to the ECE discourses; however, the privilege buried here is in the knowing, having access to the rules, being included in the discourse of early childhood education, and so on.

When L. Mun Wong (1994) dissects the powerful presence of whiteness in her analysis of psychology journals and texts (in Di(s)-secting and Dis(s)-closing 'Whiteness':
Two Tales about Psychology), she makes a point of noting how differences amongst groups are also semantic traps (p. 134). Referring to Foucault (1978), she writes,

The colossal number of works which focus on deconstructing and demystifying the wrongs that have been perpetuated by dominant groups will leave intact much of the power of the 'norm' to define reality as if somehow natural and predetermined.

(L. Mun Wong, 1994, p. 134)

This is evidenced most clearly in the ways early childhood educators are encouraged to 'think' about issues of racism, where 'people of colour' are positioned in opposition to the unnamed white dominance, as though white people have no colour (eg., Hazel Carby, 1992; Leslie Roman, 1993). White authority is located in the course work of teacher-education which focusses on multiculturalism, "without specifically interrogating the racial identities of a predominantly white teaching force." (Sleeter, 1993, p. 157).

Multiculturalism is commonly discussed as a teaching unit, an insertion into the dominant (white) curriculum, wherein ideas about racism are approached from a psychological perspective, as assumptions and attitudes, as beliefs which can be countered through classroom activities which will focus on how "we" are all the "same". These curriculum units tend to feature unusual foods, clothing, dance, music, and so on, all the while rendering nonwhite cultures as exotic, strange, and very different from the dominant white culture. Advocating these scenarios, such as "Multiculturalism Week", suggests children can move through the exposure to these edible, adornable, danceable customs as though this will eliminate racism. By limiting culture within such simple,
coherent groups, however, it is difficult to explore any 'zones of difference within and between cultures' (Rosaldo, 1989, p. 28); and colour and culture are unavoidably compartmentalized, while white culture remains gazing.

The more frequently expressed disclaimer of racism is expressed as "colour-blindness" (Rist, 1978; Sleeter, 1993), where teachers insist that they do not "see" children as raced. This enables an act of de-racing the presence of nonwhites; or, as Sleeter asks, "What does it mean to construct an interpretation of race that denies it?" (1993, p. 161).

Similarly, denying the overwhelming presence of whites is not unlike "e-racing" the white privilege: it enables a semblance of invisibility, but maintains its structural dominance (Wong, 1994, p. 137).

This colour-blindness is available in the critical literature on early childhood education in, for example, Smedley's consideration of class difference in her discussion of the choices which are involved in becoming an early childhood educator. Smedley refers to Widdowson's (1983) research on women's experiences in teacher training from 1840 and 1914. According to Widdowson, mostly "girls" (sic) from the lower middle classes began to dominate the profession in the late 19th century, effectively elevating elementary teaching from a working-class to a middle-class profession (in Smedley, 1994, p. 36). Contrarily, however, Susanne R. Williams' research on women and social class reveals that middle-class and professional class women entered teacher college consistently during this same period. Smedley advises that choosing to be a teacher is a complex issue,
and that "we should have no expectation that this will represent the experience of all." (in Smedley, 1994, p. 37).

Nevertheless, the fact remains that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, only white women were allowed access to teacher training, and so choosing to be a teacher has been a predominantly white option. Furthermore, the efforts of Walkerdine, Steedman, Smedley, Miller, and so on, to reveal the feminisation of teaching and the de-intellectualized, nurturing role of the woman/mother/educator are indeed powerful and telling depictions of white women. Teaching, in these historical contexts, was a privilege of whiteness, economy, and authority. Similarly, the science which informed teacher's perceptions about how to teach young children have been, and continue to be informed by white/Eurocentric science.

Reading the historical and material forces which have shaped the oppressive structures of ECE, then, necessitates the acknowledgment that the dominant white population of ECE unavoidably oppressed nonwhite cultures - in this respect, working through a critical history of the ways women's subordination is structured in early childhood education is in itself a potentially racist practice.

A critical reading of teacher-training, then, needs to consider how the postcolonial discourses can influence a radical ECE text, and possibly how resistances to traditions within this institution can reveal a rejection/reflection/inspection of its white sheen.
The development of student-teachers

Central to this thesis is the problem of teacher identity in the development of student-teachers. While the purpose of teacher-training programs is to bring student-teachers through a curriculum which will enable them to teach, the implicit assumption is that student teachers will, through their experiences, develop into teachers.

Walkerdine describes the institution of ECE as the site wherein a multiplicity of subjectivities are constantly shifting; where "power relations are produced as a constantly shifting relation." (p. 14). This comment on the discursive power relations which structure these discourses and practices situates the multiplicities of teacher identity as discursively shifting in-relation to, and as interactive with power. This can be understood within the context of choice, where choosing to be a teacher is a student-teacher's initial agentic move towards cultivating her teacher-identity. Here the appearance of power is sighted in the individual decision.

Smedley (1994) notes that a frequently expressed reason for choosing teaching as a profession is found in an expressed "desire to put something back into society." (p. 37), and she refers to Carolyn Steedman's (1987) famed quote:

I don't care any more about sounding pretentious, so now I tell people who ask at parties why I did it for such a long time, that it did seem a way of being a socialist in everyday life.

(Steedman, in Smedley, 1994, p. 37)

But, Smedley remarks, this idea of choice as a self-determinant is often entangled within a sphere of predetermined practices of complicity, where women are "duty-bound
servants working for small rewards, in a caring profession." (p. 38). As Kathleen Weiler (1988) argues, "Thus even when choices are freely made, they are choices made within a kind of logic of existing social structures and ideology." (p.89)

This is not to imply or suggest that women who decide to become teachers are somehow passively reconstructing the patriarchy; rather, as Smedley points out, neither students nor teachers are persons who are simply acted upon: personal agency is necessarily in relation to the genderedness of women's work in education.

*The development of student-teachers, part 2*

Diane Piland and Jacqueline Anglin (1993) liken the development of student-teachers to childhood development, suggesting that the supervision of student-teachers can be framed in a perspective which acknowledges that student-teachers go through "stages" of development which, as with children, are developmental phases that the student-teacher can be guided through. Piland & Anglin review a history of studies which consider the developmental stages of preservice teachers from 1925 to 1992, and emphasize Fuller's (1967) study, where the final stage for student-teachers involves an identity struggle, "Who Am I?" (Fuller, 1967, in Piland & Anglin, 1993, p. 20-21).

Following in the steps of these studies, Piland (1992) proposes that student-teachers move through four stages of development: fear/uncertainty, socialization, autonomy, and affirmation (p. 22 - 23). The purpose of her study, she asserts, is to facilitate more sympathetic supervision from faculty and cooperating teachers (p. 24), stating:
[a]n understanding of the stages of development would alleviate or dispel some of the fears, anxieties and misunderstandings which often sabotage a student teaching experience.

(Piland & Anglin, 1992, p. 24)

Issues of who is in control of this teacher identity are vagrant notions. In Piland & Anglin's above-cited remark, the implication is that somehow teacher supervisors and cooperating teachers not only can, but ought to assume responsibility for the student-teacher's sense of herself as a teacher. Whatever the impact of this sort of practice, Piland's statement that "misunderstandings" are what can "sabotage" a student-teacher's experience, denies the practical experiences which contradictory curriculum and impossible expectations in the preservice curriculum can invite. This sort of trivializing of student-teacher struggle enacts a kind of violence against women, where women who make their struggles visible are pathologized, assuaged because their anxieties are irrational; these misunderstandings can be reconciled: it is, after all, as Piland writes, "...only a stage they are going through." (p. 19). This sort of presumption of passivity in identification-practices reinforces the subordinated position of women to theory, and inadvertently substantiates the dominant ideologies which inform not only the genderedness, but the implicit and explicit violence of early childhood education.

