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ABSTRACT

Personal observation, supported by Ministry of Education statistics, indicates that women are underrepresented in social studies teaching in BC. Social studies is about how humans interact and have interacted in the social world. Yet, these interactions are defined largely by men and are about men. The experience of women as teachers of social studies is both little studied and extremely important for understanding the subject and improving its teaching. This thesis looks at their experiences, as constructed in the stories of six women who have been leaders in the teaching of social studies and geography. It draws from their personal and professional narratives some reflections on women's ways of understanding equity, pedagogy, curriculum, citizenship, and leadership.
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INTRODUCTION

Social studies is concerned with the processes through which individual and social identities are formed and transformed; it is about "the study of human action in the social world, and the activity of learning itself takes place within such social action" (Whitson and Stanley, as cited in Stanley (1991, p. 258). But women are marginalized in social studies, leaving "human action in the social world" to be defined largely in male terms. The experience of women as teachers in social studies is both little studied and extremely important for understanding the subject and improving its teaching. This thesis looks at the experiences of six women who have been leaders in the teaching of social studies and draws from their experiences some reflections on equity, pedagogy, curriculum, and leadership.

In a comprehensive analysis of the present state of social studies in the U.S., Jenness (1990) alludes to the absence of women social studies teachers in one school, adding that "it is well established that nationally, most social studies teachers are men" (p.361); he footnotes figures of 60 to 75% male teachers. Rutter (1986) also notes the imbalance:

Three-quarters of social studies teachers are male; 92% are white. Social studies is the most male-dominated subject although science, math, and computer science also have large proportions of male teachers (p.252).

BC Ministry of Education data (1992b; see Appendix I) confirm personal observation that women are underrepresented in social studies in British Columbia to a greater degree than they are in the US. Table 1 compares the presence of women teaching senior social studies elective
courses with academic areas not traditionally taught by women and with academic areas more traditionally associated with women’s teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Math/Science</th>
<th>English/Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law 12</td>
<td>Physics 12</td>
<td>English 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog 12</td>
<td>Chem 12</td>
<td>Eng Lit 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist 12</td>
<td>Math 12</td>
<td>French 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9%  7%  44%
14%  11% 47%
17%  17% 71%

Table 1: Comparison of % Female Teachers
Selected Grade 12 Academic Courses

Kelly and Nihlen (1982) suggest the greatest implication of women’s underrepresentation: "The gender of a teacher, when sex-segregated by subject area, may well tell students that particular subject matter is legitimate knowledge for one sex rather than both sexes" (p.169).

The Ministry of Education publication entitled Gender Equity (1991) notes the uneven distribution of women across subject areas.

Female teachers are a small minority in several key areas: computer education (10.6%), mathematics (20.9%) science (17.8%) and social studies (25.3%) (p.8).

The underrepresentation of women in social studies is not generally acknowledged, although there is recognition of the problem in the other more technical areas. The figures cited for social studies, however, obscure another reality of women’s teaching of social studies and that is their uneven distribution. Most of these women (70%) teach junior social studies, that is, social studies 8, 9, and 10. Kelly and Nihlen’s (1982) point that "the higher the level of education, the fewer the number of women in administrative and teaching positions" (p.168) is confirmed in social studies teaching. The higher the grade level, the less noticeable the presence of women in social studies; besides the figures for senior elective courses in social studies already shown in Table 1, in grade 11 social studies, 22% of teachers are women, as compared with grade 8, 31%. Women who teach senior courses (grade 11, Law 12, History 12, Geography 12, and
Western Civilization 12) constitute only 7% of secondary social studies teachers in BC. In fact, men are nearly five times more likely to teach senior courses than women. The figures vary considerably from district to district within the province, as well, with some small districts having no women at all teaching social studies. (Interestingly, however, 58% of teachers of Sciences Humaines, that is, French Immersion social studies, are women.) Enrollment in preservice social studies methods courses promises little change. In UBC’s Teacher Education program (1992-1993), only 14% of the students in social studies methods courses are women, as compared with 30% in science and 40% in mathematics methods.

The dominance of men is also expressed in curriculum and in the way in which social studies is taught. Current social studies curricular objectives explicitly include the transmission of a nation’s legacy: its culture, its history, its citizenship expectations. Jane Roland Martin (1982) says that this has been mainly a male legacy:

> When the activities and experiences traditionally associated with women are excluded from the educational realm and when that realm is defined in terms of male activities and experiences, then these become the educational norms for all human beings (p.146).

Feminists have shown that the treatment of history in schools has been based on the "white man’s" discovery and exploration of the new world and on his attempts to make sense of these processes in legal, artistic, military, political, economic, and social terms. History as it has been taught, says Rich (1986), is "white man’s nostalgia...[which] sees only certain kinds of human lives as valuable, as deserving of a history at all" (p.140).

Even a reformed liberal-progressive curriculum inadequately addresses the real contributions of women (McKenna, 1989). Such a curriculum insets the experiences of women; stories of great women like Elizabeth I and Eleanor of Aquitaine, pictures of women, and
references to women's achievements such as the attainment of the suffrage, have been added to the main story as sidebars in textbooks in response to the feminist challenge.

On the positive side, women have gained access to a world once exclusively maintained for men. On the negative side, social studies ... has been flooded with trivia and is threatened by continuing fragmentation. Further, women’s genuine contributions have been glossed over because they do not fit the male model of achievement (Noddings, 1992, p.240).

Male dominance may also be viewed in pedagogical terms. Profiles based on large-scale surveys of social studies teachers conclude, for example, that social studies teachers are more likely to coach sports than other academic teachers but are often isolated professionally, having little time to collaborate or take part in professional development; they rely on a narrow range of traditional teaching and evaluative strategies; they value coverage of content and are text-focussed in their approach to curriculum; their lessons are teacher-centred; most do not belong to professional associations (Clarke, 1982; Goodlad, 1984; Rutter, 1986; Cassidy and Bognar, 1991; Aoki, 1977; Cuban, 1991). While such profiles hardly describe exemplary teaching for men or women, it can be argued that they are closer to what feminists critique as male -- or at least not female -- pedagogy. Feminist scholarship suggests that women, valuing connection, create teaching and learning contexts which are more collaborative, collegial, cooperative, and interactive (Tetreault, 1986).

Social studies research has not recognized gender as a factor in teaching. Leming (1986) ignores gender in his call for research on curriculum effectiveness and for descriptions based on insights and commonalities of exemplary programs in social studies. Dynesson (1984) is also silent on gender in calling for innovative social studies research in several areas, including: the role of the social studies classroom on cultural transmission; the connection between cultural learning, cognition, human behaviour, and the social studies classroom; the relationship between
teachers' communication skills and student learning; the links between instructional modes and learning outcomes; the relationship between cultural learning and discovery/inquiry methods of teaching; the connection between teachers' concern for students and the use of instructional materials; and the personal and professional attributes of effective teachers of social studies. Armento (1986) claims that social studies pedagogy can be better understood by considering the affective and cognitive dimensions of both teachers and students, as well as the ecological and political institutional factors in which teaching is contextualized. She also suggests that researchers examine the ways in which teachers "care" in encouraging students to "connect" with social studies, social issues, and sociopolitical action. "New social studies constructs, such as the ethic of caring, should be carefully considered for their relevance to research on teaching social studies" (1991, p.193). All these questions have a gender dimension which needs to be explored. Since gender is a factor in curricular and pedagogical transformation processes and, as Fouts (1990) indicates, in student response to curriculum and teaching practice, then research into social studies teaching can be informed by research into women teaching social studies.

THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this investigation is to begin such research by describing the experience of women who are considered leaders in the field of teaching social studies. The experiences of these women will be important because, as Cuban (1991) suggests, social studies researchers should focus on teachers as individuals in particular settings and in particular environments to examine the beliefs that inform their practice:

By the 'individual,' I mean seeking answers in how teachers think and behave, but with an emphasis on the will of teachers to make choices and bend situations to meet their goals. By 'setting,' I mean the immediate context of the work that teachers do, that is, the classroom and school. By 'environment,' I mean the district, the community, the state, and the federal structures that influence
the school, and the larger culture with its values that inevitably penetrate the classroom (p.206).

Inclusion in Ministry of Education committees on curriculum development and evaluation/assessment is used in this study as the criterion of leadership, although other dimensions of leadership are also evident. Asking why these exemplary women teach as they do and understand their work as they do facilitates an investigation of the many factors that shape their practice of teaching as women. The study seeks perspectives, insights, differences, and commonalities to illuminate how these women perceive the experience of social studies in their own terms.

Research questions which underlie the investigation are:

1. What are the personal and professional attributes of women who have shown leadership in the field of social studies?

2. How do successful women respond to the experience of teaching social studies? That is, how do women negotiate, conform to, or resist the dominant expectations inherent in the domain of social studies?

3. What incentives and/or obstacles -- personal, structural, or curricular -- do women perceive in the teaching of social studies?

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

Chapter 1 reviews current literature which pertains to the study. Chapter 2 describes the methodology used in conducting the study and analyzing the data obtained. Chapter 3 tells each woman's personal story, describing the 'individual,' in Cuban's terms, and what she brings as a woman to the profession of teaching and to the teaching of social studies, in particular. Chapter 4 focuses on classroom 'settings' and examines the particular curricular and pedagogical stories by which they describe their practice of teaching. Chapter 5 looks at the larger landscapes of the women's teaching, the 'environments' or particular contexts for teaching social studies, including departments, schools, professional groups, district, and Ministry of Education
committees in which they encounter the institutional and social forces which shape their lives as teachers. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 analyze the data with the understanding that, consciously or unconsciously, these women have particular beliefs and ways of knowing and of viewing themselves culturally and socially, that is, particular standpoints and identities, by which they negotiate and transform curriculum, practice, and experience in their teaching lives and around which they construct their stories. Chapter 6 reviews the major themes of the study and considers the implications of the findings of the study for teaching practice, for pre-service education, for students, for curricular reform and re-vision, as well as for hiring and promotional practices as these pertain to women and social studies, and for feminist research.
CHAPTER 1: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

If, as Stanley (1991) tells us, social studies is the study of human action in the social world, then teaching and learning take place within patterns of social action which tie the social studies classroom inextricably and directly to the world beyond. To study the teaching of social studies from a gender perspective is to study the gendered patterns of social interaction.

Overview of the Study’s Theoretical Framework

As a study of women’s experience of teaching social studies, the study is grounded in the theoretical discourse of feminist and critical pedagogy, though these are perceived as problematic within the context of the study. Additionally, a gender lens is used to view the discourse of social studies, seeking to expose the hidden and androcentric agenda of research, of teaching, and of the explicit curriculum, including history, geography, politics, and citizenship. Social studies literature, at worst, omits girls’ and women’s concerns and, at best, marginalizes them. Unlike the literature of math and science teaching, social studies literature does not specifically discuss a girl-friendly curriculum or teaching style. Research into social studies teaching indicates the persistence of a tradition of text-focused, lecture-style, teacher-centred teaching, despite research and reform initiatives for incorporation of more learner-focused (or student-friendly) strategies to actively involve students in the construction of knowledge. Yet the discourse for women’s teaching and leadership suggests that women prefer the more open, collaborative, integrative, horizontal agenda associated with current educational reform initiatives in BC. A poststructural perspective cautions us to consider that there are many ways of being a woman and that gender generalizations are restricting, naive, contradictory, and potentially politically dangerous. The discourse of teachers’ work exposes the contradictions which may be particularly significant for women, as education is increasingly tied to conservative economic and technical agendas. The
review of literature explores the theoretical underpinnings and paradoxical nature of the contexts within which women experience and negotiate in complex ways their identities as teachers and leaders in social studies. Specifically, the study looks at the implications for women of the discourse of teacher identity, of empowering, that is, critical and feminist, pedagogies, of social studies, as compared to science and mathematics, teaching and curriculum, and of the nature of teachers’ work.

Empowering Pedagogies: Feminist and Critical Discourse

The first area of review, the literature of feminist discourse and pedagogy, explores a model for teaching which, the literature suggests, is grounded in women’s experience. Feminist teaching is connected, caring, collaborative, collegial, cooperative (Noddings, 1984, 1992; Shrewsbury, 1987; Schniedewind, 1987; Culley and Portuges, 1985); it assumes an ethic of responsibility to others rather than of individual rights (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan, Lyons, Hanmer, 1989). Feminist pedagogy has an explicit political ideology which seeks to transform classrooms, connected ecologically and holistically to local, regional, and global communities, with goals of gender and social justice and commitment to growth, renewal, and life (Shrewsbury, 1987).

Feminist pedagogy is based on a questioning of traditional authority relations between teacher and student and a distrust of bureaucracy. It eschews the separation of the public classroom from private experience, and does not recognize a clear distinction between emotion and reason. It is quite opposed, then, to traditional academic structures (Gaskell, McLaren, and Novogrodsky, 1989, p.197).

This gender model raises questions: do the women in the study, consciously or unconsciously, incorporate Nodding’s (1988) "caring" in their teaching and curriculum transformation? Kristeva’s (1986) "cyclical time"? Ruddick’s (1986) "maternal thinking"? Gilligan’s (1982) "connectedness"? Belenky et al’s (1986) intuitive and contextual "ways of knowing"? If so, are their "women’s ways" somehow in conflict with the explicit or dominant pedagogical/curricular
ideologies of social studies teaching? Do they incorporate the cooperative, interactive, subjective strategies of Maher’s (1987a) "feminist classrooms"? What "connectedness" do they have as women to curriculum and to teaching?