Walkerdine (1991) discusses another kind of violence through her analysis of classroom interactions in early childhood sites. Here physical violence is transformed into symbolic violence through the discourses and the pedagogical practices which validate the practices of ECE. In her discussion of how the fictionalizing practices of ECE are
constitutive of femininity, Walkerdine points out the ways teachers tend to downplay the violence of boys, "violence which is directed at... [the teachers]... as well as the girls", and the ways in which this practice of "disavowal...is endemic to the pedagogic and child-rearing practices on which it is based." (p. 127). The violence of boys is often transformed into assertiveness, independence; and girls are perceived as lacking these qualities, "a lack of spark, fire, brilliance." (p. 127).

**Feminized authority**

The belief in access to authority is socially constructed within the teacher-training community; however, the ways this belief plays out in practice is highly contradictory to the images of teacher-authority which are available in teacher-training. When interacting with violence in the classroom, the practice of identifying as an authority figure suggests that the violence can be intercepted, or controlled by the teacher. One of the more popular tenets of ECE teacher-training involves a belief that inappropriate behaviours can be controlled, or managed, or "extinguished" (per Nelson, 1987):

Extinction...can be used as part of a process in which the undesirable behaviour is ignored as long as the behaviour does not affect the other students... (Kaplan, 1990, p. 166)

Simply put, the behaviourist's creed works along the lines of reward and absence-of-reward: positively reinforce the behaviours you wish to promote, and ignore the behaviours you wish to discourage (in Kaplan, 1990).
This practice is exemplified in Walkerdine's (1991) reading of an ECE classroom interaction between a female teacher and two young boys working at the table with her. As the boys proceed to explicitly sexualize the teacher by speaking about her in the third person, discussing her underclothing, anatomy, in derogatory terms, and so on, the teacher sits quietly and ignores the remarks. This practice of withdrawing teacher-attention in order to eliminate certain behaviours actively sanctions various kinds of violence against women which can take place in the ECE context.

The passivity which is structured into the pedagogical practices of the early childhood educator can be constructed through historical traces found in the feminizing practices which guided the kindergarten movement in the late nineteenth century (Wolk Feinstein, 1980). As Karen Wolk Feinstein describes it: "Because kindergarten teachers needed to be loving, well-informed, patient but purposeful, kindergarten was regarded as the extension of the ideal home, and kindergarten teachers as the highest form of motherhood." (p. 30). Wolk Feinstein heralds this movement as liberating middle-class white women from their domestic cells; but as Carolyn Steedman (1983) notes, "[It] is a set of extremely common social attitudes which bestows the qualities of martyrdom and stupidity on women who, like nurses and teachers, earn money by taking what are seen as natural skills into the market-place." (p. 7).
**Contradictory positions**

...[I]f we are to understand what is happening... we need to stand back, not trust the obviousness of the taken-for-granted and yet remember to look at what it means to be a teacher, a pupil, a parent, a child. We look at ourselves. We have tools. The great and injurious act of forgetting which happens in institutions of teacher education means that students come, teachers come, as I once came, and forget, obliterate, imagine that they know nothing. The insertion into the new practice of psychology, or any of the other disciplines, uses that forgetting. Nevertheless, it also tells us what it is like to be a pupil again. And we can use that knowledge too. But, of course, that is to explode the boundaries between theory and practice.

(Valerie Walkerdine, 1991, p. 17)

I chose to quote Valerie Walkerdine at length here because her reflective observations are so provocative, sheer, incisive; but as well, she articulates for me the most profoundly disturbing aspect of my teacher education: the forgetting. For three years I questioned and contradicted developmental/educational psychology on the grounds that I remembered being a child, I remembered being a pupil in kindergarten, primary school; and I pleaded, at times, with my peers, "Don't you remember?" but they invariably looked at me with vacant gazes,

no,

I don't remember anything about my childhood,

you're so lucky,

they would say,

you remember so much...
As Walkerdine points out, these recollections are invalid in teacher education and each time I argued on the basis on my lived childhood realities, I was denied, dismissed, corrected, excused. It is this practice of silencing my experiences which initiates a gesture toward the contradictory relation of girls and women to early education. Indeed, it is highly possible that because I was bringing so many of my childhood practices into my participation as an adult in university, I was caught in, if not instigating a collision between two cultures, what Bronwyn Davies (1982) describes as children's culture and adult culture:

Children are caught in a world where they must balance on the one hand the convincingness of their own world and on the other the powerful and convincing world of adults. In this latter world of the adults, moreover, there is no real recognition of the former world as experienced and developed by the children. Adults provide structures which children are dependent on and legitimate these very structures in the process of socialising their children. Yet adults do not want children to share this world or to be adults.

(Bronwyn Davies, 1982, p. 32)

That my childhood realities were impossible in the university's curriculum is not surprising, for as Davies suggests, there is a boundary between childhood and adult worlds which is not to be traversed. By bringing my childhood into the adult curriculum, I violated the structural code which enforces this contradictory practice of perceiving and denying children's worlds as legitimate, lived culture. When Davies points out that adults do not want children to share their world, I can revisit my struggles as a student-teacher and recognize how threatening my practices were, for clearly I was trespassing
as I performed within these contradictory spaces. The most dangerous aspect of this, I suspect, was that I carried the violence of my childhood into the curriculum and experienced its reflection within the educative practices and discourses of early childhood education.

Issues of control, classroom management, authority, appropriate practice, and so on, are central to the ECE teacher-training curriculum. But in isolating an aspect of the ECE teacher-training community which might elucidate the identity conflicts that can take place within a community of practice, I find myself continually drawn to the practices of journalling which student-teachers participate in during their training.

As I have explored here, participation in the ECE community's practices is unavoidably informed with practices and discourses which are historically and structurally oppressive to women and children. In chapter four, the discursions which take place in identifying within this community are examined through acts of diarizing and journalling.
Once or twice I turned timidly and said, Would you like a star for good conduct? I sat all night in my room, cutting out stars from sheets of gold paper, pasting the stars on the wall... till the room was papered with stars, furnished as a private night, as a charm against the three headmasters who made me drink tea in sociability every morning in the staff room...

(Janet Frame, *Faces in the water*, 1961)
outside, the looking glass reflected the hall table, the sunflowers, the garden path so accurately and so fixedly that they seemed held there in their reality inescapably. It was a strange contrast - all changing there, all stillness here. One could not help looking from one to the other. Meanwhile, since all the doors and windows were open in the heat, there was a perpetual sighing and ceasing sound, the voice of the transient and the perishing, it seemed, coming and going like human breath, while in the looking glass things had ceased to breathe and lay still in the trance of immortality.

(Virginia Woolf [1944], *The Lady In The Looking Glass: A Reflection*)

Diaries of women...

Just as teaching - once the domain of men - shifted to a profession for women, diaries and journals were primarily a record-keeping activity of men until the late nineteenth/early twentieth century, at which point diarizing gradually moved to a practice for women (Culley, 1985). Culley attributes this shift to the latent emergence of self as the subject of the diary. When Thomas Mallon (1984) writes that "[t]he very word diary excites us with the promise of guilty secrets to be revealed." (p. 247), he misleadingly ascribes to the "modern idea of the diary as the arena of the 'secret' inner life" (Culley, 1985, p. 3). As Culley points out, the diary, as a private document, emerges as an activity for women in the late nineteenth century,

...as a split between the public and private spheres came increasingly to shape the lives of women and men, those aspects of culture associated with the private became the domain of women.

(Culley, 1985, p. 3)
Culley also argues that the changing ideas of "self" (influenced by romanticism, the industrial revolution, the 'discovery' of the unconscious) also contributed to this shift to a cultivation of an inner life, where, ...a life of personal reflection and emotion - became an important aspect of the 'private sphere' and women continued to turn to the diary as one place where they were permitted, indeed encouraged, to indulge full 'self-centeredness'.

(Culley, p. 4)

...girls...

In *The Tidy House* (1982) Carolyn Steedman, evaluates the diarizing practices of young girls and the historical uses of children's writing. Steedman argues that children's writing in the nineteenth- and early twentieth century contributed to the cultivation of the "cult of the child which was really the cult of the little girl. It was almost without exception the writing of little girls that was published." (p.62). Analyzing the historical texts of girls' writing, Steedman explores how these published works contributed to reinforcing social theories about childhood:

...childhood as an area of innocence, or as a charming arena of budding adult sexuality, or of children as bearers of some important yet inarticulate message for adults. What has been especially valued by readers in the past is the flattering mirror of adult intention that some child writing seems to provide...when children have shown a misunderstanding of adult motivation or adult rules and strictures in their writing, they rarely portray adults as unkind, or as purposefully misleading, merely as puzzling.

(1982, p. 82).

In an echo of Culley's emphasis on the role of "self" in writing as a woman's practice, Steedman's gesture towards the ways girls' texts have been implicated in theories of
childhood is emphasized in an excerpt from an education document called the Newbolt Report (1921). This short passage articulates the dramatic switch from the preferred practice of rote learning and copying practices as literacy, to the performance of self in writing, and suggests how the feminization of diarizing is shifting into the literacy practices of ECE:

...the capacity for self-expression is essentially the measure of success or failure of a school.

(The Newbolt Report, 1921, in Kelly, 1994, p.199)

Alison Kelly (1994) remarks on this, suggesting that a worst-case scenario here places "...creative writing sitting uneasily between notions about the child's need for self-expression and the teacher's view of what constitutes a suitable stimulus to trigger such expression." (Kelly, 1994, p. 199).

Kelly (1994), in writing about the literacy practices of ECE, notes how literacy activities, specifically writing in the classroom, is usefully conceptualized as a social activity (p. 196); however, Kelly invests these activities with a political dimension which accounts for the ways power relations are unavoidably structured into children's writing. With references to Walkerdine (1984) and Steedman (1982), Kelly advances a complex reading of how children's literacy practices - both reading and writing - are performances which take place in an atmosphere which is controlling and manipulative. While literacy is an empowering practice, the role of the teacher in these instances is unavoidably suspect because of her powerful position.
Children's writing is used in literacy research to substantiate the usefulness and potentially empowering experience of certain practices, such as shared writing; but when Kelly asks, "[W]ho holds the defining power - are new literacies developed collaboratively or defined hegemonically?" (p. 211), she puts forth a question which repositions children's writing as reflective of much more than children's language practices: couching the child's textual production in, for example, psychological frames of child development, merely reinforces the ideological forces which inform the teacher's readings and interactions with children's texts (Kelly, 1994, p. 212).

...and teachers

For student-teachers, the journal is a tool of self-evaluation, reflection, and - indirectly - is a form of record-keeping for the supervising instructors; which is to say that the student-teacher's personal journal is a textual record of her practical experiences with teaching.

Smedley (1994) summarizes the journalling practices of student-teachers rather succinctly, when she discusses how the contradictory positions of student-teaching can interact with the process of constructing a sense-of-self as a teacher:

...this is reinforced by the emphasis placed on evaluation, an important process, but one which could be seen as: expect this to go badly, then write about what you did wrong. (Smedley, 1994, p. 5)

Situating the practice of student-teacher journalling in relation to her membership in the ECE community allows for a reading of the ways participation with community
practice interact with identity. As an evaluative tool, the journal represents and contains the struggles involved in the process of identification. If the contradictory practices of early childhood education are, as Walkerdine writes, "an impossible fiction", the student-teacher's performances are material manifestations of an impossible practice. Examples of these are present in the oppositionality of developmentally appropriate practice and individual differences; the struggle to negotiate authority and control; and the dominant positioning of theory to the student-teacher's practice. Under these conditions of irreconcilable expectations, the student-teacher's performance will, invariably, fail to meet the demands of her curriculum. Smedley (1994) describes the student-teacher's situation as one of inevitable self-directed blaming:

> When they see their work as inadequate they have little option, but to turn the inadequacies in on themselves and blame themselves for not being 'good' teachers. The sense of responsibility is acute and can be a considerable burden. There seems to be no other way to make sense of this or to understand it... the only option is to accept that they themselves must be doing something wrong.

(p. 51)

And so, this personal responsibility is reflected upon in the journal: *what did I do wrong? how can I learn from my mistakes?* As a reflective practice, journalling these experiences as failures is a practice which, over time, interacts with identity and membership in the ECE community. In particular, identification can be hindered by the interpretation of experience as failure. This is not to say student-teachers do not become teachers; rather, the value, or self-worth generated in teaching practices, and in identifying as a teacher, are in-relation to the belief in successful performance. Moreover, because most student-teachers will interact with the incompatibility of the competing
ideologies of ECE in a similar way - that is, with a sense of incompleation - the practice of failing to perform in the impossible fictions is legitimated with peer relations (other student-teachers), with cooperating teachers who experienced their own frustrations as preservice teachers, and so on. Because the cultural value of reflective writing positions journalling as a tool for recovery, the journal-process can thus be reinforced as necessary, as a determining tool for working through these shared struggles.

Another way of reading this, however, allows for the structural inequalities of ECE to be reified in the journalling process of student-teachers. The importance of reflecting on failure in order to learn from mistakes can only be central to the learning experience when the sense of failure is profound enough to warrant an evaluation. As such, the journal process is an interaction with the displacement of oppression. Rather than situating the contradictions within the ECE curriculum, or in the conflicting demands of student-teacher practice, the problem, as Smedley remarks, is experienced as one which is positioned within the student-teacher. Her reflective work, her movements toward constructing an identity as a teacher, are unavoidably informed though a sense of failure, struggle, and overwhelming responsibility.

_The politics of disclosure_

Michel Foucault's argument that speech is not a medium or a tool through which power struggles occur, but is itself an important site and object of conflict (in Alcoff & Gray, 1993) renders this practice of diaries as intricate and complex. In their examples of
survivor discourses, Alcoff & Gray (who assert their own authority by positioning themselves as survivors of sexual abuse [p,261]), explore how acts of speaking can be appropriated by Other authorities who speak over the survivor, ventriloquiate the survivor's speech in ways which disempower the utterance and dismiss the validity of experience:

These discursively constituted subjectivities are then made dependent upon expert advice and help. In short, survivor discourse has paradoxically appeared to have empowering effects even while it has in some cases unwittingly facilitated the recuperation of dominant discourses.

(p. 262-3)

In a similar space, though diarizing is regarded as an empowering act of speech for young children, it is critical to consider how acts of corrective authorizing and ideological interpretation of these texts enable the same disempowering processes which take place in survivor discourses. These are symbolic acts of violence, structured into early childhood curriculums as practices which can repress the powers of speaking by policing texts for structurally mandated literacy practices.

Alcoff and Gray extend their analysis of survivor discourse beyond the hegemony of innocence which precludes private confession, and state that,

[a] nonbifurcating ontology of experience and theory requires us to relinquish the idea that in reporting our experiences we are merely reporting internal events without interpretation.

(Alcoff & Gray, 1993, p. 284)

Building upon bell hook's (1989) suggestions on how personal narratives can effect political transformation, "instead of increasing the privatization and individualization of political phenomenon" (Alcoff & Gray, p. 282), the authors analyze how personal
disclosures can enable political disruptions in dominant discourses. In this way, the violence structured into diarizing practices is not removed, (for clearly the acts of journalling are inextricable from the material and historical forces which inform the performance); rather, they propose bringing a critical awareness of the dangers of the confessional, as a subjective speech constituted by discourses which can contribute to the reification of victims.