The discourse of critical and democratic pedagogies has important implications for feminist pedagogical models; all seek to empower students to act in ways which will benefit or transform society (Apple, 1990; Wood, 1990; Osborne, 1991). Such teaching is progressive, democratic, reflective, relational, and dialectical. "Pedagogy," says Osborne, "is a powerful form of political education" (p.13); a pedagogy which empowers students "points to a political process" which is directed to individual and social transformation (p.62). The critical/feminist perspective challenges the assumptions of universality which underpin traditional teaching and curriculum. This traditional refrain drowns out the voices of others in its exclusive monologue. Do the women of this study, in the content they teach and in their own actions and appearance, create a learning context which embodies "commitment to a more just society for everyone" (Weiler, 1988, p.115)? Do they define themselves as "creators and enactors of curriculum in improving teaching and schooling" (Miller, 1986, p.112), rather than as purveyors of the traditions of teaching and curriculum? Do they engage in dialogue, as Miller suggests, "among men and women who see the transformative power of education and who strive for the transformations that are possible through participation in knowledge creation as well as dissemination" (p.121)? Do democratic and liberatory curricular goals impart to those who teach a sense of the politics of personal power which, within institutional sites of hierarchy and patriarchy, is both contradictory and constrained?

Constraints which some may feel in pursuing teaching or career goals create questions about the role of agency in the lives of women. Do themes of being acted upon and nurturance limit women’s sense of agency in teaching? Is there an active and/or intuitive awareness of the
institutionalized nature of male-dominance in pedagogical practice, in the ideologies which create
the master narratives of curriculum and which underpin the criteria for leadership? Are some
women more constrained than others? How do they resist the constraints? Weiler (1988) tells
us that women resist notions of victimization; they still view themselves as making particular
personal, academic, career, curricular, or pedagogical choices despite circumstances of constraint.

Post-structural feminists acknowledge the "essentially paternalistic project of traditional
education" (Ellsworth, 1992, p.99) but offer critiques of critical and feminist theory, as well as
democratic notions of education. Post-structural feminisms stand firmly on the feminist
foundation or standpoint in rejecting normative masculinist representation but "make conceptual
space for difference in subject location, identity and knowledges, [so as to render] such a
foundation anti-essentialist and indeterminate" (Luke and Gore, p.7). Critical theory is politically
gender-blind in its assumption that all have individual and equal rights to challenge the authority
of knowledge and power (Luke, 1992; Lather, 1992; Kenway and Modra, 1992; Martindale, 1992;
Greene, 1988). Critical and democratic pedagogies fail to address the problems of inequitable
power relations in which some are more respected and empowered than others, some more
audible (Briskin and Coulter, 1992; Lewis, 1992; Currie, 1992; Hoodfar, 1992). Progressive and
feminist pedagogies create essentialist traps for women in the very gender stereotypes they seek
to escape (Kenway and Modra, 1992; Walkerdine, 1992). Post-structural feminisms refuse the
Either/Or dualisms of Western liberal thought (Miles, 1989; Kenway and Modra, 1992) as
"conceptual residue of the age of modernity" (Luke, p.45), speaking instead of multiplicity and
contradictions (Gore, 1992).

Fuss (1989) confronts the contradictions of poststructural feminism, however, in its
creation of the binary opposition of essence and difference; interrogating essence, she says, does
not mean dismissing it, but coming to terms with its internal contradictions and being more
attentive to its cultural and historical specificities. The tensions created by the apparent contradictions between essentialists’ beliefs that the natural is constrained by the social and social constructionists’ beliefs that the natural is produced by the social produce feminism’s greatest insights. Essence, in Fuss’s view, lacks essence in that it is historically contingent, an elusive and shifting category which must be risked and negotiated and accessed, not erased. One’s subject-positions are not defined by clear and linear boundaries but are rather multiple, shifting, and changeable; allowance must also be made for real and material differences of privilege between women. The politics of essence, she suggests, depend upon "who is utilizing it, how it is deployed, and where its effects are concentrated" (p.20):

I cannot help but think that the determining factor in deciding essentialism’s political or strategic value is dependent upon who practices it: in the hands of a hegemonic group, essentialism can be employed as a powerful tool of ideological domination; in the hands of the subaltern, the use of humanism to mime ... humanism can represent a powerful displacing repetition. The question of the permissibility, if you will, of engaging in essentialism is therefore framed and determined by the subject-position from which one speaks (p.32).

The essence of all feminisms is politics, says Fuss, though the risky debate over what kind of politics continues and is essential in producing the critical tensions necessary to prevent solidification and paralysis.

Beyond the philosophical debate about women’s identities, Greene (1988) illuminates the reality of women’s locations. Women are situated in the concreteness and particularities of the everyday; they negotiate freedom and identity within constraints as on-going transactions of the matrices of social, cultural, economic, political, and psychological conditions. From their different standpoints, women negotiate a more complex, tentative, and difficult process to claim equality and the right to be heard than has been suggested in the discourse of the liberatory or empowering pedagogies and theories.
Women and the Discourse of Social Studies

A second area of literature relevant to this study is social studies research which addresses women's experience and concerns in some way. Sometimes the literature is notable for its omission of a gender dimension, however, as Bernard-Powers (in press) confirms in her feminist look at social studies research. "Inattention to gender concerns is a major flaw in the review of research in social studies," she claims. Within this broad area of social studies literature, there are a number of sub-categories and tangents which relate to concerns identified for women in social studies teaching.

There are very few studies of women teaching secondary social studies, in fact, and these are very recent. Few have been conducted from a feminist perspective. Cornett (1990) studies the impact of personal judgement on the professional decisions of an experienced secondary social studies teacher who happens to be a woman. He focuses on the factors which constitute her frame of reference for enacting curriculum in a senior elective course; gender is not seen as one of the filters.

Bennett and Spalding (1992) identify seven different pedagogical perspectives in their study of 68 academic teachers. Only in social studies are these all operational. They present "colour portraits" of each perspective; four of the portraits are of women. Theirs is an interpretive, rather than a critical feminist, frame of reference, yet we can see in their portrait of Katherine a woman uncomfortable in her attempts to conform to traditional curriculum objectives and transmission pedagogy. Little about Katherine's teaching as an inculcator represents the feminist pedagogical model. Marilyn who empowers, Caroline who nurtures, and Jenna who facilitates thinking present happier portraits of women teaching social studies. While the researchers identify the importance of teacher perspectives, or values, attitudes, and beliefs, to
teaching style, there is no gender lens by which to view these women’s pedagogical perspectives in social studies teaching.

Another study by Evans (1988) focuses on the relationship of teachers’ conceptions of history to their interpretations of curriculum and to student responses to history. Evans’ interns are three young men whose quite different views of history are "shaped by interaction with cultural institutions" (p.212). He speculates that gender may be one of several other important determinants. These conceptions of history are important in transforming the curriculum and are shared by the students in their classes. Evans’ study raises questions about the ways in which being a woman influences conceptions of history and social studies, the transformation of curriculum, and ways in which students receive that transformed curriculum.

Students who chose Tetreault’s (1986) ten-week eleventh-grade women’s history option struggled with the "opinioney" nature of the program; prior to her class, they had viewed history as "an objective record of the facts" (p.81). The women’s history class had altered their views:

They had a glimmer of an understanding that learning history from a woman’s perspective challenges the continuation of a dominant male culture and threatens the common-sense rules that govern male and female relationships and responsibilities. Women’s history gave them a critical edge (p.82).

Another area of social studies literature reviewed for this study looks at the current reform debates about schooling and about social studies (Goodlad, 1984; Jenness, 1990; Shaver, 1991). What are the implications of reform for women? Little or no reference is made to women or to the "proliferation of feminist scholarship" and the changes alluded to by Tetreault (1987a) as having taken place in the last 15 years in thinking about women, gender, and social studies. This "current renaissance," as she calls it, has reframed the way in which we see history:

Women were an anomalous element in the content, structure, and methodology of these disciplines, whose paradigm was one in
which men -- in most instances, dominant white men -- and traditional male activities were the norm (p.170).

Grambs (1987) discusses resistance to women's scholarship in social studies:

There is an abundance of interesting, exciting, and revolutionary findings in all the social sciences and all branches of history. Yet the experience and testimony of students and teachers, as well as studies of school texts, indicate that women and scholarship about women's experience are still marginal, if not entirely missing (p.228).

Fullinwinder (1991) analyzes the contributions of philosophical inquiry to social studies research and teaching; feminist challenges to philosophy, he suggests, are like "depth charges" which may not affect philosophy so much as:

... so roil the cultural surface that any number of creaky, barnacle-encrusted social, political, and educational traditions floating there are put in peril of sinking. The wide-ranging feminist critiques alone show how much of that surface needs rehabilitation, how much of our "common sense" about politics, education, science, sports, military service, business, finance, religion, and art needs rethinking. This rethinking, and the "unthinking" that must precede it, need not involve plumbing the depths for metaphysical doctrines, but they do require that we "think behind appearances," that is, that we bring to awareness beliefs and methods we more or less have taken for granted and have never much thought about, at least from the point of view of gender. Making gender a central category changes everything. What we thought was adequate, complete, impartial, neutral, objective, and comprehensive often looks, through the prism of gender, to be partial, one-sided, incomplete, loaded, selective, and biased (p.17).

He continues by examining the implications of the absence of women in law and science, in particular "questions about the very meaning of good science, the very meaning of justice in the courtroom" (p.17). Fullinwinder, like others, does not recognize the problems of the relative absence of women teaching social studies which must surely call into question the very meaning of a good education when "human action" is, in fact, largely a description of "man's action" in the social world. Nor is the feminist challenge to social studies a main point in his argument.
Social studies literature also focuses on teaching models. In addition to constructing generalized profiles of social studies teachers, studies search for models of teacher competence in social studies. Cuban (1991) reviews the history of studies of social studies teaching, noting the persistence of particular instructional patterns.

Remarkable improvements in the occupation of teaching are paralleled by constancy in a narrow band of teaching practices and students' complaints about that teaching (p.205).

Others confirm the predominance of the transmissive style of social studies teaching which is text-based, teacher-centred, and lecture-oriented, and which creates passive learning environments for students (Rutter, 1986; Goodlad, 1984; Cuban, 1991; Armento, 1986; Wineburg and Wilson, 1991; Thornton, 1991). Cohen (1988) traces the historical roots of the traditional model of teaching as telling, knowledge as discovered, not constructed, and learning as passive to its early roots in medieval Europe, Christianity, Judaism, and Protestantism, seeing it as an inheritance that is both conservative and unwittingly passed on. "Traditional teaching in schools echoes and reflects popular practices outside schools"; parents and other students influence students' learning about learning. Despite the rhetoric of new pedagogies, "many educators and local districts carefully avoid new ideas and practices, and teachers who might embrace them" (Cohen, 1988, p.48).

Thornton (1991) reviews research that focuses on the teacher as the key to the social studies curriculum which students receive; curricular/instructional gatekeepers employ decision-making skills through a particular frame of reference, also called personal perspective, personal theory, implicit theory, and personal practical knowledge (Clandinin and Connelly, 1986; Stanley, 1991). Thornton calls for well-crafted studies of exemplary cases of gatekeeping as "images of the possible," noting the concerns of feminist and critical theorists with the lack of a theoretical or research challenge to the status quo. According to Armento (1986),
What the field [of social studies teaching] needs ... is broader recognition and better application of the idea that pedagogy cannot be properly studied without fully considering ecological and political institutional factors and student and teacher affective and cognitive factors (p.949).

Critical/feminist pedagogical models of interactive, cooperative, democratic, caring teaching suggest that the traditional transmission model of social studies teaching would not appeal to women. Competent teachers, suggests Stanley (1991), "stress active student participation in the learning process and reject most transmission models of instruction, including much of the teacher effectiveness model" (p.257). Studying women's curricular/instructional gatekeeping strategies, and the personal practical perspectives which govern these, could perhaps generate new models of competence for men and women teaching social studies and alleviate somewhat the tension and discomfort of borrowing unwittingly a traditional social studies pedagogical model which does not fit all teachers and all learners and our times. There are additional implications for implementing reform in social studies in BC in studying women's ways of teaching.

There are many studies of student attitudes to social studies (Fraser, 1981; Haladyna et al, 1982; Schug et al, 1984; Shaughnessy, Haladyna, 1985; Fouts, 1990). They show that students lose interest in social studies as they progress through school and that the teacher is significant in creating a successful learning environment and in shaping student attitudes. Only Fouts' study added the perspective of gender; he studied twenty junior high social studies classes, ten taught by women, ten by men. Fouts was not able to research senior students' attitudes because "there were no women at the [senior] high school level in this district" (p.418). He found that girls responded more positively to social studies when they had a woman teacher than when they had a man. He speculates that girls and women are uncomfortable with the curriculum and that the women teachers bring unique perspectives, values, and insights to the
social studies classes or use feminist teaching methods to create a learning environment more appealing to girls. In particular, Fouts’ study raises questions about the importance of women as role models in social studies and the effects of their absence or relative absence in teaching this subject. Two other studies, not based on social studies teaching but on observations of all subject areas, suggest that girls respond more positively to women than to men teachers (Stanworth, 1983; Riddell, 1992). Recent studies show that girls respond positively to "girl-friendly" classrooms where high value is placed on interactive, social learning as girls’ ways of being in classrooms (Riddell, 1992; American Association of University Women, 1992; Whyte, et al, 1985; Sadker and Sadker, 1986). No literature specifically addresses the importance of women as role models for students and the particulars of women’s relating to students in social studies. If, in fact, women embody and teach more caring, holistic, integrative, and relational notions of citizenship and social life in their classrooms, the dynamics of women’s teaching social studies might well be the subject of ethnographic and critical research or theory.