*Transparent technology*

The relationship between a student-teacher's personal journal, and practices of literacy within the ECE context is a useful example of how the shifting power relations in these experiences with journals are transparent movements: "transparent...refers to the way in which using artifacts and understanding their significance interact to become one learning process." (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 103).

The student teacher is required to use her journal as a devise for reflecting on her practice, and she is unavoidably objectified by the readers (faculty) who are scrutinizing her text for signs of explicit reflective practice. The student teacher is similarly in a position to objectify the child diarist, to peer into the texts of an Other student who also has no direct control over whether or not s/he will write in a journal (i.e., both examples of journal-writing for student-teachers and for children are curriculum-bound). In both instances, authoritative comments and questions are practiced, and evaluative remarks from faculty who read student-teacher journals are transparently transferred into the
student-teacher's practice. As a teacher-in-training, she learns to write in children's journals: indeed, journal-writing is an activity which is foundational to theories of emergent literacy (e.g., Strickland & Morrow, 1989), and stimulating literacy is the teaching-practice of the early childhood educator (Kelly, 1993). To identify as a teacher, it is necessary to perform these "teaching" behaviors, and as such, the journal, as a tool, is both a visible text and an invisible technology which is structured into student practices. Through this technology, literacy visibly shadows the practice of disclosure, and renders the problematics of diarizing as invisible within the educative context.

There are conflicts in this transition from diarist to audience/voyeur, particularly because, in ECE, the movement from student-teacher to instructor is imbued with the oddly positioned relations of the adult as student and the child as student. As adults, student-teachers "study" children as a precursor to their engagement with children, and studying children's diaries in a university course on literacy is one way the student-teacher can be separated from her identification in classrooms as a child, a separation which invariably leads to the further objectification of children.

*I was once a strawberry in a Hansel and Gretel pageant when I was in nursery school and didn't have no better sense than to dance on tiptoe with my arms in a circle over my head doing umbrella steps and being a perfect fool just so my mother and father would come dressed up and clap. You'd think they'd know better than to encourage that kind of nonsense. I am not a strawberry. I do not dance on my toes.*

Toni Cade Bambara, 1970, Raymond's Run
**Textual panopticons**

*Every text, being itself the intertext of another text, belongs to the intertextual...*

(Barthes, 1979, p. 77)

Personal journals and two-ways mirrors share similar features: both tools enable practices of covert surveillance and manipulation, and both tools are forms of technology which allow the user to perform in multiple and contradictory ways. For example, on the window side of a two-way mirror, it is possible to see through the glass and secretly observe others; however, the observer is unavoidably reflected in the glass. No matter how dim the lights are in the observing room, the self is visible in the window's pane and while the eyes can focus beyond this reflection and concentrate on the activity on the other side of the mirror, the self remains reflecting, whether we choose to observe this or not.

There are similar multiple reflections in a personal journal. From the writer, a dimension of observations and thoughts are textualized; however, self, here, is strangely positioned in time and space. Specifically, a student-teacher who is writing about her experiences in a classroom is composing these thoughts after the event, thus the past tense controls the script. Her written reflections are intertextual - the instant of writing representing one text, and the re-collecting of content (what is worth telling?) represent another text, as subjective selectivity contributes to the re-construction of the historicized self.
In the context of a teacher-training community, these acts of reflecting take on a more complex dimension because these are processes of the personal construction/reflection of a self which is unavoidably informed by the interactions of peers and superior authorities such as faculty, and theory. For example, in the Observation Lounge I could not only see myself in the two-way mirror, I could see my peers reflecting as well. I was not alone in the room, but in the company of the other student-teachers and we were talking with each other, talking about the children, the nursery teachers, the curriculum, our childhood, and so on, all of which inform, distract, colour, diffuse, shift in and out of, penetrate the observing gaze.

Lave & Wenger refer to this as "talking about and talking within a practice." (p. 109), and refine the distinction as follows:

Talking within itself includes both talking within (e.g., exchanging information necessary to the progress of ongoing activities) and talking about (e.g., stories, community lore). Inside the shared practice, both forms of talk fulfill specific functions: engaging, focusing, and shifting attention, bringing about coordination, etc., on the one hand; supporting communal efforts of memory and reflection as well as signaling membership, on the other.

(p. 109)

In the ECE community, participation includes this practice of co-constructing observation and perspective, but I would venture that the practice of then textualizing these communal processes in the form of a personal (i.e., individual) journal is problematic.
The collective acts of objectifying the nursery children was almost unavoidable: the two-way mirror reified the distances and differences in ways which were impenetrable.

Nonetheless, the practice of talking about them, as though they - the children - were some sort of distant and curious life form, was both appropriate in the ECE context within which these conversations took place, and disturbing, often painful. And while these were the reflections I wished to document in my observation journal, I was also aware that I was being evaluated on my ability to record my observations of the children, not the other student-teachers. I often felt trapped on many levels: trapped in the narrow corridor with so many conflicting reflections, trapped in discourses which violated my lived perceptions of childhood, and trapped in practices which I experienced as demeaning to children and to student-teachers. But I dutifully wrote in my journal, studiously recorded what I thought I saw on the other side of the glass.

Donna Varga (1991) writes that "[t]he bounding of human behaviour within documentary forms is a textual model of the panopticon." (p. 72). When trying to understand the complex role a journal takes in a student's educative experiences, it is useful to consider the contradictions which frame this process of self-reflective writing, particularly with regards to surveillance technologies, and the shifting boundaries of reflection, disclosure, privacy, and so on. As Varga expresses it:

Institutional records are a substitution of the panopticon's physical detention with an instrument capturing activity by the written text.

(Varga, 1991, p. 72)
As a method of surveillance, journals are especially devious. Students are required to record their personal thoughts, reactions, reflections, evaluations, observations, and so on; however, the content of these records is the teaching/educative experience. So, student teachers must reflect on institutional processes which are structurally oppressive to women, and do so in ways which perform for the reader a sense that something worthwhile has been learned. Not only is this an impossible contradiction, the non-negotiability of this writing performance can be seen as contributing to the oppression of women.

As a tool, an artifact of the ECE community, journalling is critical to the construction of teacher-identity. It is within these pages that the student-teacher works to articulate her interactions with/in teaching practice. Through the process of textualizing her experiences, and - of necessity - framing these experiences in a specifically self-reflective discourse, she is re-reading her own performance. Furthermore, she is re-reading her teaching performance as a reflection of her teaching ability, and thusly, her identification with teaching is re-processed in evaluative practices. Not only is the student-teacher in a position to objectify her performance through the lens of subjective reflection, she is required to submit this evaluation to her supervising teacher: the authoritative gaze here shifts from one of self-scrutiny, which is informed in part by the student-teacher's awareness that this self-reading is going to be evaluated by the faculty. The practice of evaluating the student-teacher's evaluation positions the journal as yet another exhibition,
a performance where the ability to write about the teaching-self is the discriminating aspect of student-teacher practice.

The demand for reflection in student-teaching journals echoes Culley's observations on the feminizing of diary-work, where the "self" emerges as a personal identity which, through reflective writing, is developed. As a multiple-text, as a reflective prism of shifting subjectivities, the journal process can be read as political activity within the community process of identity. As sites of discursive power relations, diaries/journals, and two-way mirrors are tools which can reveal how inequalities, structured into a community's practices, can participate in identity-processes. And, as Lave & Wenger (1991) point out, "[p]articipation involving technology is especially significant because the artifacts used within a cultural practice carry a substantial portion of that practice's heritage." (p. 101). Agency is critical in these practices, and so there is a contradiction always mediating participation in a community of practice, where participants cooperate, resist, accommodate, protest, reject, accept, and struggle for position.