Stanley (1991) reviews research on teacher competence in social studies and concludes that it requires technical skills, practical knowledge, and critical awareness. He worries that the assumptions of teacher effectiveness in social studies are too limited and technical to measure teaching "for more complex goals such as reflective examination of social issues .... There is a danger that teacher competence for social studies will be defined too narrowly" (p.259). Shulman (1986) acknowledges that teachers of social studies may experience discomfort with cultural literacy, standardized curriculum, and standardized assessment which prescribe standards of practice and de-skill the profession. Jenness (1990) discusses the call in social studies in the U.S. for a return to the basics, a focus on cultural capital, excellence, and technicism, what he calls the "excellence, equity, and efficiency" problem, which he sees as a response to rapid technical
change and globalization. Tetreault (1987b) correlates this to the call for higher standards and
standardized curriculum,

...an implicit call for returning to a standard that presumes male
experience and human experience are equivalent. Gender is rarely
a relevant category in the analysis of excellence in schools (p.167).

Yet reform that is learner-focused (Year 2000), or that incorporates global awareness (Cassidy
and Bognar, 1991; Bernard-Powers, in press; Noddings, 1992), for example, can hardly fail to
reflect the perspectives of women educators whose critical awareness sees the technical and
traditional directions of education as contradictory, uncomfortable, controlling, and constraining.

Most of the research into women and social studies pertains to the absence of women in
history textbooks (Baldwin and Baldwin, 1992; Light, Staton, and Bourne, 1992; Contreras, 1987;
Gaskell et al, 1989; Bernard-Powers, in press) and the biased treatment of women in standard
history curricula (Novogrodsky and Wells, 1989; Brandt, 1989; Coomber and Evans, 1989;
Flaherty, 1989; Gross, 1987; McKenna, 1989; Grambs, 1987; Maher, 1987; Makler, 1987;
Tetreault, 1987; Styer, 1988; Prentice and Pierson, 1989). The relevance of this literature to the
study is in its identification of the discomfort women may feel as a response to omission or
marginalization in the standard curriculum.

Brandt (1989) says that most history specialists understand subjectivity in historical
representation but do not see gender as a factor; she suggests that most teachers have not taken
courses in women’s history. McIntosh’s (1983) five-phase classification of curricula suggests
that, in phase one, there is little or no mention of women; in phase two, a handful of women who
have competed successfully in a male world in men’s terms are added on to the curriculum; in
phase three, in recognition of the gaps and biases, there is an examination of the politics of
curriculum and suggestion of alternatives; in phase four, women’s lives and experience are
incorporated into the curriculum, changing the boundaries of power for the teacher; in the final phase, new ways of thinking about knowledge create a new curriculum:

... a circular, multi-cultural, inclusive curriculum which socializes people to be whole, balanced and undamaged, which includes rather than excluding most parts of life, and which fosters a pluralistic understanding and fulfils the dream of a common language (p.33).

The particular issues which underlie this body of literature create tensions for critically aware women teachers who consciously transform the explicit curriculum of social studies with its implicit message that the male standard is universal.

Tensions are not alleviated by studies of teachers’ curricular choices in social studies; two show that gender concerns rate low in social studies teachers’ priorities. Flaherty (1989) notes a "resistance to teaching about women in history that still prevails within many history departments" which too often, in his view, are "boys’ clubs":

Teachers across Toronto were asked to rank in order of priority the units they would most like to see developed ... the one dealing with the women’s movement in Canada and the USA came in last on the list (p.15).

In Case’s (1992) study, creating a gender sensitive curriculum came last on a list of 26 principles of teaching and learning that the social studies teachers in BC would support in further defining directions for social studies in the province’s Year 2000 reform.

Jane Bernard-Powers (1993) concludes that "the climate is chilly for gender fair, culturally inclusive social studies." Literature about the absence of women in historical representation suggests questions for this study. Are the women of the study aware of omission or of trivialization or of marginalization? Do they compensate in transforming the curriculum? Do the women of the study create and enact a more inclusive curriculum? Have they taken courses in women’s history or women’s studies? Are they aware of the limited space they occupy in the
margins of social studies teaching? Do they understand their own stories as the interesting and colourful sidebar narratives of the few exceptional enough to be added on to the master narrative of social studies teaching?

But social studies is not synonymous with the study of history, though the embeddedness and pre-eminence of history in the social studies curricula might suggest this. Geographers are concerned with place or location; they study movement, interactions between the human and physical environments, the nature of the landscape, its climate, its regions, its relationships. Critique of the gendered nature of social studies curricula by feminist geographers focuses on the androcentric bias in traditional geography which has not accounted for the particular and diverse ways women experience place. Themes of confinement, spatial constraint, and restricted movement emerge from geographic studies of women’s experience of cities and suburbs, of aboriginal or minority cultures, and of developing countries, for example (Pratt, 1993; Matthews, 1987; McDowell, 1988; Monk, 1988). Women’s access to services, resources, development, paid work, and capital influences the way they experience local and global economies; their real place in the world too often has little to do with the romantic or exotic portrayal of textbooks, if any account exists at all (Monk, Betteridge, and Newhall, 1991). Even those familiar with women’s omission from the master narratives of education express unease in telling other women’s stories and understandings of their global locations in classrooms. A woman historian, attending a conference on global feminism, said, "Although I was accustomed to generalizing about past women’s experience ..., I was loath to represent living women about whom I knew little beyond a text, however compelling that text might be" (Monk, Betteridge, and Newhall, 1991, pp.243-244). The realization of goals of teaching for and incorporating global feminism or the geography of women in the curriculum is a difficult but important direction in social studies.
Women have been constructed as immigrants to malestream geographic thinking; attentive to the psychic implications of finding their place, women are attuned to the connections or relationships which allow them to feel at home within an environment. Feminist geographers illuminate women's special connection to the natural world as standing in direct and political opposition to traditional themes in economic and physical geography, themes of claiming, naming, using, measuring, and doing business with the world's physical and human resources. Studies demonstrate women's notions of sacred sites and interior landscapes, the negative effects of development and new technologies on women, and women's efforts to address environmental deterioration, for example (Monk, 1988). Gender distinctions, as these are reflected in spatial terms, represent "complex interactions of economic, ecological, ideological, and historical circumstances" (Monk, 1988, p.5).

The literature of feminist geography provides a metaphor for the study of women's places as leaders and teachers in social studies, in addition to questions about their experience. As geographers, do the women of the study transform the teaching of geography to reflect the diverse ways women live their lives in the world today? What micro-geographic and macro-geographic understandings do they have of women's place, that is, where place has both real and symbolic dimensions? Do they reflect women's particular connectedness to the natural and human environments in which they live and work and about which they teach? Do they have geographic notions or maps by which they understand their own place or ecological situatedness within the landscapes of leadership, teaching social studies, and schooling? Women's geographic inquiry seeks answers to questions, such as: where are the women located? where are they, in relation to men? and what is the significance of this distribution? (Monk, 1988)

Social studies is, however, primarily about educating citizens. It has a political dimension. The politics of social studies curricula depict a man-made world defined by
masculine ideologies. If world politics were feminized, suggests Miles (1989), the world would be a better place, more human and more caring:

The female characteristics, concerns, and abilities marginalized in industrial society are necessarily central to the building of a new, more fully human society. The holistic, collective, intuitive, co-operative, emotional, nurturing, democratic, integrated, internal, and natural are affirmed against the over-valuation of the competitive, analytical, rational, hierarchical, fragmented, external, and artificial (man*-made) .... The deep dualities of life in our fragmented society are overcome (p.21).

In the words of the radical feminist Adrienne Rich (1986), history as "advertisement for the state" has existed as long as the state itself; it is used to justify "the hands that already hold power, of proving that others are unfit for power"(p.140). She argues for affirmation of women's political integrity and a consciously critical stance toward both white and male culture. Women's power, she suggests, is transformative; it is the energy of creation which shares, empowers, teaches, and is concerned with the basic forms of food and shelter and health care and literacy (p.5). "We live in a society which has brought the entire planet to the brink of having no future. We are experiencing a kind of global anger and grief"(p.153). Rich sees the absolute necessity of raising questions to establish women's terms for political location and identity:

Where, when, and under what conditions have women acted and been acted upon, as women? Wherever people are struggling against subjection, the specific subjection of women, through our location in a female body, from now on has to be addressed. The necessity to go on speaking of it, refusing to let the discussion go on as before, speaking where silence has been advised and enforced, not just about our subjection, but about our active presence and practice as women .... The liberation of women is a wedge driven into all other radical thought, can open out the structures of resistance, unbind the imagination, connect what's been dangerously disconnected. Let us pay attention now ... to women: let men and women make a conscious act of attention when women speak; let us insist on kinds of process which allow more women to speak; let us get back to earth -- not as paradigm for 'women,' but as place of location (p.214).
Women, as citizens of school communities, participate in the discourse of a democratic education, the meaning and content of which is situated in public and formal structures of power. Yet women in education and in government office "are still traipsing along at the tail of the procession" on men's traditional path (Bernard-Powers, in press).

Noddings (1992), whose voice is maternal, introduces the "caring" concept as a way of re-inscribing social studies teaching and curriculum. Noddings' caring, however, has a political and social agenda, seeking to transform "human action in the social world" by focusing on women's concerns with peace and environmental stewardship and community building and social issues, for example. Martin (1985) speaks in more starkly analytical tones about American society when she argues for consideration of educational narratives grounded in the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the reproductive processes of society; as Canadian educators, we too can reflect on her comments:

Ours is a country in which one out of four women is raped at some time in her life, one out of four girls and one out of ten boys is sexually abused before the age of eighteen, and some $4-6 billion per year are grossed by the pornography industry. Our country belongs to a world on the brink of nuclear and/or ecological disaster. Efforts to overcome these problems, as well as the related ones of poverty, economic scarcity, and racial injustice, flounder today under the direction of people who do not know how to sustain human relationships or respond directly to human needs, indeed, do not even see the value of trying to do so. We should not suppose that education can solve the world's problems. Yet if there is to be any hope of the continuation of life on earth, let alone of a good life for all, those who carry on society's productive processes must acquire the nurturing capacities and ethics of care (p.187).

Bennett and Spalding's (1992) portraits of Marilyn, Jenna, and Caroline (mentioned earlier in this chapter) are perhaps the first of "caring" women in social studies. Compared to Katherine's discomfort with traditional curricular interpretations, Marilyn, Jenna, and Caroline would, I suggest, be far more at ease with Noddings' curriculum and Martin's politics. Are the
women of the present study uneasy or uncomfortable with conforming to Noddings’ view of women’s maternal ways, to Martin’s critical feminist social analysis, or to traditional expectations? Have they integrated caring as a creative, transformative energy into their teaching practice and their transmitted curriculum? Does caring and the need for connectedness characterize all women’s teaching, and would the inclusion of a more caring component in teaching create new, more democratic, more fully human descriptions of schools and of communities and produce more women teachers?

Politically and socially located by notions of identity and citizenship which do not account for their experience, women can transform and enact social studies curriculum and teaching to put their issues on the political agenda of the classroom. The concerns of women’s culture for cooperation, conflict-resolution, social justice, peace, environmental stewardship, community participation, domestic issues of housing, educating, and nurturing in/form alternative concepts of citizenship and democracy which reflect women’s political understandings (Bernard-Powers, in press; Martin, 1985; Noddings, 1992; Pagano, 1988; Rosenberg, 1987; Spender, 1982; Vickers, 1987). Such political standpoints also challenge the politics of power in which their teaching is ecologically bound. Schools are sites of contradiction wherein the gap between the rhetoric of various pedagogies and curricular goals and personal ideologies and the reality of social constructions of gender and institutional politics exposes for women (and others) the very subordination they teach to overcome. For some whose identity does not fit those identities and locations constructed for them, the personal can be more political than for others.

Recognition of the politics of teaching and of teaching social studies, in particular, sets up a number of questions for the study: Do women consciously or unconsciously redefine the world, seeking greater integration of such dualities as the public and private, production and reproduction, the personal and the political, the means and the end, man and nature, theory and
practice, commitment and objectivity, the emotional and the logical, the intuitive and the rational? (Miles, 1989, p.21) Do they have a transformative agenda, seeking the world of Kristeva’s "future perfect" (p.189)? How do women who are leaders in social studies embody ideological concepts of power and authority both within classrooms and in other educational contexts? How do they respond to the power of authority (their own and others’) and to identities and locations defined for them in others’ terms? Do they articulate differences in their concepts of citizenship and of democratic process which suggest that the concepts in current democratic discourse are socially and educationally grounded in masculinist assumptions? How do they negotiate the gaps and the path which traditional authority models offer them?

Pagano (1988) considers the question of subversiveness in the feminist challenge to the dominant order of institutions. Women, traditionally charged with the guardianship of culture, do not beget it; they mind it; that is, they tend it and they obey it. They are the products of the institutions which embody our cultural heritage. Comparing women’s teaching to women’s art, she calls for an art of teaching constructed as a "different story" based on respect and conversation between men and women and a re-thinking of educational goals:

Disrespect of self and others, disregard for the future of the planet, failure to take social and political responsibility, moral apathy, spiritual enslavement to fashion or anything else -- such things as these seem to me subversive of educational goals, for it seems to me that a sense of respect and regard ought to be a primary educational goal .... And yet the structure of our institutions, the laws, the regulations and the regularities, the form and the content of our teaching places those cares beneath what we may take as a concern to safeguard private property. For knowledge has come to be a sort of property .... But more important than the status of knowledge as private property, I think, is our expectation that knowledge do more than it can .... We academics suppose that to know the good is to do it. We suppose that the truth will set us free. And knowledge, we hope, will heal the narcissistic wound, will assure us our integrity .... The language and knowledge contained in the narratives of the values and commitments of the community for whom that language and knowledge served as the
single mode of discourse is undermined finally by the exclusion of women from those narratives -- by inattention to the maternal subtexts of the stories of what teachers and students are like. The cards are stacked against us because of what is foregrounded in our narratives and what is denied, split off, but which nonetheless complicates the foregrounded story (p.337).

Women and the Discourse of Science and Mathematics Teaching

The literature of science and mathematics teaching, unlike social studies, has begun to address the absence of women and explore its meaning. This literature shows that despite equal access and assumptions of equal treatment, science and math education have not achieved equal outcomes (Kahle and Matyas, 1987; Lewis, 1991; Robertson, 1988). "Study after study in the developed Western world suggests that girls and women receive very different educations in math and science than boys and men do" (Kahle and Matyas, 1987).

Recommendations for making science and math more girl-friendly focus on eliminating the masculine image of curriculum and methodology which limits some students’ ideas about appropriate activities and careers (Gibson, 1992; Kahle and Matyas, 1987; Robertson, 1988). As Sheila Tobias says, "for many girls, all or some of science is outside their comfort zones and cognitive self-images. To keep girls in science, it is necessary to shift these limits" (as cited in Gibson, p.4). Feminist pedagogical principles underpin the gender-sensitive strategies of making curriculum relevant, connecting it to social concern, emphasizing the personal and historical, discovery and aesthetics, the joy of science, and incorporating social learning skills such as hands-on processes, connections, creativity, listening, supporting, negotiating, and co-operating, as well as observing, analyzing, and reporting (Gaskell, McLaren, Oberg, and Eyre, 1993; Gibson, 1992; Menzies, 1991; Willis, 1989).

In schools, mathematics and science typically are represented as mere bodies of knowledge rather than ways of knowing and finding out, and as objective truths about the world and collections of rules and facts which students must learn simply to regurgitate.
Mathematics and science are products of historical and social conditions and developments and each present models of reality but little of this is communicated in many classrooms .... The tentative, intuitive, exploratory and fundamentally human, and therefore fallible, nature of these fields is overlooked or misunderstood .... Furthermore, mathematics and science curricula tend to emphasize the experiences, concerns and interests stereotypically associated with masculinity and rarely is mathematics and science embedded in social and human concerns and issues (Willis, 1989, pp. 3-4).

Ursula Franklin, however, an experimental physicist and professor at the University of Toronto known for her interest in the social impact of technology, encourages all women to become "'citizen scientists,' that is, to gain a general knowledge of scientific and technical information in order to understand issues which interest them both personally and politically" (Clarke, 1991, p.5).

The science/math discussion of equity attends to the absence of women by proposing the integration of studies of women scientists and of encounters with actual science/math role models (Kahle and Matyas, 1987; Robertson, 1988; AAUW, 1992; Gardner, Mason, and Matyas, 1989; Whyte, 1985). "It has been suggested that models may be effective whether they are encountered through written materials, on television, or in person" (Kahle & Matyas, pp. 21-22). Willis (1989), noting the greater perceived instrumentality of math and science for adult men than adult women, suggests that a few role models are not sufficient, calling instead for a "critical mass of women in these fields [so that] girls perceive these options and occupations as part of their natural range of choices" (p.5). The role models are often depicted as visiting women scientists or women scientists in textbooks and text histories. Willis (1989) emphasizes the need for teachers sensitive to gender inclusivity in math and science but falls short of calling for more women teachers, not only as mentors and role models for students but also as those for whom inclusivity has the greatest personal/political significance.
In the 1990 BC Mathematics Assessment Report, Gaskell, McLaren, Oberg, and Eyre (1993) respond comprehensively to gender issues in math and science; they do suggest that more mathematics and physical science teachers should be women:

The vast majority of senior mathematics and physical science teachers are men. This may pose serious difficulties for girls to identify with subjects primarily taught by men. In our study, some girls who were taught by a female mathematics or physical science teacher seemed to feel more positively about their experiences with the subject. The gender of the teacher was one of many factors influencing the girls’ experiences, but an important one, nevertheless. Apart from serving as role models, women teachers because of their experiences may approach mathematics and the physical sciences in distinct ways. By taking different approaches to mathematics and the physical sciences a broader range of girls and boys may be more attracted to these subjects (p.161).

This study, which included teacher and student perceptions of gender issues in science and mathematics, also found that most teachers did not consider gender an important issue in their school, that women teachers were more concerned than men about problems faced by girls in math and science, and that most teachers felt that girls would benefit from more women role models in math and science, though they did not support affirmative action hiring. "Few teachers were concerned about the problems girls faced ... in being a minority, being taught almost exclusively by men, being taught a ‘male-oriented’ curriculum, and being prepared for ‘male-oriented’ careers" (p.73). Students’ responses showed the importance of teachers in developing students’ interests and abilities in math and science and of good teaching at the senior levels; they liked teachers who used a variety of approaches, who did not rely solely on the textbook, and who "really cared" about them. Girls, more often than boys, felt excluded by teachers who focused on the "smart" students, which often meant smart boys.

Many students speculated that girls would have better experiences in mathematics and science if they were taught by more women teachers. The main benefits for girls would be that they could talk more easily to women teachers, since the latter would more readily
understand their experiences and incorporate them into the curriculum and that women teachers would inspire the girls more to pursue mathematics and science fields. Some of the boys also thought that boys' experiences would improve if more women taught these subjects. They thought this would bring more variety to the subjects (p.124).

Women's absence in math, science, and computer studies both as role models and as learners, the literature suggests, has real economic and social implications. Young women with science and math training (Gardner, Mason, and Matyas, 1989), are "important not only to promote educational equity and equal career opportunities, but [they] will be a major determinant in our nation's future economic and research competitiveness" (p.72). The National Science Foundation made this agenda specific, stating that the economy of tomorrow "will require a population skilled in the sciences and mathematics .... We must take advantage of all our resources, particularly women and underrepresented minorities" (1987, p.2, as cited in Gardner, Mason, and Matyas). Industry, Science and Technology Canada argues for more women scientists and engineers on the bases of employment equity and the need for industry's realization that "the skills and creativity of a diverse work force are essential for gaining and maintaining a competitive edge" (Women in Science and Engineering, Volume 1, 1991, p.1, as cited in Gaskell et al, 1993, p.4). Gaskell et al (1993) do not see the solution in asking girls to change to become more comfortable with these subjects as they are currently constructed, but rather in subjects being reconstructed to incorporate the experiences and points of view of women:

It is ... important that the reasons for encouraging more women into mathematics and physical science are not only economic. It is a matter of justice and equity. Mathematics and physical science are powerful forms of knowledge in our society. It is important that all people have access to those forms of knowledge so that they can participate equally in defining the kind of society in which we live (p.5).
This is clearly not the discourse of social studies. The lack of focus on the importance of increasing the "competitive edge" by "taking advantage" of women’s and girls’ particular skills or strengths as citizens, for example, and on the development and inclusion of girl-friendly teaching and curriculum in social studies as the study of "human action," suggests conservative, masculinist, and non-democratic assumptions about the kind of citizenship required in a world governed by technical rationality, and about who can define the society in which we live. Integrating notions of educated citizens as not only thinking, reasoning, and skilled, but also as caring, compassionate, empathetic, and nurturing may be not only irrelevant but incompatible with education’s desired end (Martin, 1982). Does an increasingly technical society require critically reflective, politically informed, and caring citizens? Can such a society account for or afford re-definition in terms of women’s particular concerns as citizens?

Women and the Discourse of Teachers’ Work

A fourth area of literature relevant to this study can be broadly categorized as describing the nature of teachers’ work. MacLeod (1988) talks of the paradox of progress in education, caught as it is in a struggle between the idealism of the sixties in its concern for balance, human rights, and justice, and the materialism and restraint of the eighties, characterized by conservative agendas and hierarchical authority structures. Historically, teaching has been considered "women’s work" and the "natural calling" for women (MacLeod, 1988; Casey and Apple, 1989; Walkerdine, 1992), yet women are increasingly disillusioned, feeling out of step with the emerging goals and caught in the contradictions of teaching and leadership (McLeod, 1988).

The model of technical rationality which has increasingly permeated teaching since the eighties, underpinned as it is by the conservative ideologies of the right, is a social model. Bernstein (1990) points out that, with rising unemployment, new communications technology, and increased international competition as present global trends, "the linkage between education and
production is seen as crucial, and the failure of the economy to develop is blamed on the failure of education to provide relevant skills" (p.153). Education is thus vocationalized and governed by the principles of business and industry. "The ideology of the market is celebrated, the myth of its powers of social, individual, and economic redemption is used to undermine the old collectivism [of the 60s]" (p.154). Students, girls and boys, are trained as the productive labor force required for a highly technical and rapidly changing world (Apple, 1990). Girls and women as trained technical workers are viewed as instrumental to the development of a future labour force which will ensure economic viability for western nations in the changing global economy.

Vocationalization and technicism in education are about students’ preparation for the productive processes of society and not about students’ education for society’s reproductive processes (Martin, 1982). Martin sees little concern for men’s and women’s working and caring for others in either vocational or liberal education:

The distinction between liberal and vocational education corresponds not to a distinction between the two kinds of societal processes but to one between head and hand within productive processes. Liberal education is ... the preparation for carrying on processes involving the production and consumption of ideas, while vocational education is preparation for processes involving manual labor (pp.137-138).

Critical and feminist educators identify additional problems with the professionalization of education, which sees the increasing impact of business metaphors and strategies in an attempt to make education more effective, accountable, and measurable, or more business-like. Business as a metaphor for education creates images of students as products, teachers as assembly-line workers, and administrators as managers. Apple (1990) says that such technical and conservative ideas imposed by "efficiency experts posing as educators" are not the only or best ways to define curriculum:
All too often, we are told to treat education as a technical enterprise, and to value teaching and curricula only for their contributions to meeting the needs of business and industry, to a 'productive labor force,' and to instilling a 'common' set of knowledge and values defined by the conservative agenda (p.187).

The themes of the de-skilling and professionalization of teachers are critical and have a gender dimension in their capacity to devalue women's work as teachers, as curriculum creators and enactors, and as leaders. Teacher autonomy comes under increasing bureaucratic control, threatening the "fundamental existential identity" of those who work for the children they teach (Casey and Apple, p.182). The discourse of teacher-as-professional presents effectiveness in teaching and leadership as particular skills measurable against male norms, defining women's ways or skills as deficient (Weiler, 1988; Wood, 1990; Casey and Apple, 1990; Acker, 1989; Erdman, 1990; Grant, 1989; MacLeod, 1988; Miller, 1986; Shakeshaft, 1986; Helgesen, 1990;Connell, 1985). Apple and Jungck (1990) suggest that women's "commitments to environments that embody an ethic of caring and connectedness ... may actually provide the resources for countering such rationalized curricular models" (p.249) which intensify teachers' work and strip away teacher autonomy. The collective memory of difference, they say, is restored with recognition of the sense of loss, the absence of community, and the need to resist. In resistance can be found "the very possibility of difference .... that possibility is of no small importance" (p.251).

Sadker, Sadker, and Klein (1991), in their review of major areas of gender equity research, find that women's ways of teaching and managing or leadership place high value on concern for others, on democratic, participative style, on community participation, and on teaching and learning. They cite research by Shakeshaft (1987) which shows that "women's ways of managing are congruent with the findings from research on effective schools, [suggesting] that schools and conceptions of educational administration should be restructured
to take advantage of these female strengths" (p.285). Shakeshaft herself says, "Women teachers and administrators are more likely to exhibit behaviors conducive to good schooling" (p.502). Shakeshaft illuminates the problematic and gendered vocabulary of effectiveness when she states that "the link between female socialization and styles of effective leadership is ignored in the literature on school improvement."

Fullan (1982), like McLeod, notes the paradox of schooling: schools are expected to engage in continuous renewal, but school organization, teacher training, educational hierarchies, and the politics of decision-making result in a system more likely to retain the status quo. He discusses the administrator's role as an educational leader in bringing about change, though most principals, he notes, do not play this role. Instructional leadership for meaningful change in schools incorporates teachers in a collaborative process and does not confuse authority to legislate with the power to implement it. Such collaboration, however, breaks down traditional hierarchical power relations. In a more recent article (1993), he shifts the moral responsibility to teachers to become agents of change. They are to seek change by incorporating personal vision-building, inquiry, mastery, and collaboration.

Wilson (1993) echoes Fullan's ideas for what she calls teacher leaders, explicitly deriving her model from leadership behaviours in business and sport. Leaders, she says, inspire a shared vision, enable others to act, model the way, and encourage the heart as "cheerleaders and coaches." Teacher leadership, she suggests, is a feminine paradigm.

The masculine style [of leadership] uses structural power, which is based on authority associated with position, title, and the ability to reward and punish. The feminine style relies on personal power, which is based on charisma, work record, and contacts. Masculine versus feminine styles of leading also are labeled transactional versus transformational (p.27).
The paradox and contradictions inherent in such imperatives for educational change as described in Fullan’s teacher as agent-of-change and in Wilson’s teacher leader, however, further serve to keep women whose educational vision is holistic, integrative, or transformative sidelined in positions of subordination within existing hierarchical power structures. Those who would change the system are encouraged on moral grounds to provide the energy for change without the monetary, authority, or status rewards and more often than not without support. In this way, women’s "natural" style can be used to continue to ghettoize and take advantage of them.