Voluntarism and structuralism

One critical aspect of the diary which is not discussed in the literature on diaries and voice is the issue of voluntarism. Voluntarily picking up blank pages to write for the personal (or, for that matter, for the public) is entirely different from the site where students are required to keep personal notes and reflections on their experiences as student-teachers. Here, the power inscribed in these practices diffuses in significant
ways. While the student has no control over whether or not she will keep a reflective journal to record her experiences and reactions etc., nor can she control what is being read by the faculty/audience, it is not appropriate either to situate the responsibility of this act in structuralist concepts, as though the student teacher in this case is a victim of curricular authority:

*Knowing too much about other people puts you in their power, they have a claim on you, you are forced to understand their reasons for doing things and then you are weakened.*

Margaret Atwood, 1988, *Cat's Eye*

This unacknowledged power of disclosure is exemplified in my own experiences with journalling as a student-teacher. My recollections of childhood abuse, for example, found their way into my reflective writing often; I was fully aware that my childhood was colouring my perceptions of children and teachers in a variety of ways, and I endeavoured to untangle these frequently in my journal practices. Interestingly, the more devastating my struggles were, the higher my evaluative grades were. Similarly, the less I overtly agonized over my position as an educator/student/adult etc., the more critical the comments from faculty.

In this instance, the structuralized powers which make journalling obligatory are underwritten with disclosures that can intercept the linearity of control implied - in this way it is possible to understand Frazer & Lacey's (1993) conception of power, where agents are "...participating in practices in particular ways, working with or against
structures of power." (p. 35). The resistance to the locus of control is not always explicit (i.e., I did not refuse to journal my experiences; rather, I used my journal is a way which performed my refusal to accept my role as a teacher as unproblematic), just as the locus of control is not always fixed but is shifting discursively.
Revisiting reflections

I really have discovered something at last. Through watching so much at night, when it changes so, I have finally found out. The front pattern does move - and no wonder! The woman behind shakes it!

Sometimes I think they are a great many women behind, and sometimes only one, and she crawls around fast, and her crawling shakes it all over.

Then in the very bright spots she keeps still, and in the very shady spots she just takes hold of the bars and shakes them hard.

And she is all the time trying to climb through. But nobody could climb through that pattern - it strangles so; I think that is why it has so many heads.

They get through, and then the pattern strangles them off and turns them upside down, and makes their eyes white!

If those heads were covered or taken off it would not be half so bad.

Charlotte Perkins Gilman, 1973, The yellow wallpaper
Accommodating protest

Power invests [the dominated], passes through them and with the help of them, relying on them just as they, in their struggle against power, rely on the hold it exerts on them.

(Michel Foucault, in Elowe MacLeod [1992], p. 533)

In order to usefully complicate women's struggles with power as both voluntary and structural, there is much to be gained from a reading of Arlene Elowe McLeod's (1992) *Hegemonic relations and gender resistance: The new veiling as accommodating protest in Cairo*. Elowe MacLeod (1992) explores how working women in lower-middle-class Cairo struggle to re-define themselves in the midst of the contradictory roles they are negotiating. For example, while the women in her study are employed in the workforce and earning wages, they perceive themselves primarily as central and significant participants in the family. Responsibilities for improving the quality of material life (expressed in the advantages of earning an income in the face of increasing inflation) are critical to their family role; however, being at home to cook and clean is regarded as more important to their expressed cultural identity. Many of the women in Elowe MacLeod's study claimed that while working for wages is regarded as a progressive step, as a move towards increasing their economic and class mobility, the demands of working at home and in the city are "...troublesome and tiring: it is not surprising that many women claim they would quit their jobs if they could." (p. 547).

Elowe MacLeod goes on to say:
These complaints point to an important problem women are experiencing as they move into the intersection of the two worlds of household and workplace; they face a deep dilemma of identity and role.

(p. 547)

This problem of identity and role, expressed through gendered and classed cultural and social responsibilities, is mediated through the re-claiming of traditional dress for women, the wearing of the veil. Elowe MacLeod sees this practice as signifying how these women are struggling to position themselves between competing ideological pressures. There is the economic pressure which pushes women into the workplace, reinforced by the ideological requirements of class standing: here these women see their work as a trade-off for the necessities of middle-class status.

Yet the economic ideology which pushes women into the workplace is countered by a gender ideology which frames women's place within the home as mother and wife... According to both women and men, women belong in the home, where their nature is fulfilled by caring for husband and children and managing the household.

(p. 547)

The women - in a double bind of economic and gender ideologies - voluntarily practice veiling as a statement about their identity as wives and mothers (p. 551); Elowe MacLeod argues that this practice represents a desire to both accommodate and resist the dominant ideological pressures. As she writes, "The dress of the muhaggaba expresses both a demand for renewed dignity and compliance." (p. 552). Far from idealizing this renewed practice, Elowe MacLeod notes that veiling symbolizes women's protest against their threatened identity and status, brought about by the necessity of working; however, it also represents how these women are accepting of the culturally-inscribed view of women as "sexually suspect and naturally bound to the home." (p. 552). Protest, here,
"...is firmly bound to accommodation in a resonant public symbol, creating an ambiguous resistance, an accommodating protest." (p. 552).

Elowe MacLeod outlines some interesting reasons for how this sort of ambiguous subjectivity is practiced:

Facing a layered and overlapping round of oppressors, women do not have the luxury of knowing their enemy. Relations with men, class relations, and the more distant realm of global inequalities all affect lower-middle-class women in Cairo, yet none is exclusively responsible for women's subordination;
...women daily inhabit the worlds of their oppressors rather than only occasionally intersecting the lives of the dominant group. Women live with, among, and in some ways, as one of, the dominant group... Women truly do inhabit a unique position; accommodation is involved because women are part of both the dominant culture and the subordinate subculture.

(p. 554)

Where Elowe MacLeod regards the women and men of Cairo as "enmeshed in a struggle where oppositional imagination cannot effectively engage reality" (p. 555), I find a useful parallel to the ECE community, where a similar struggle takes place as student-teachers are negotiating traditional concepts of child development and teacher roles, informed with contemporary ideologies about women's identity.

Throughout this text I have attempted to explore the ways women - as girls and as adults - are exposed to and participating in ECE practices and discourses which are historically and materially oppressive, violent, and invested in subordinating women as intellectuals. Restrictions in the ECE curriculum, such as the overwhelming practice of developmentally appropriate practice, can be read in the same way which Elowe MacLeod reads the dominant ideologies of Cairo: in Cairo, it is accepted that women are
naturally predisposed to be homemakers, mothers, wives; similarly, in ECE, teachers are expected to work within an ideology which insists that children are naturally predisposed to certain kinds of developmentally appropriate curriculum practices, and women are naturally predisposed to teach these practices in caring, nurturing roles.

One of the ways in which these role conflicts are bound up in practices within the teacher-training curriculum is, as I have discussed, in diarizing and journalling, which represents both the reflective process of teacher-identity, and the emergent literacy practices in ECE. Whether textualizing one's own experiences as a student-teacher, or writing in the journals of young children, clearly the texts are symbolic of accommodation to the culture and tradition of ECE communities.

Acts of resistance in these practices diffuse somewhat more discursively within the questions and conflicts about identity in early childhood education. It is within the performative aspects of personal journalling where the disclosure of practices, (the narrative itself), and the recovering of performance, (i.e. the interpretation of practice) are enabled. In one sense, the struggles are legitimated through the emphasis on reflection; in another sense, the language of struggle is itself a site of conflict. Thus, the journal is also a forum for protestation which takes place within acts of accommodation to the dominant discourses of early childhood education.