New management models which depict administrators as those who "distribute, award, dole, dispense, and execute" do not appeal to women who are concerned with educational leadership, expertise, and excellence (McLeod, 1988, p.21). Women are not rewarded for their commitment to the classroom or to education and are not likely, because of their absence as administrators, to participate in decisions for change that better reflect their priorities.

The literature of women’s work and careers in teaching addresses the politics of location for women. Women’s work as teachers and leaders is ecologically contextualized by the social, structural, personal, and political constraints within which they act (or are acted upon). As teachers of social studies and as leaders, women are geographically isolated and located at the margins of the master narratives of curriculum and schooling. The literature of teachers’ work suggests questions about women’s places in the educational procession and about women’s understandings of democratic freedoms and of the terrain of leadership. Are they free to articulate and enact their notions of citizenship and leadership, particularly where these contradict or challenge traditional models? Are they free to give voice to informed opinion/response to leadership? Are they free to choose to move or speak or interrupt or express anger at injustice or inequity? Are some leadership roles more accessible or appealing to women than others? Are
some leadership roles more accessible or appealing to some women than to others? Do their career paths suggest alternative operational maps than those given by the male leaders?

Such questions are metaphorically about the geography of women’s teaching and are as applicable to the local analysis of women’s work in schools as communities as they are to teaching about the global contexts for women’s working and living:

No geography that hopes to motivate students to create a ‘better world’ and prepare them to bring that world into being can presume it will achieve its goals if it leaves out half of humanity, fails to challenge gender inequities, and does not show women and girls as valid and valuable sources of information and important contributors to society. To ‘engender’ the new geography calls for a transformation of our vision, so that we see the world in stereoscopic perspective and create a curriculum that serves the interests of women as well as men. The task will require a substantial effort (Monk, 1988, p.97).

The Ecology of Women’s Identity Construction in Teaching Social Studies

The final area of literature reviewed for this study focuses on the particular contexts within which women teaching social studies negotiate the construction of their identities. Social forces shape identity according to criteria of gender, class, race, ethnicity, sexual preference, age, and physical ability. Weiler (1988) studies the dialectical relationship between structural forces and personal consciousness which is apparent in the lives of women high school teachers.

The life experiences and choices made by these women reveal the power of ideology and of material forces on them and at the same time demonstrate their ability as human beings to understand, criticize, and act as agents in history (pp. 74-75).

The fact of their gender is negotiated, contested, and experienced dialectically in the dynamics and terrain of everyday social and professional relationships.

Bernstein (1977) further explores the social and political inscription of identity. He suggests that "educational identities" defined by "subject loyalties" are socialized within traditional systems of schooling. Clearly bounded, hierarchical knowledge frames prescribe
conditions for membership based on subject specialization; these conditions actively resist change, seen as "pollution of the sacred" (p.96). Within these systems, autonomy of content constructs the separateness and isolation of disciplines, the identities of individuals within the disciplines, and vertical relations of power. States of knowledge, as opposed to ways of knowing which characterize the more open, integrative systems for learning, preclude an explicitly offered ideological reference base; teachers’ diverse ideologies operate visibly within the bounded frames. "There is no neutrality in culture" (p.2), as Rich (1986) says; all art, science, and scholarship is ideological.

Lightfoot’s (1973) study shows that mythic depictions of schools as "shielded from the negative, destructive influences of partisanship and politics," (p.197) deny the social realities. Teachers, she concludes, construct their educational philosophy and practices around their personal and political ideologies within curricular and social constraints.

The kinds of critical and elaborative thinking permitted and encouraged by the teacher not only reflect the teacher’s political identifications but also are an integral part of the political socialization of students (p.198).

Curriculum and practice thus inform and are informed by teachers’ professional, political, and social identities.

Vickers (1987) and Pagano (1988) tie the social reproduction of cultural identities in patriarchal societies to the dynamics of gender role socialization and to women’s work. They argue that the construction of cultural cohesion, stability, and continuity within communities and societies depends upon women’s "social nurturance," which establishes "incontrovertable links among people which can be socially elaborated to create loyalties, identities, rights and responsibilities, inclusions and exclusions" (Vickers, p.483). Women rarely produce culture in
their own terms; they reproduce it within the constraints of male-defined constructs for identity maintenance.

Noddings (1990) claims "that curriculum and teaching are not easily separable and that a thinking, teaching self cannot be deftly plucked out of either teaching or curriculum and set aside" (p. ix). She sees that community and curriculum in/form each other and that teachers’ values, desires, and encounters not only shape their work but are shaped by that work.

"Personal practical knowledge," that is, the personal and practical filters which are engaged as teachers mediate the demands of particular teaching and learning situations (Clandinin and Connelly, 1986), has pronounced social and political dimensions in the constructed identity of social studies teachers. The women in this study are located or contextualized in the broader landscapes of their work as teachers in departments and schools and as leaders in their professional community. They actively negotiate and construct personal, subject, and leadership identities within complex relations of power; their stories illuminate the politics of schooling and gender which characterize the contexts of their teaching. They also enact a gendered and political curriculum which advocates liberal progressive notions of humanism, educated citizenship, social justice, critical thinking, and democracy in masculine terms. They negotiate their identities within social and structural constraints, participating as politically-informed citizens who are strong, knowledgeable women within the various communities of teaching.

Social studies teaching and being a social studies teacher are extremely political experiences; this study speculates that these experiences are generally more consciously political for women than for men. Social studies teachers’ perceptions of their teaching and curriculum are intricately woven stories which, like tapestries, are composed of threads which are their practical knowledge of teaching and curriculum, their political ideologies, their personal values, and their understandings of the politics of schooling, pedagogy, curriculum, social identity, and
location. Each woman’s tapestry told as a story depicts her understanding of the experience of social studies teaching. Each tapestry is, therefore, a unique expression of her "fundamental existential identity" (Casey and Apple, 1990) and yet still discernible as the work of a woman. The tapestries, their personal stories, of women’s teaching and leadership in social studies have obviously political messages.

Conclusion

Post-structural feminist political critique of educational narratives places difference at the centre of the discussion agenda. It shifts from a focus on the male/female dichotomy of Western liberal thinking, a dialectic which frames women’s "voice" as "different" (Gilligan, 1982), to the multiple, partial, and often contradictory voices of women’s different ways of being within particular contexts of power. This critique suggests that women differentially negotiate their discomfort and contradictions found in the traditional patriarchal discourse of dominance and subordination. Some learn the language and acquire skills in negotiating identity, curriculum, pedagogy, and the dynamics of difference. Some interrupt the master discourse, seeking acknowledgment of their stories, their anger, or their capacities as educators or educational leaders, though the consequences of speaking out of turn or without proper respect or in too loud a voice may be harsh, even violent (Briskin and Coulter, 1992; Connell, 1985; Culley, 1985; Cunnison, 1989; Currie, 1992; Ellsworth, 1992; Faludi, 1991; Gore, 1992; Greene, 1988; Hoodfar, 1992; Kenway and Modra, 1992; Lewis, 1992; Luke, 1992; Manicom, 1992; Walkerdine, 1992).

Yet the social costs of ignoring the particular concerns and capacities attributed to women and to women’s culture are high, as suggested in the comments cited earlier by Martin (1985), Noddings (1992), and Pagano (1988). The absence of women in social studies teaching, of models of women’s ways of teaching, and of women’s concerns in curriculum and leadership has
implications for what young people learn about women’s places in society, about women’s understandings of society, about women’s voices and stories in the discourse of politics, culture, society, and schooling, and about the possibilities of meaning for social action in truly human terms. To deconstruct the essential aspects of women’s understandings of social studies rather than negotiate these would, according to Fuss’s (1989) analysis, throw the baby out with the bath water and render the feminist thesis politically powerless.

There is enough literature to suggest that there are many ways of being a woman. Recent feminist scholarship recognizes multiplicity. Feminisms acknowledge the maternal and caring, the intellectual and reflective, the radical and political, the subordinated and silenced, and the previously ignored and marginalized strands which weave the tapestries of women’s experiences. The literature also suggests that the differences of and between women’s stories about social studies teaching, curriculum, and leadership are worth exploring. The focus of this study is on women’s stories, but it is undertaken with the explicit understanding that many others are disenfranchised by or excluded from a generalized discourse which cannot measure effectiveness in social studies teaching and learning in the truly human terms which celebrate and speak of difference, recognize commonalities in multiplicity, seek social transformation through visions of the "future perfect," and give place to the passion for a pluralistic and caring society as our most fundamental and mutual goals.

The movement for change is a changing movement, changing itself, demasculinizing itself, de-Westernizing itself, becoming a critical mass that is saying in so many different voices, languages, gestures, actions: It must change; we ourselves can change it.

We who are not the same. We who are the many and do not want to be the same (Rich, 1986, p.225).
CHAPTER 2: A FEMINIST METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this study is grounded in the emerging traditions of critical and feminist research. In seeking to "[demystify] the patterns of knowledge and social conditions that produce domination and restrict human possibilities" (Popkewitz, 1986, p.19), feminist projects enter the discourse of the critical paradigm. There is open commitment to creating a more just social order, a "‘transformation’ agenda with respect to both social structure and methodological norms" (Lather, 1986a, p.258). Eichler (1983) states:

Unless we can establish some connection between the topic and the achievement of social justice for women, either in concrete terms, or in abstract terms through the manner in which the knowledge is generated, it does not qualify as feminist research (p.47).

Critical and feminist research projects are concerned with research as praxis (Weiler, 1988; Lather, 1986a):

This form of discourse "tells" us about how institutional conditions create particular ways of thinking and reasoning and then seeks to relate these conditions to larger social issues of cultural, social, and economic change. The research is concerned with how our feelings, beliefs, concepts of self and knowledge relate to ideologies and how particular social forms limit and create human possibilities (Popkewitz, 1986, p.13).

Feminist research projects-as-praxis do not pretend to be neutral. They are personal and political, seeking to describe from women’s perspectives their contextualization within the distinct and often disenfranchising political cultures of their lives and their work (Currie, 1992; Ellsworth, 1992; Gilligan, 1982; Gore, 1992; Lewis and Simon, 1986; Luke, 1992; Martin, 1985; Oakley, 1982; Tetreault, 1986; Vickers, 1989; Walkerdine, 1992; Weiler, 1988). Such projects explicitly intend to challenge the social order by exposing the conflicts, tensions, and mediations of women in male-dominated institutions (Westkott, 1979). They ask, "How do male-based constructs need to be reformulated from the vantage point of female experience?" (Lather, 1986b).
As women we inhabit our world with a 'double consciousness.' We are in and of our society but in important ways also not 'of' it. We see and think in the terms of our culture; we have been trained in these terms, shaped to them; they have determined not only the ways in which we have been able to perceive and understand large events, but even the ways in which we have been able to perceive, structure and understand our most intimate experiencing. Yet we have always another consciousness, another potential language within us, available to us. We are aware, however inchoately, of the reality of our perceptions and experience; we are aware that this reality has often been not only unnamed but unnameable; we understand that our invisibility and silence hold the germs of both madness and power, of both dissolution and creation (Du Bois, p.111).

Feminist research projects are often structured around women's intimate experiencing, consciousness, and language. One of the ways to create the context for such understanding is to establish conversations between equals where knowledge is shared through stories. The context is reflective and collaborative. The sharing of knowledges connects the researcher and the researched, their public and private spheres, their personal and political identities, their knowing and feeling selves, their multiple and partial voices (Weiler, 1988; Clandinin and Connelly, 1986; Vickers, 1989; Miles, 1989). Martin (1985) reclaimed a conversation amongst theorists of women's education; she says:

A good conversation is neither a fight nor a contest. Circular in form, cooperative in manner, and constructive in intent, it is an interchange of ideas by those who see themselves not as adversaries but as human beings come together to talk and listen and learn from one another (p.10).

April, 1993: This project began with my critical reflection upon the experience of being a woman teaching junior social studies. It was not the absence of women's stories in the history or geography I taught that first caught my attention so much as the absence of women around me and the presence of men around and above me. At the invitation of Dr. Donald C. Wilson, a university professor of social studies whose children I was teaching, I became a part-time
graduate student, entering a shadowy world of night classes and summer sessions and partial but compelling glimpses of the world of theory, experienced as compartments of time which I had managed to juggle free of my other roles as teacher and single mother of two. By the summer of 1991, I was ready to construct my thesis around the questions arising from my experiences as a woman teacher and graduate student of social studies.

Summer, 1991: Eleven days marking Geography 12 provincial exams in Victoria, BC. I like marking exams, as much for the professional immersion as the space it gives for me. For eleven days, after 3 o’clock, I am nobody’s mother, teacher, student, lover, housekeeper. The thesis-project-as-idea came with me, as it would for another two years. Women who mark Geography are few in number (never more than eight in a room of 34, in my experience). There is time to talk. The geographic isolation which is women’s experience in social studies is given over to connection. In our conversations were the threads of ideas and the themes of my study. I had the rest of the summer to write a thesis. I realized that I could tell these stories. I would borrow Martin’s notion of reclamation and claim a place for the conversation of women practitioners of education.¹

Heilbrun (1988) talks about writing a woman’s life. From a literary perspective, women’s stories should be consciously and collectively articulated. Women, she says, must overcome the traditions which cast them as the heroines of literature who are isolated from each other and not allowed to offer other women the most personal accounts of their lives.

¹ The italicized paragraphs which interrupt the academic discourse of this thesis are reflective passages derived from the journal which I kept during the research and writing periods. They represent my on-going personal negotiations of meaning during the processes of re-constructing and writing other women’s stories as well as of the need to acknowledge and construct a space for my own voice in this story.
What has become essential for women is to see themselves collectively, not individually, not caught in some individual erotic and familial plot and, inevitably found wanting. Individual biographies and autobiographies have always been conceived of as individual, eccentric lives (p.46).