As is the case with this thesis/document, journalling in the ECE curriculum can be read as performative and interpretive practice. What is enabled, then, is a way of reading into conflicts which is un-recoverable: which is to say that rather than attempting to find ways
of smoothing out difficulties in student-teacher practice, rather than developing a
curriculum which attempts to resolve the conflicts, there is perhaps more to be learned
here through the application of a practical, critical understanding of the uses of conflict.
The unruly woman is the undisciplined woman. She is a renegade from the disciplinary practices which would mold her as a gendered being. She is the defiant woman who rejects authority which would subjugate her and render her docile. She is the offensive woman who acts in her own interests. She is the unmanageable woman who claims her own body, the whore, the wanton woman, the wild woman out of control. She is the woman who cannot be silenced. She is a rebel. She is trouble.

Karlene Faith, 1993, p. 1
The play within the play

Throughout this thesis I have struggled to write; that is, I have tried to work through the text in a way which is mindful of how the performance here is unavoidably subjected to an institutional gaze, from within the community of the university and within my own willful practice.

It is a struggle because I do know what is expected of me here,

I do understand how the traditional thesis structure performs a thinking(thinging)-through of problems.

And although I want to resist the tedium of acquiescence, the struggle seems to lurch out of my interest in compliance,

the material need for continued acceptance, the maintenance of membership, and so on.

It is a politicized relation to practice, a power struggle which is not simply about what I want or need to do, but inextricable from who I want or need to be, in relation to the university community.

For every gesture which seems to turn against the tradition, I feel the tug of my training and I step out suddenly, apologetic and uncertain...

(it is all, of course...)
...I falter then, fragmented: a part of me caught in the loop, my feet tangled behind me; part of me lunging forward,

(it's just a thesis, just do it and get it over with)

and part of me strangled, always biting the angry words and chewing them up, turning them into something more tasteless, easy to digest, safe to spit out now, the rough edges painstakingly masticated, turning bitter grains into meal.
Throughout this document I have emphasized the struggle involved in participating in a community of shared practice. I have engaged multiple readings of performance-as-participation in an effort to both explicate a problem, and to demonstrate a version of its appearance. In other words, I have described the complex political dynamics which inform a reading of participation, and I have engaged in a practice of protest within the parameters of my own accommodation to the university’s curriculum.

I have attempted to design an interpretive frame which allows for a more complex reading of participation as identification with community practices: reading for interactions with artifacts and technologies, texts, ideologies, traditions, and so on, all of which effectively organize the community. Within the community the social relations are framed and organized, as well as frame and organize the community’s processes. More critically than this, I have struggled in this text to establish a space for dissension. Another way of considering this is to recognize that the historically situated community is helpfully interpreted through analyses of resistance and change, through comprehensive readings of compliance, affiliation, and difference.

As I have discussed, teacher-training in ECE continues to be informed through the lenses and practices of modernity, which is to say it is a practice structured within the dominant discourses of white/Eurocentricism. Women and girls continue to be situated in these communities in ways which re-invent the inequities structured into the ECE community. An example of this is available in the discourses and practices of developmentally appropriate practice, where the authoritative gaze of observation enables
the structuring of children within the parameters of a normalizing ideology. Similarly, in practices of journalling and diarizing, the position of the ‘personal’ within the contexts of reflection are historically feminized positions, where girls and women are textualized within a tradition of disclosure relegated to the ‘feminine’. In the ECE community, the diarizing practices are problematized by the contexts of disclosure, contexts informed through institutionalized readings and practices.

By politicizing communities of practice; that is, by reading for conflicts and discusions of power, a stage is arranged which makes space for the play within the play. As I have been writing this document I have been acutely aware of my own shifting position as a woman within the university community, and I have scrutinized my own proximity in this work in an effort to foreground the body as a text. Rather than consuming events for the purpose of producing a rational coherence, the emphasis moves from the assumptions of a sensible intellect to the confusion and discomfort of proximity. The body, read as an historical text, produces difference. Not in contrast to sameness, difference here describes multiplicities, discursive subjectivities; not fixing or stabilizing for categorical clarity, foregrounding the irreducibility of the historicized self displaces the logical text.

I have tried to position my textual performances - (as resistance to a dominant tradition of writing) - as an immediate version, (a self-selected section) of participation, and change. It is a conflicted gesture of performance-as-unruliness, tempered with institutionalized concerns, never nearly as oppositional as it seems. Difference does not
emerge from the struggle, as an episodic revelation following a performance; rather, what changes is the struggle itself.

**Situating the struggle**

There is a fairly simple premise which drives this writing, one which is potentially self-defeating: *struggle is essential to change*. To write about the political dynamics of identification with/through conflict is one dimension of this premise; however, exploring this via the contradiction within a textual context, that is, embedding the issues of struggle in a site of struggle is, at best, tautological; it is an unresolvable loop which can only drive itself into redundancy, reducing itself to something quite mundane.

*Yes, it's a struggle; life is hard; so what of it?*

I cannot write my way out of the conflict; and the contradictions are not problems to be solved. Within the social world, certainly, there is only compromise. As Frigga Haug (1987) explains it, the ongoing acts of processing the social world...

...[have] to be seen as a field of conflict between dominant cultural values and oppositional attempts to wrest cultural meanings and pleasure from life. It is a compromise.

(Haug, 1987, p. 41)

In an effort to understand how women actively participate in their own socialization, Frigga Haug, (and colleagues) acknowledge how this process of compromise renders the contradictions invisible, unperceived (p. 40). Through active, practiced, deliberate
memory-work, Haug (et al.) set out to consciously position themselves within the structures of socialization, in order to

...[identify] the ways in which individuals construct themselves into existing structures, and thereby themselves are formed; the way in which they reconstruct social structures; the points at which change is possible, the points where our chains chafe the most, the points where accommodations have been made.

(Haug, 1987, -p. 41)

Haug’s (1987) project is focussed on the processes through which women construct their bodies; how identities, through a reading of the body, are sexualized through social relations and interactions within the dominant cultural frame. This practice of searching through lived memory in order to explore the problematics of socialization is certainly compatible with phenomenological research practices; however, Haug’s work also responds to Dorothy Smith’s (1988) assertion that for women to be explicitly recognized in social processes, the methodology of the inquiry must reflect women’s situatedness. In order to understand the relations of women in/to/through/with society, Smith states, “We must begin from where we are.” (p. 77).

The ethnographic process of inquiry is one of exploring further into those social, political, and economic processes that organize and determine the actual bases of experience of those whose side we have taken... [T]he aim is to disclose the social processes from within as it is lived.

(Smith, 1988, p. 77-78)

Here Smith alludes to the relations of the historical self, where the social world is recognizable first “from within as it is lived”. Smith’s argument is specifically directed at finding ways to proceed strategically in an inquiry into social processes. Working from the recognition that women are situated “outside the ruling apparatus” (p.63), Smith calls
for the researcher to consider women's social situations as immediate, and as in need of specialized reading skills to account for how social relations are organized and shaped by the larger political, economic, institutionalized processes (p. 64). The constructions, reformations, and affiliations which constitute identification are not traceable in the individual alone, but are disseminated throughout the social relations which are organized by institutional processes:

In doing so we adopt an analysis that fully recognizes individuals as the competent practitioners of their everyday worlds, an analysis that takes into account the organization and determinations of their worlds and the active ways in which people participate in them.

(Smith, 1988, p. 69)

The relation here of the historical self is pivotal to a practice of subverting traditional constructs of identity as fixed or stabilized within the individual. To actualize Smith's project, ideologies of identification can be countered through an attention to the material details of the lived past. This is not to advocate self-absorption; rather, this enables the historicized subject to acknowledge the discursive shifts of self. To encounter one's own manipulated and manipulating self is an oppositional strategy which employs a critical and conscious reading of the interplay of social forces. In this way, the critical work is not directed at that situation, as opposed to this situation, but is recognizably transgressive. Situatedness, as an historical reconstruction of self, invites a constant re-reading, and so the dynamics of social/institutional processes are historically incorporated into the inquiry.
The compatibility of Haug's (1987) and Smith's (1988) approach help describe a reflective work which is not specifically invested in the personal disclosure as a basis for inquiry, but which recognizes how the inclusion of personal experience is a process within which the multiplicities of self and/in the social world persist. The personal is more than political here: it is politicized.

It is this inclusion - the shifting (historicized) perspective of identification through participation - which responds to <and acts out> the politics of resistance. If there is an understanding which will enable a more generous reading of women's participation in the social world, then multiple reflections of what participation entails can contribute to a disparate reading; it is (potentially) a process of recognition, of making visible the historicized practitioner in the social world. It is a critical process which can reveal the discursive structures of society.

As a critical practice, this sort of work contradicts the dominant ideologies regarding identity formation[s]. For example, in this context I have tried to complicate the practices of teacher-training in an effort to explore the process of conflict and struggle. Obviously, there is no such thing as a "teacher"-identity; however, teacher-training programs are invested through an ideology which conforms to a belief that, through a certain specialized training, students can learn to be, or identify as, teachers. As Britzman (1991) suggests, issues of conformity in teacher education necessarily invite the problems of processing "...not only knowledge but persons as well." (p. 32).
More precisely, in ECE, it is predominantly women who participate in the practices of becoming a teacher of young children. And as I have discussed, the social world of ECE, as a community of practice, extends far beyond the immediate instant of participation: the social relations of ECE shift from the lived childhood experience of being a child/girl/student within the ECE classroom contexts, to the adult/woman participating as a student within the ECE teacher-training context. Here women are bringing their educational biographies to teacher education, "...and some well-worn and commonsensical images of teacher's work." (Britzman, 1991, p. 3). In her own eloquence, Britzman describes it as follows:

Despite the persistency of cultural myths that position the teacher as expert, as self-made, as sole bearer of power, and as a product of experience, those learning to teach feel a rupture between the ethic and the experience, because learning to teach constitutes a time of biographical crisis as it simultaneously invokes one's autobiography...[I]t is a time when one's past, present, and future are set in dynamic tension.” (p. 8)

Reading the multiplicities of self necessarily includes a reading of the structures which work against this, such as ideologies (eg., the logic of unity) which promote the cultivation of a stabilized self.

Identity/Identification

If identity is positioned as multiplicitous and discursive, it is irretievable in participation. By approaching issues of identification from the perspective that identity is inseparable from practice, however, a space opens where the problem of participation can
be understood differently. It is possible to study practices in order to gain some proximity to identification issues. By the same token, it is not enough to examine practices and identification processes as thought there is some sort of specificity which can be attained; as though at some point, any moment now, a reasonable direction for future research will emerge from the confusion; here the reader, understandably, anticipates recognition, coherence, something which is utterly possible. To shift the weight of this expectation, it is useful to complicate the rational conclusion with an elaboration on what is utterly impossible.

There is no form of identity which is inclusive, and so an approach to understanding participation necessarily acknowledges multiplicities (difference) and “...the heterogeneous systems which, masked by the self, inhibit the formation of any form of identity.” (Foucault, 1977, p. 162). The discursive self is a relational self:

Learning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations. To ignore this aspect of learning is to overlook the fact that learning involves the construction of identities.

(Lave Wenger, 1991, p. 53)

Similarly, however, it is futile to deny the ways totalizations participate in practices. This is to say that there are undeniable forms, or ideals, which are assigned in the cultural construction of teachers. An example of this is available in the way the language of morality is used to describe teacher effectivity; that is, “good” teachers are positioned in opposition to “bad” teachers (Britzman, 1991, p. 5). To better understand the influences and interactions these kinds of totalities (eg., generalizations which are contingent upon
negation, or opposing dualisms), it is helpful to consider the historical traces which contribute to the generativity of these forms.

Returning to the example of developmentally appropriate practice, one of more frequently assigned reasons for the sweeping acceptance ECE has given to developmentally appropriate practice is the belief that there is indeed a whole child, that there is a unity which can be preserved (e.g., Hendrick, 1992). The whole child is categorized as an emotional, physical, social, intellectual self and the curriculum, accordingly, embraces this unified system of self-contained interactions and student-teachers learn to look for ways where the whole child can be taught.

This is an example of what may be deemed as the inescapable expectation of normalcy within communities of shared practice. Certainly the criteria for what constitutes the appropriate construct of normalcy is situated within each community's particular practices: (obviously, what is normal practice for a glass-blower is not normal practice for a circus clown). Sets of practices carry with them sets of expectations which are specific to the history and traditions of the community. As I have discussed, the role of tradition in communities of shared practice is reflective of a dominant order which invariably privileges certain persons and not others. Normalcy is embedded in the rigour of practice, which is to say that tradition and organization of a community produce kinds of normal practices: so participation is always, in some way, an interaction with the expectation of normalcy.
In ECE, this expectation is found in developmentally appropriate practice, where the suggestion that there is an appropriate practice renders the efforts to work outside this doctrine as definably inappropriate, unacceptable. As a normalizing technology, DAP inculcates its practitioners into an operational ideology which positions difference as the exception to the norm, and which privileges conformity. Here then, DAP, as an ideological practice, involves the interactions of the practitioner as well as the children.

**Performance, revisited**

In order to explore how this interaction between ideological practices and the members of a community specifically plays out in practice, I have decided to re-open the narrative which closed Chapter 1 of this text and read for the conflicting relations which are taking place:

*In a daycare practicum, less than a year into the teacher-training program, I was asked by my cooperating teacher to perform the calendar routine with the children in her group, which consisted of eight four-year old children. During this routine, one of the children was suddenly overcome with a fit of giggles. I knew I was being observed, evaluated on my ability to "manage" the group, but this girl's giggles were infectious: even I began to laugh. The cooperating teacher instructed me, then, to direct this girl to the "silly chair" because she was being disruptive. While I thought that disrupting the calendar routine was a welcomed interruption, I complied with the instruction and, effectively echoing the authoritative voice of the observing teacher, I told the girl she would have to sit in the silly chair. (The silly chair is a chair positioned outside the circle area, the purpose being to isolate the child from the rest of the group). The girl went to the chair and cried, while I continued with the obligatory monotony of naming week-days, the month, and so on.*
Following this activity, I approached the girl and apologized to her, comforted her; and I was powerfully aware of a feeling that I identified more with the children than with the teacher. My sense of alliance with the girl was embarrassing to me, because I knew I was expected to perform as an authority figure, the teacher, the adult in charge of young children, and so on.

After my conversation with the girl, the cooperating teacher reprimanded me for apologizing, and explained to me, patiently, speaking to me as though I were one of her four year olds, that by apologizing I undermined my own authority.

What struck me profoundly was that I never spoke to the children in the manner that she spoke to me, and I was significantly offended by what I perceived to be condescending speech: I was both resenting the way she was communicating to me, and experiencing a sense of displacement, for I thought I could never talk to children that way, and I believed, as well, that it was a necessary practice for ECE teachers.

As a re-collected experience, this episode can be positioned as reflective of the struggle not only to perform within the parameters of my own teacher-training, but also in the current context of this thesis, where the experience is being used to represent a disruption within the document. Here it is the <my> body which takes up space as a text, in the text, interrupting the academic discourse with what appears to be anecdotalism. Further confounding this episode is the conflict of my own complicity. Clearly I have sculpted this event in a way which serves my own investment in historicizing my participation within the ECE community. In one sense, this excerpt is a self-constructed gesture at providing some sort of evidence, as if to say see how awful it was for me?

The inclination to uncomplicate experience is also confronted by Frigga Haug and her colleagues, where they acknowledge that in the processes of socialization and the recalling of experiences, human beings will work at restructuring, rewriting their histories so that existence/experience is effectively uncontradictory:
Given that there is however no such thing as an existence without contradictions...we had to assume that the absence of contradictions in our self-interpretations will to a large extent be constructed by us; contradictions are forgotten and omitted, left unperceived.