Collectivity and connection make women’s life stories credible, taking them out of the socially constructed realms of fantasy and madness. Stories of women’s lives can only be told when they "no longer live their lives isolated in the houses and the stories of men" (p.47). Women’s stories, she says, will be found first in their talking together. Dialogue with others is a process of negotiating images of ourselves as human beings in relation to the social world.

The idea of knowledge emerging from a self-other dialectic is reflected in the historical exclusion of women from educational institutions where knowledge has been transmitted through books and lectures and in women’s participation in societies and friendships where social knowledge has emerged from dialogue (Westkott, 1979, p.426).

Feminist scholars challenge the methodological norms of objectivity. Questions emerge from the researcher’s concerns and experiences; answers are found in confirmation, expansion, opposition, and silence. Affirmation in listening to stories is important as "a practice of respect for women’s knowledge," and a means of eliciting further information (Litner, Rossiter, and Taylor, 1992, as cited in Briskin and Coulter, 1992, p.255). At the same time, "knowledge is an unpredictable emergent rather than a controlled outcome" (Westkott, 1979, p.426).

[Feminist methodology] requires ... that the mythology of ‘hygienic’ research with its accompanying mystification of the researcher and the researched as objective instruments of data production be replaced by the recognition that personal involvement is more than dangerous bias -- it is the condition under which people come to know each other and to admit others into their lives (Oakley, 1986, p.253).
Du Bois (1983) tells us that women's scientific methods explain and understand reality as whole, eventful, and complex, as contextualized within and as part of its own matrix. "And this matrix includes the knower" (p.111).

In thinking critically about women's experience in social studies, I had originally intended to interview a group of ten women whose experience as teachers and as leaders in the field reflected the whole range of teaching senior social studies electives. Teaching senior academic courses is, within teacher culture, generally seen as having a kind of specialist status which, I would suggest, is tied to factors of seniority, experience, and intellectual recognition and underpinned with assumptions about teaching ability and content knowledge. At the summer marking sessions, I approached women marking History 12 and gathered names of women who taught Law 12 and Western Civilization 12. Everyone I spoke to seemed interested in the project. My list grew with direct approach, referrals, and suggestions to a group of about 15. The decision to focus on six who taught Geography was one of expedience; these were my peers, the women I knew best and with whom I could most readily converse about curriculum and teaching. Within that geographic region or community of women having common curriculum and academic interest, there were six whose stories represented differences of age, family status, and experience in teaching. Additionally, they had all taught or were teaching social studies, grades 8 to 11. As women, we shared a culture of being white, middle-class, and European in heritage. There was no choice in these factors, but such a group could serve to illuminate gender, as opposed to ethnicity or class, as the factor which distinguished them from the men who teach social studies.

In selecting the group, I also assessed the leadership that each had demonstrated both within social studies and in teaching. The formal working definition of leadership utilized in this
study was the inclusion in BC Ministry of Education curriculum development, assessment, and evaluation committees and the teaching of Geography 12. Leadership, however, was also signalled by additional factors, such as administrative advancement, collegial respect, involvement in extracurricular, district, professional, Ministry, and community activities, and writing for publication. Each woman met leadership criteria in more than one of these areas as well. In this sense, each woman participated as a citizen within school, educational, and real-world communities.

Ministry of Education documents also provided criteria by which to informally assess the women's leadership. They actively modelled the explicit social studies curricular goal of "willingness and ability to use knowledge and understanding as a member of society" (Ministry of Education, 1988, p.5) and the explicit goal of educated citizenship which underpins educational reform in BC. Educated citizens are skilled and productive, able "to contribute to society generally, including the world of work," and "to gain satisfaction through achievement," and "prepared to exercise the responsibilities of an individual within ... the community" (Ministry of Education, 1992a, p.21). This active participation implies an integrated understanding of schools as "communities of learners" (p.123), of schooling as a "'real world' experience that contributes to the lifelong learning of all" (p.137), and of their personal responsibilities as teachers to enact "educated citizenship."

The study does not include student perceptions of the women's teaching or "leadership," nor does it include classroom observations. These would have provided different insights from the ones I sought in their stories. Such a project has the proportions of doctoral research and would add much to the building of well-crafted cases of exemplary social studies teaching called for by Thornton (1991).
Friendship became another commonality. "A feminist interviewing women is by definition both ‘inside’ the culture and participating in that which she is observing" (Oakley, 1986, p.253). For the most part, the six women and I all knew one another, though not all initially as friends. The community of women geographers is a small one. Incorporating Lather’s (1986a) concept of reciprocity, or what Woods (1986) calls "the researcher as friend," great importance was placed on our conversations being a respectful and comfortable sharing of ideas and stories and on building an interactive and trusting relationship. The conversations and collaborative communication process incorporated within the study forged links of friendship across difference and distance and place and time. Spender (1982) says that "in a male dominated society it is essential that women do not make links with other women, that they do not pool their experience and make deductions and generalise from it" (p.112). Women’s stories are a tradition of their friendships, yet women’s storytelling is "dangerous, even subversive in a patriarchal society" (p.138). The implicit agenda we shared was transformative, though there is an awareness that such transformation subverts and disturbs the status quo.

Friendship is grounded in trust. The requirements for ethical research using human subjects are that all participants sign an agreement to participate. The women agreed in writing to complete a questionnaire and undertake taped interviews which would be transcribed and seen only by the researcher. The agreement ensured that the women participants understood that they would be assigned a pseudonym and that they retained the right to review and negotiate both the data and the construction of meaning, and to consent to its use. The participants were asked to provide member checks by reviewing the accuracy of my accounts of their interview transcriptions and questionnaire summaries. Confidentiality and safety, primary criteria for trust, were guaranteed, as was the right to withdraw at any time. The project was thus constructed as
a collaborative one in which the women’s voices would be attended to at any stage of the research process. Manicom’s (1992) discussion of feminist pedagogy can be applied to feminist methodology and processes: "Safety must be consciously constructed to allow women to speak of certain of their experiences" (pp.378-379). Briskin and Coulter (1992) suggest that giving women the space in which their voices may be heard is "fundamentally connected to respect for women’s knowledge" (p.256); acknowledging their differences as a contribution to knowledge provides the foundation for women’s empowerment.

Questionnaires are conventional tools for field research and can be useful as starters or bridges to further research; they give time for reflection (Woods, 1986). The six study participants completed questionnaires (see Appendix II, Questionnaire) to provide background data on professional and academic qualifications and preferred curricular/instructional approaches. The questionnaires were adapted from a survey administered to teachers during the 1989 BC Social Studies Provincial Assessment. The Assessment Report (Cassidy and Bognar, 1991) provided a baseline of descriptors of BC’s social studies teachers against which the summarized data about six women’s experience could be compared. In addition, the questions asked for personal information, academic background, professional qualifications, leadership roles, extracurricular activities, teaching experience, including other subjects taught, details of their teaching practice, and understandings of curriculum and curricular goals in social studies. Open-ended questions which asked the women to reflect on issues of gender and social studies were added to begin their processes of thinking critically about women and social studies. The questionnaires were analyzed, the data summarized (again, see Appendix II) and used as a bridge to our conversations.
Wise and Stanley (as cited in Bowles and Klein, 1983) believe "that feminism should borrow, steal, change, modify and use for its own purposes any and everything from anywhere that looks of interest and of use to it, but that we must do this critically" (p.18). However, quantitative research is not objective and ungendered. Statistics such as those that report on the male/female distribution of teachers in BC secondary schools (Ministry of Education, 1992b) and survey data which are generalized to present profiles of subject teachers (Cassidy and Bognar, 1991; Goodlad, 1984; Rutter, 1986) do not tell the whole story and may obscure the reality of women's lives as teachers, subsuming them, in the case of social studies, into male-skewed and unflattering portraits of traditional, text-focused, teacher-centred social studies instruction which purport to be universal. Although gender was not a factor in the provincial assessment of social studies, BC Ministry of Education statistics indicate that more than 75% of the respondents to the teacher survey were male. The questionnaire used in this study was derived from the provincial assessment teacher survey tool and so allowed for comparison of the women's responses to the universal profile. Though data derived from six women's responses could not pretend to be representative, they could suggest the ways in which traditional and scientific methodological tools inscribe male attributes as human. As a challenge to the normalized constructions of teachers of social studies, the women's responses strongly suggested that gender be accounted for and that their stories needed to be told in different ways. "Women, it is argued, should be able to tell their own story" (Eichler, 1987, p.32).

Field studies often employ unstructured interviews which depend upon intersubjective agreement; both parties agree to an interactive process which is fair and comfortable (Burgess, 1982; Woods, 1986). In the original project design, I had asked that the women agree to participate in two one-hour interviews of a loosely structured nature. The second interview
would allow for completion of discussion as well as clarification of the data of the first interview. I had compiled a list of questions which would guide these interviews (see Appendix III, Sample Interview Questions). During these interviews, I would seek an understanding of their worldviews, the factors which have influenced these, and the ways in which these are lived out in their teaching of social studies and in their own lives. The first group of interview questions focused on the personal stories of childhood, schooling, years of university, family and adult life, and interests. The second group of questions looked at their experience as social studies teachers, including pedagogical and curricular processes and transformations, professional relationships, and political and social perspectives which informed their teaching and their working lives. The final group of questions focused on their understandings of the gender issues of social studies curriculum, teaching, and the contexts for their work.

At the outset of each interview, I gave a copy of the guiding questions to the interviewee and asked that she glance over the questions for a particular topic in advance of our discussion. I had highlighted some questions for discussion under each topic to give some consistency to the discussions. In this way, the women had some control over the discussion and of the aspects which had most significance for them. New topics and discussion foci came in the natural and fluid ways of emergent conversation. The limitations became apparent, however, in a number of areas. The time spent in conversation was never one hour. Not all topics were given equal time or value in each conversation. Some new or emergent topics, such as those specific to the teaching of Geography 12, required that I re-contact other interviewees. I was always free to do this, which I felt to be an indicator of the comfortable and supportive relationships we had developed as project collaborators. Stories have an improvisational quality to them; the shape
of the creation is discovered along the way rather than pursued from the outset as a defined vision (Clandinin and Hogan, in press).

One of the methodological consequences of adopting a narrative orientation to the study of teaching is that the boundaries for inquiry are not defined in advance. Rather, the unfolding of a telling narrative leads where it will and researchers must follow or the narrative assumes an artificially constrained character (Clandinin and Connelly, 1986, p. 381).

This was to become as true of the research story as it was of the women's stories themselves.

February, 1993: The truth of the matter is I have 24 hours of tape, all of which I personally transcribed (at the rate of 4 hours transcribing to 1 hour of tape) to fill a binder with data. I could tell you that this was to get the full nuance of meaning which comes from emphasis, tone of voice, pauses, laughter, and so on, which would be part of the truth. Another part is that, by late August of 1991, I had conducted three full interview cycles with Louise, Joan, and Alison, transcribed two fully, and put several tapes aside untranscribed, returning to teach in September. I interviewed Tammy, Ellen, and Amanda-Leigh more than a year later. When I finally got back to the first tapes, I needed to review and re-cover the conversations. I needed not only re-visit the information but also the interviewees themselves for up-dates. The size of the task I had set myself was beyond my capacities as a working mother; to complete it would take more than summer holidays. There was another, more practical consideration in transcribing the tapes myself: completing the project had meant becoming a full-time graduate student, and I could not afford to have the tapes transcribed by someone else.

The tapes are characterized sometimes not by questions but by single words which probed more concrete detail, more example, more explanation, more description. They are punctuated with my thoughts, though I really did try to minimize these as leading rather than exploring. There are places where, knowing their stories, the questions are leading, getting them to retell
what I had already heard or understood to be their way of being. There are a lot of my "yeahs" as well. Quickly the interviews had become conversations. One story often lead to another. I couldn’t NOT tell my own stories at times and feel comfortable; real conversations need investment on both sides. In this way, we explored the tangents of our knowledge and experience as women and as teachers of a common curriculum. It was the differences that I felt I needed to attend to the most, though the shared experiences provided the trust or the humour or the warmth in our talking.

Oakley (1986) contests the scientific conventions of interviewing. She says that "interviewing is rather like a marriage: everybody knows what it is, an awful lot of people do it, and yet behind each closed front door there is a world of secrets" (p.231). Methodology textbooks carefully construct proper interviews as instruments of data collection, as pseudo-conversations in which the interviewer is "socialized" to ask "unbiased" questions and create rapport, and the interviewee, in an essentially passive role, is "socialized" to give answers (p.235). The conventional research protocol of interviewing, particularly as it pertains to "a feminist interviewer interviewing women (who may or may not be feminists)," she says, is a "masculine paradigm" or fiction (p.232). Proper interviews, in valuing objectivity, detachment, and hierarchy over the improper inclusion of subjectivity, involvement, and people’s more individualized concerns, are classic representations of the gender stereotyping which occurs in countless scientific studies (p.237). "Through the prism of our technological and rationalistic culture, we are led to perceive and feel emotions as some irrelevancy or impediment" to the business of real science-making (pp.238-9). Conventional interviewing techniques are constructed in terms contradictory to women’s experience and are, in Oakley’s view, morally indefensible in their exploitation of women as sources of data. She reformulates the interview as an
opportunity for friendship grounded in trust and reciprocity and as "a tool for making possible the articulated and recorded commentary of women on the very personal business of being female in a patriarchal capitalist society" (p.246).

Women’s stories, told in their own ways, expose "the tension between the rigid arrogance of theory and the reflexive domesticity of practice" (p.230). They pose ethical dilemmas for researchers which are

... greatest where there is least social distance between the interviewer and interviewee. Where both share the same gender socialization and critical life-experiences, social distance can be minimal. Where both interviewer and interviewee share membership of the same minority group, the basis for equality may impress itself even more urgently on the interviewer’s consciousness (p.251).

Witcher (1985) further exposes the feminist dilemma in research: there is a danger of a kind of "voyeurism" in building in the trust and warmth of interactive research relationships and then withdrawing "to academic heights to impart those parts of the relationship which she deems worthy of reporting" (p.96). The dilemma was exposed in her relationship with one of her three study participants whose views she felt did not support and were discordant with the project-as-praxis goals of illuminating sexist practices in classrooms and of planning anti-sexist strategies.

The dilemma, says Witcher, is personal and professional:

What do I write about the third? This seems to be a crucial dilemma. I am torn between the personal -- that is, presenting the sexist teacher in as positive a way as possible out of respect for her feelings and my anxiety not to exert status or power by taking the liberty of defining her for academic delectation -- and the professional, where I am dedicated to tackling as truthfully and as positively as possible all the aspects of the teacher’s responses which seem important for planning intervention strategies in schools (p.103).
Despite attempts to break down hierarchies and build in intimacy, trust, and personal commitment, equality is only apparent. The ultimate responsibility is the researcher’s. Feminist research has a responsibility to acknowledge the inequality and to reflect upon and clearly articulate the "messy and subjective" process of "combining the personal with the professional and genuinely attempting to incorporate the perspectives of the researched and award them some status and ‘right of reply’" (p.104). According to Witcher, it is in this way that the feminist researcher is personally and professionally honest and effective.

March, 1993: Moira, said Louise, in an early morning long distance phone call, you didn't ask about our bad days. We all sound so good. I realized that, despite my democratic intentions, I controlled the destiny of the project by virtue of the questions I asked, the answers I chose to relate, the theory I chose to include in the discourse. I tried to attend to their voices and their trust and their responses, in every nuance of meaning and inquiry. There are problems in speaking for others.

I kept a journal during the research period; it too is a conventional tool of field research (Woods, 1986; Anderson, 1989). Journals are an on-going record of the researcher’s dialectical process of practical decision-making and are especially important in resolving feminist research dilemmas; they provide "the best maps and sign-posts for the journey" to search for feminist theory (Vickers, 1989, p.31). The practice of writing incorporates the reflective and on-going dialectical process of integrating and negotiating the fragments of theory, methods, data, response, themes, metaphors, language, tensions, and insights which I have found abound in the complex matrices of women’s work as researchers. Feminist scholarship, says Miles (1989), is committed scholarship. It sees no separation between research, analysis, and practice; "the goal of the process of discovery is transformation (self and societal) as much as understanding" (p.18).
Vickers (1989) suggests that "observation of the practical decisions which feminist researchers make in their efforts to understand and explain the nature of female experience reveals a praxis" which is part of the process of discarding the baggage of traditional or malestream research and of creating new tools and new norms for feminist research and action (p.45):

The searcher’s dilemma is clear. The weight of her own evidence produced by the methods ‘proper’ to her discipline as ‘explained’ by the dominant theories which express her discipline’s rational consensus ‘prove’ either that she is a freak (not being passive, preoccupied with the approval of others, or nurturant); or her ‘intuitive’ knowledge that women are not all alike, that they ought not to be passive, etc., calls into question both her own evidence and the great weight of the disciplinary consensus (Vickers, 1989, p.33).

Keeping a journal incorporates self-reflection and self-discipline into feminist research which, as "disciplined rebellion, [follows the rules of] scholarly principles of reliability, consistency, logical inference and honesty" but also assigns priority to intuition and the authenticity of individual experience and empathy as tests of subjective truth and relevance (p.36). "Whatever I feel/know is," says Christian (as cited in Ellsworth, 1992, p.94).

February, 1993: I found the tape recorder a problematic tool for investigation, more of a constraint and an annoyance which at times impaired and interrupted the talk as I worried that it would not be working and that I would have no evidence of our conversations. I also took notes in the initial stages of interviewing, but that too proved cumbersome and constraining, disturbing eye contact and patterns in conversations as I tried to write things down. I used this note-taking strategy less and less, preferring to record only particular spellings and to record descriptions (as, for example, of the interview setting) immediately after the discussion. My first interview with Tammy was two hours long and was, in fact, never recorded but recalled from memory the day after. Even technology conspires to confound and confine the research
enterprise, particularly when introduced to research grounded in subjectivity. I showed Tammy the transcripts-as-recalled and she commented upon my remarkable memory, which was in fact partially based on the notes I was thankful I had taken concurrent with and immediately after the interview that day. Contradictions abound.

Increasingly, narrative is the starting point for sense-making of the personal and political complexities of teaching life. "Stories," in Carter’s (1993) view, "capture, more than scores or mathematical formulae ever can, the richness and indeterminacy of our experiences as teachers and the complexity of our understandings of what teaching is" (p.5). Teachers have a "rich storied knowledge" of classroom dynamics, curriculum content, student learning, and academic tasks which they use to "transform knowledge of content into a form that plays itself out in the time and space of classrooms" (p.7). Rather than reducing teaching to its discrete variables and indicators of effectiveness, stories give order and coherence to the multiple meanings and events of classrooms and teaching. In this way, stories detechnalize the discourse of education:

The narrative study of schooling has potential for freeing education from a language of the technical, for ensuring that understandings link with fundamental qualities of human experience; and for establishing bonds in method and meaning between education and other fields of human endeavor (Clandinin and Connelly, 1986, p.385).

In addition to their "storied" knowledge of teaching, the women of the study brought quite different personal stories and worldviews to the classroom. These, combined with their knowledge of and experience in teaching, form what Clandinin and Connelly (1986) call "personal practical knowledge":

Knowing a teaching and learning situation as an experienced teacher is a matter of recollections from one’s narrative called forth by the situation. These recollections are personal, for they are derived from a person’s narrative, and they are practical for they are aimed at meeting the demands of a particular situation. These
recollections are also theoretical, both in the sense of containing conceptual content and in the sense of typifying the particulars of a situation; and they are cultural, in the sense that individual narratives are embedded in cultural and historical narratives (p.383).

Individual narratives are embedded in particular political and social contexts. The storyteller is aware of the conventions and consequences of storytelling and, as an agent of a construction process, is attuned to meaning and interpretation she conveys, referred to as the narrator effect, as well as to the listener's process of constructing meaning and interpretation, referred to as the audience effect. The critical/feminist researcher, the one "who has access to the relevant literatures, who frames the study, who provides the interpretations, and who modulates the teachers' voice" also constructs meaning within the gendered traditions of storytelling (Carter, 1993, p.9). For women, the art of storytelling is a double problematic for, as Du Bois (1983) has pointed out, our language and conceptual framework are learned "in the terms of our culture," not in the terms of our subjectivities. Our "divided consciousness," says Pagano (1988), the result of always seeing ourselves in others' terms, has meant that "either we are locked out or we are plagiarists. The stories we tell are not our own" (p.339). Thus, even reading and storytelling can be seen as gendered acts (p.335). In telling our own stories, we must challenge our assumptions, methods, and goals and seek narrative alternatives which are not tentative and which give authority to women's knowledge in the language and constructs of women.

Spender (1983) uses the present imperfect verb tense to describe the process of women's construction of meaning as partial and progressive. The words are as true for personal narrative as they are for feminist research:

Developing a theoretical framework for this when the words aren't there and the concepts are shadows. Being brave ... deliberately
adopting positions that are legitimated as outrageous. Looking to
women for validation ... huge change when it is no longer
necessary to seek male approval and confirmation.

Recognising that life cannot be separated from knowledge ... that
we are knowledge, nothing out there ... who we are means what we
know. My life, my biography inseparable from what I know ...
dispensing with male approval: not an intellectual decision.
Finding new ways of understanding not learnt through books.
Finding myself involved in processes and then trying to describe
and explain what happens.

Pushing myself to the paradoxes: perceiving who put it on its
present plane, recognising the needs it serves, knowing I will not
subscribe. Wanting to endorse theorising and wanting to insist that
it is open to all. The contradictions. The necessity of a new frame
of reference. The reconceptualisation of theory in order to theorise
(pp.30-31).

Ellsworth (1992) suggests that "any individual woman’s politicized voice will be partial,
multiple, and contradictory .... It is impossible to speak from all voices at once" (pp.103-104) and
that what gets said and left unsaid is a highly complex and strategic process of negotiating "the
politics of knowing and being known":

What they/we say, to whom, in what context, depending on the
energy they/we have for the struggle on a particular day, is the
result of conscious and unconscious assessments of the power
relations and safety of the situation (p.105).

Hence, the task was one of building the narrative collection in which the women speak in their
own voices which are multiple, shifting, intersecting, contradictory, partial, imperfect, and
unequal (p.109). The narratives are colourful stories told across the "grey areas" of differences.

The analysis of the women’s narratives sought the colour of patterns, discordancies,
themes, refrains of figurative language, unities, commonalities, and differences; such narrative
devices provide coherence within complexity and the critical tension required to construct a good
story. Many teacher biographies are not very memorable, says Carter (1993), and are inattentive
to the narrative conventions of characterization, plot, rising action, setting, and theme. They
describe "stick figures" without contexts (p.9). To describe each as a woman and a teacher, I
wanted the richness of detail that gives life and dimension to the characters of stories. The
transcripts were indexed for key quotes and patterns and examples. I also tried to identify the
partialities and multiple subjectivities which are reflected in the stories each woman tells of her
experiences and her different identities.

Ellsworth (1992) discusses narratives as partial, that is, unfinished, imperfect, and limited:

They project the interests of "one side" over others. Because those
voices are partial and partisan, they must be made problematic, but
not because they have broken the rules of thought of the ideal
rational person by grounding their knowledge in immediate
emotional, social, and psychic experiences of oppression, or are
somehow lacking or too narrowly circumscribed. Rather, they
must be critiqued because they hold implications for other social
movements and their struggles for self-definition (p.97).

My own identities as researcher, as friend, and as colleague created a tension around the
contradictory asymmetry of power; I struggled with this throughout the research process. Respect
for their knowledge meant giving over space for that knowledge. Feminist projects contest the
fact that "men occupy all the conceptual space" (Spender, 1982, p.30), relegating women’s stories
to the status of sidebars which, as McIntosh (1983) has noted as phase two, are added on to the
master narratives of curriculum and teaching. But my voice must allow for their stories to be
heard from the centre as they wished them to be told. In retelling their stories, I have included
extensive passages from the conversations, an attempt to fulfill these goals. Letting the data
speak for themselves, however, made my own standpoint as the primary maker of meaning a
shifting, multiple, partial, imperfect reality. I was moving personally within McIntosh’s "phase-
three" political analysis of women’s absence or marginal presence to create a woman-centred
project. Again, I came to understand the process of feminist research as emergent.
March, 1993: As the project began, I was looking for women's ways of knowing, being, and teaching which reflected the themes of caring, nurturing, connection, collaboration, and cooperation of the earlier feminist theoretical constructions cited in the review of literature. But I could not make all the women fit these descriptions with any degree of conviction, no matter how hard I tried. Caring, I thought, could be demonstrated in a number of ways, such as concern for one's students or concern for the environment or for world peace and other social issues. And it can and it was, to varying degrees. But what if the primary characteristic of that particular woman's teaching and being is not caring, and what are the consequences of depicting all women as caring? The six women were far from the same as people or as teachers.

The poststructural feminist perspective or standpoint (Luke and Gore, 1992) allowed me to illuminate the differential location and identity of each as a woman in teaching. In so doing, importance was given to the places or ecology of their experience as women who are teachers and leaders in social studies. Descriptions of their personal lives (Chapter 3) offered some possibilities for generalizable characteristics, but for the most part, the lives of the women were quite different. Their teaching styles and standpoints were also all quite different, though there were common themes and tensions in their curricular transformations and understandings (Chapter 4). They did not all conform to the feminist pedagogical model, and some who did would have actively resisted this designation. Their experiences of the broader contexts of their teaching, what can be viewed as their citizenship within their educational communities, were also quite different (Chapter 5). Yet, within these stories of difference, there were commonalities which emerged as themes in some of the narratives. Themes which were missing in other stories created critical questions around differences of standpoint and understandings of place. Why was
the experience of some different than that of others? Why had some not talked about it? Why had I not included it?

As collaborative, praxis-oriented research, the project incorporated the "mutual negotiation of meaning and power" (Lather, 1986a). The women were asked to read, reflect upon, and respond to Chapter 1, "The Review of Literature" and on the emerging theory. Their responses came in writing or in personal conversations. Some of the women phoned after reading a draft chapter; I took notes during our conversations. Others mailed responses with comments written in margins or letters with suggestions and encouragement. Occasionally, the concerns were with the grammatical expression and the informal structures of the language of their conversation. I have tried to negotiate retention of some of these for the veracity or flavour of talking; the spoken language of stories is, after all, imperfect and fragmented. Several times, the problems were of omission or of identity. Sometimes, there were questions or observations which caused me to critically reflect on the process and the theory. All changes, insights, and questions were discussed and accounted for in the theory-building. While this collaborative process added time at the writing stage, as Riddell (1992) notes, it was essential to addressing issues of validity and of women’s authority over their own stories and knowledge.