(p. 40)

This problem of invisible processes in experience is taken up by Joan Scott (1991). In *The evidence of experience*, Scott (1991) discusses the uses of personal experience in historical inquiries, and points out that while individual experiences helpfully introduce contradictory readings of history, the problem lies in letting experience speak for itself, or in believing that experience is self-explanatory. To avoid reading experience as somehow innocent or self-regulating, issues of (the politics of) identity production need to be incorporated into the positioning of personal experience:

Experience is, in this approach, not the origin of our explanation, but that which we want to explain. This kind of approach does not undercut politics by denying the existence of subjects; *it instead interrogates the process of their creation and, in so doing, refigures history and the role of the historian and opens new ways for thinking about change.*

(Scott, 1991, p. 797, my emphasis)

As such, the narrative I have included can be understood as a given interpretation of an event, and “...as something that needs to be interpreted.” (p. 797). In this respect, memory-work can be understood as a counter-memory (Foucault, 1977), an act of descent into the physical self where social structures imprint, disfigure, chafe, and so on, as an act which enables the necessary emergence of disparity. By attending to the language of the narrative, that is, by considering experience as a “linguistic event” (Scott, 1991, p. 793), it
is no longer the experience itself which demands scrutiny, but the way in which the experience has been re-constituted through language.

With this in mind, it is possible here to attempt a re-vestment of the tale with an exploratory reading.

Smith (1988) outlines three analytical components which constitute an institutional ethnography: (i) the ideological organization of the environment; (ii) the practices which constitute the everyday involvement of persons in their work/participation; and (iii), "...the concept of social relation analyses the immediately experienced..." (p. 64, my emphasis).

Haug's (1986) explanation of memory-work not only provides a methodological companion for institutional ethnography (where the body is brought into the analysis as a kind of text through which ideologies and institutionalizations are lived historically [p. 50]), but Haug offers an echo of Scott's claim as well: "If we allow ourselves to subject our own past to dispassionate scrutiny, we may perhaps be able to effect some change in the present." (Haug, p. 51).

Turning to the narrative, for example, I can read how my body is loudly written into the text through my shared laughter with the giggling child, ("...but this girl's giggles were infectious: even I began to laugh") and how I have quietly turned away from my body:

_The girl went to the chair and cried, while I continued with the obligatory monotony of naming week-days, the month, and so on._
I omit the part of me that listens to the child, I have not written this into the text; and yet I acknowledge that I can hear her in the same gesture. My reference here to the “obligatory monotony” of the calendar routine is a clearly a self-conscious claim. It is interesting here to try and trace the multiple threads of control and power which permeate this instance, where I have been instructed to send the child to the ‘silly chair’, and I comply. Instructional authority passes through me in a way which carries institutionalized directives into the body. Here a dominant text is transgressing through the relations of the cooperating teacher, myself, and the child. I remain situated awkwardly, performing a ‘routine’ which is ‘monotonous’, simultaneously ignoring and acknowledging the audible grief of exclusion with the un-uttered drone of curricular authority.

Further conflicting this episode is the discomfort of my complicity with both the child and the institution:

The cooperating teacher instructed me, then, to direct this girl to the “silly chair” because she was being disruptive.

The implication is that the girl was disrupting the routine, but she was also disrupting my performance as a teacher; and yet she wasn’t, because I laughed with her. What is being disrupted here shifts with the direction of the gaze. And I make note that I thought “disrupting the calendar routine was a welcomed interruption”; but within the experience, as it is written, I seem to have no sense of how to make this visible. My feeling of powerlessness as a student-teacher is evidenced in my obeisance to the cooperating teacher’s instructions; however my power status as an adult relieves me having to answer for my own laughter. It is only years later that I reveal my private belief
that for myself the laughter was more useful and interesting than the calendar routine. In effect we were both disruptive, but it appears as though only one of us answers for it.

There is much to be gained at this point from an understanding of the body-as-text in relation to institutional texts:

*After my conversation with the girl, the cooperating teacher reprimanded me for apologizing, and explained to me, patiently, speaking to me as though I were one of her four-year olds, that by apologizing I undermined my own authority.*

Here the institutional text dominates the body-as-text. The hierarchy of authority is enacted as I am reprimanded for apologizing, but more critically is the issue of my authority. I write that I knew “*I was expected to perform as an authority figure*”, and yet I am unnerved by the ways teacher-authority is demonstrated to me by/through the cooperating teacher. I am both performing with an perception of power, and resisting the position at the same time. Similarly, when I am offended by the “*condescending speech*” of the cooperating teacher, I am equally subsumed by my belief that “*...it was a necessary practice for ECE teachers.*”. The teaching practices of ECE, positioned as an institutionalized text (in the form of speech, and in the form of sanctioned practice) effectively dominate the body-as-text (in the form of my shared laughter with the child; my gestures to apologize and comfort the girl following the activity).

What is interesting here is the way the body and the institution are interacting in conflicting shifts and discursions; the cooperating teacher’s authority, the emphasis on control (no laughing!), and the locus of power are traceable, and yet these interactions are described by me with a kind of linearity which invests me, as the author of the event, with
a central and controlling authority. I have taken over the episode in a way which
privileges my participation and positions my perception as unproblematic.

Most provocative to this analysis is the admission that "I identified more with the
children than with the teacher". Certainly the experience demonstrates kinds of
infantalising practices: the 'silly' chair, the verbal reprimand, the unspoken expectation
that there is no giggling allowed during certain routines. Within the blurred chronology of
these events, however, are the invisible manipulations of hindsight, the unavoidable guile
of memory. My feelings of alliance to the girl are disclosed as I am comforting her,
following the routine, and it is this particular action, my apology, which provokes the
verbal reprimand. What is not clear, then, is in what ways I was identifying with the girl. I
write that I identified with "the children" (plural), and side-step the possibility that I
identified with the girl for reasons which are not disclosed. In this instance, interrogating
the narrative reveals gaps, strange spaces which I have stumbled through without looking.
It is also not clear why I was so slow to notice the way gender and racial privilege are
operating within this narrative, which is a story about three white persons, as two women,
and the four year old girl.

To pursue these traces is possibly beyond the scope of this current document;
although, certainly Joan Scott's cautions regarding the uses of experience are worth
noting as a critical and necessary dimension of historical uses of experience as evidence.
As well, it is possible to understand how the body-as-text is readable through social
processes which take place in institutional contexts. It is equally possible now to perceive
how a reading of the institution as text reveals ideological structures (concerning, for example, what is appropriate behaviour in an educative context/what indeed is an educative context?), and how these work within/through/and upon the body.

This does not point to resolution: it points nowhere, really. What is critical at this junction is the emphasis on reading, as a political activity, where participation is framed as ongoing negotiations for position. How, for instance, does a practitioner resist oppression and perform in a way which is still acceptable to a community’s dominant practice? What would it mean to identify more problematically within a community of practice? How might practices and organizations change if the expectation of unity were discarded, or transformed into something more discursive? Are there communities-of-practice which foreground the multiplicities of identity within practice and participation? If so, what do they look like? How could an understanding of discursive organizations inform transformation?

If experience is understood as a linguistic event, what does the language of opposition reveal and recover within the scripts of conformity and transformation?

The task here is not simply to seek out the conflicting acts, but to recognize that participation necessarily invokes both acts of rebellion and performances of compliance: and it is these struggles which interact with identity and practice. These struggles are relations between what we do and who we are, how we act and how we perceive
ourselves in action, these are the sites where power relations manifest in performative and interpretive practice.

Within the contexts of educational research, as a critical and historical praxis, the academic is surely no witness of history or events, but is both a writer of history, and an already historicized subject. This is not to say that all educational research must be performed in discursive spaces; but it does indicate the impossibility of academic work being anything but discursive, historical.
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