Two issues emerged significantly within the collaboration process. Both surround the problems of identity and naming. I had some very political concerns about the consequences of making some of the stories public. Although each had been assigned a pseudonym and some personal and identifying details were changed to protect identity, the community of "geography women" is so small (there are only 28 presently teaching in BC) that identification is still possible. Chapters 4 and 5 were read by several staff members of the BC Teachers’ Federation who, with a one-sentence deletion, felt that the stories met the ethical and professional guidelines
for teacher conduct. I find this fear itself an interesting response to the research, but then my own identity is visible; my name is clearly implicated as the primary story-teller.

The other issue emerged from discussion with Tammy of the "convention of anonymity" in academic research. When I told her I needed to change real names to pseudonyms, Tammy was adamant: it's about time, she indicated, that we were able to name those whose support has made a difference. Naming, of course, has significance as a feminist strategy in identifying those factors of existence which women value as well as those which demean women (Vickers, 1989; Du Bois, 1983). Its limitations, admittedly, are in failing to name others whose presence has made a difference for women or in mis-naming. We resolved the issue by asking Wanda Cassidy of Simon Fraser University, who is named in the study, what she thought. She did not recognize the convention and was delighted at being named. I made the authorial decision to seek the permission of those women whose real names are used in the conversations because they are positive role models and because they have, in their teaching lives, made a difference for other women.

Cornbleth (1986) makes the case for intellectual-scientific and social passion in social studies research, describing it as

... an intense purposeful emotion of eagerness in pursuit of significant goals ... disciplined, in part by the communities to which we belong, to respond to challenges to our cherished values and to pursue our visions of the desirable future (p.2)

In the critical paradigm, any emancipatory theory, including feminist research, seeks to "build theory that possesses 'evocative power' [which] by resonating with people's lived concerns, fears, and aspirations, ... serves an energizing, catalytic role" (Lather, 1986a, p.266). In this way, theory can express and describe "politically progressive popular feelings rather than an abstract
framework imposed by intellectuals on the complexity of lived experience" (p.267). Feminist research, as passionate scholarship,

... makes possible a common endeavour of science-making that can actually engage the conjunctions of values, purposes, methods and knowing -- that can begin to integrate subjectivity with objectivity, substance with process, passion with responsibility, and the knower with the known (Du Bois, 1983, p.113).

Critical research, and by extension any research which involves the passion of ideological commitment to a transformative agenda, must pay particular attention to questions about the trustworthiness of data and issues of validity. It is important, says Lather (1986b), "that efforts to produce social knowledge that is helpful in the struggle for a more equitable world pursue rigor as well as relevance" (p.67).

As passionate scholarship, feminist research projects do not, in methods or in purpose, recognize value-free science in which objectivity, expertise, neutrality, and separateness are reified and opposed to subjectivity, community, art, and complex understandings. They reject dichotomy, duality, linearity, and fixity as "not the properties of nature or of human life and experiencing" but of learned ways of thinking, seeing, and knowing that decontextualizes the real dimensions of life, placing them into "rigid, oppositional, and hierarchical categories" (Du Bois, 1983, pp.110-1). Instead, feminist projects synthesize and integrate, seeing things in holistic and complex ways. Feminist projects are often "charged with bias, advocacy, subjectivity [and] ideologizing" (p.112). They threaten the established order. For these reasons, feminist scholarship demands "rigor, precision and responsibility to the highest degree" (p.113); it must be acutely aware of its own theoretical constructions, design, and methods if it is to withstand the charges.
In qualitative research, "understanding is a more fundamental concept for qualitative research than validity" (Wolcott, 1990, as cited in Maxwell, 1992, p.281). Research accounts are assessed for their "integrity, character, and quality" in relation to our understanding of the things they claim to be about and in relation to the community of inquirers on whose perspectives the account is based:

Validity is relative in this sense because understanding is relative; ... it is not possible for an account to be independent of any particular perspective. It is always possible to challenge an account from outside that community and perspective, but a challenge amounts to expanding the community that is concerned with the account and may change the nature of the validity issues (Maxwell, p. 284).

Qualitative research must concern itself with descriptive validity. Is the account factually accurate? Is the researcher making up or distorting what was seen or heard? (Maxwell, p.285). On the primary level, this study addressed descriptive validity in its design by having the women review the data and their accounts. On a secondary level, the stories themselves were not observed, though they could have been, as real events. What is real is the women's understanding and ways of constructing meaning of those events; my recounting of those, as real events told in their terms, was not problematic for the women who read each chapter in several draft stages. As stories, they correspond to the women's accounts and perceptions of what really happened.

A second concern is with a study's interpretive validity. Does the meaning assigned by the research to the account correspond to the meaning intended by the people who gave them? Does the meaning correspond to the participants' perspective of their own accounts? Are the accounts "experience-near" and substantially derived from their own language? (Maxwell, p. 288) Again, the women's perspectives were accounted for in the collaborative structuring of the
research process to provide time and opportunity for reading, reflection, and response to the accuracy of draft chapters as the researcher’s re-constructions of the meaning of their accounts. Their own words are used extensively in the analysis.

A third consideration is the study’s theoretical validity. Are the theoretical constructions the researcher brings to and develops during the study applied appropriately to the particular accounts? Does the researcher connect theoretical constructs legitimately within the context of the study both to the data and to other theory? Of issues of construct validity in openly ideological research, Lather (1986a) says:

The data must be allowed to generate propositions in a dialectical manner that permits use of a priori theoretical frameworks, but which keeps a particular framework from becoming the container into which the data must be poured. The search is for theory which grows out of context-embedded data, not in a way that automatically rejects a priori theory, but in a way that keeps preconceptions from distorting the logic of evidence (p.267).

The study, as an exploration of women’s experience in the male-dominated field of social studies teaching, was grounded in critical, feminist, pedagogical, and social studies theory. The collaborative process of integrating the women’s responses to draft chapters, including Chapter 1, The Review of Literature, invited their understanding of the study’s theoretical underpinnings. It gave them the opportunity to express their perspectives on my theoretical contribution to the research story of the voices of a priori theorists, to the building of meaning and of collective narrative.

The study incorporated Anderson’s (1989) notion of critical reflexivity as an explicit, systematized, and dialectical process for including the responses of both the researcher and the researched to the theory and to the research effects. Negotiations of meaning, he says, should also reflect on context, that is, the structural and historical forces that have shaped the
participants' lives and work. Intellectual rigour at the theory-building stage was addressed in this manner within the study. Meaning was critically unveiled (Anderson, 1989) as the participants described, measured, and recorded the experience and perceptions of their lives and of teaching and of involvement with this project. The inclusion of participant responses and critical reflections also addressed McCutcheon's (1981) concern for over- and under-representation in the creation of meaning. "Making data and analyses as public and as credible as possible is essential," says Lather (1986b, p.77).

Lather (1986b), in arguing for more systematic approaches to issues of validity in ideological research, suggests that a study should be measured for its catalytic validity. What personal and/or political impact has participation in the project had upon the researcher and the researched? Given that critical research aims to transform and empower, how has involvement re-oriented, focused, or energized the participants themselves? What actions are attributable to this transformation? The women were asked to reflect on the ways their being involved in the project had in some way transformed their ways of seeing or knowing the experience of being a woman and teaching social studies. Asking practicing teachers, particularly women with children, to find the opportunity to critically reflect upon chapters-in-progress was asking a lot and was a measure of their commitment to the collaborative nature of the project. Teachers have little time to reflect upon their accounts of teaching (Erickson, 1986; Carter, 1993; Pagano, 1988). The reflective dimension to this research-as-praxis allowed the women to come to know their own stories, for some, in significant and unexpected ways.

Another concern is with a study's generalizability. To what extent can the accounts be applied to situations or people other than those directly studied? "Qualitative studies are not usually designed to allow systematic generalizations to some wider population" (Maxwell, p.293),
but they are concerned with developing a theory that makes sense of the people or the situations studied. Spender (1983) speaks of generalizability in women's terms, suggesting that women have different life experiences and that this gives rise to different interpretations, all equally valid:

Trying to reduce the diversity of human experience and the creativity of human meaning to one solitary sediment seems to me not only wasteful and time consuming, but unnecessarily stupid and denotes enormous insecurity in being unable to accept any meanings other than one's own (p. 29).

The stories are not told to suggest general characteristics about women who teach social studies but to highlight the difference of which Spender speaks and the complexity of women's personal and professional lives. They are told to retrieve women from obscurity, what Martin (1985) calls the "ontological basement," and to claim validity for their experience in and understandings of their multiple roles as women and as teachers and leaders in social studies. In contextualizing the women, this study also looks at the forces which shape and within which they shape their lives. Those who read or hear the stories make their own meanings of them.

Yet generalizability is, to some extent, a factor for consideration in two aspects of this study. While the questionnaire data do suggest the women's difference from male-dominated normative descriptions of social studies teachers, the sample group is too small and not representative of the experience of most women who teach social studies in its focus on those who have, to varying degrees, acquired specialist status in the field by their teaching of senior courses and their engaging in leadership activities. Additional and different research would allow for building such generalizations. "The value of a qualitative study may depend on its lack of external generalizability in a statistical sense; it may provide an account of a setting or population that is illuminating as an extreme case or 'ideal type'' (Maxwell, 1992, p.294). More than
anything, the questionnaire analysis illuminates the interpretive limitations of quantitative methodologies, such as external generalizing, which normalizes descriptions of women’s experience and measures them against male standards. Generalizing the women’s questionnaire responses augments the case that Eichler (1987) makes for women telling their own stories.

Another way in which generalizability is a factor of this study is in the thematic analysis of the women’s stories. Carter (1993) argues that "generalizations from stories are at best precarious" (p.10). The relationship between story and reality is problematic. Stories are ambiguous and complex constructions of reality, not reality itself. They are a way of constructing and expressing knowledge, of explaining and giving meaning and coherence to something. When teachers’ stories include their biographies, "the central themes are often moral and philosophical, having more to do with feelings, purposes, images, aspirations, and personal meanings than with teaching method or curriculum structures in isolation from personal experience" (pp.7-8). Clandinin and Connelly’s (1986) notion of teachers’ personal practical knowledge sees teachers’ narratives as an integration of the private and public selves in a process of constructing both a theory and practice of teaching.

Within each woman’s stories, I looked for "unities of experience," to use Clandinin and Connelly’s term; these are the commonsense constructs which appeared in patterns throughout her dialogue and transcended the way she understood and created her multiple identities or roles. These unities allowed me to theoretically reconstruct the stories each women told of the practical realities of social studies and teaching. Identifying these constructs or unities led me to define each woman as having a distinct style of teaching, for example. Where these constructs appeared in recurring patterns across several (though not necessarily all) stories, they were identified as narrative themes, that is, as having a degree of generalizability within the bounds of the study
itself. There were common themes that echoed in varying tonalities throughout the women's curriculum stories and experiences of other professional contexts. Presented as thematic analysis in the research account, these patterns across the differences of their stories are not highly abstract generalizations or laws to which all women's experience of social studies conforms, but "explanatory propositions with which we can make sense of the dilemmas and problematics of teaching" (Carter, 1993, p.10) from women's perspectives. Again, a different study of women's perceptions of social studies teaching might seek to address generalizability where this study does not.

Another issue of validity in qualitative research is with its evaluative validity (Maxwell, 1992, p.295). Does the study evaluate the women as teachers or as leaders? While the study seeks to reconstruct a theoretical and practical story of women's teaching as valid and to give authority to women's knowledge, the reconstruction is very much on mutually negotiated terms. Attentive to the importance of research conducted in friendship and to issues of safety for women, my own included, I chose not to offer evaluative analysis but to allow the stories to speak for themselves and of themselves wherever possible. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 are characterized by very long quotations for precisely this reason. In addition, I recognized that no matter how detailed the account, each story must be seen as partial and selective in its construction and ambiguous in its interpretation. That is not to say that, in my reconstruction, I was unaware of "audience effect" whereby readers of the story as I have chosen to tell it will make their own meaning, having their own evaluative capacity.

The study can be assessed for evaluative validity in another sense. Does it evaluate the women's stories in terms of some presence not announced in the account? The study consciously does not speak in comparative terms, that is, depicting women's experiences as "better than,"
though "different from" in the language of the theorists and the women's stories may at times overtly invite and be heard as evaluative comparison. Their experiences and perceptions are as different from each other's as they are from men's.

The stories in this study could only be women's stories, though they are not all stories depicting women as "caring" and "thinking as mothers." Such essentialist notions serve only to confine and limit the different and various strengths by which both women's ways of being women and men's ways of being men can be inscribed. Either/Or thinking within and across gender lines, however, can only be transcended when women's experiences are not marginalized or cast as deficient but as valid and worthy of inclusion in the discourse of teaching. They are the personally reflective stories of women thinking politically about very political curricula and teaching contexts and social realities. This project has moved women's stories from the sidebars of the master narratives of the practice and curriculum of social studies and teaching, claiming a place as a new narrative about valued citizens at the centre of an educational community, at least for the duration of the telling. There are other stories for which space needs to be claimed. The practices of patriarchy are not the practices of all men. Yet when patriarchal practice and master narratives in education continue to exclude some, teaching for maximizing human possibilities and educated citizenship can only be limited.

Moving beyond requires renaming the characteristics of women, not in terms of deviations from or negations of a masculine norm, but as patterns of human responses to particular situations. In this view, masculinity and femininity are simply different human possibilities that have emerged historically. This understanding had led feminist scholarship to rethink the concept of the person to include traditionally female characteristics (Westkott, 1979, p. 324).

In its feminist research design, the project was undertaken as a democratized inquiry in the spirit of open and empowering collaboration. The methodology sought consistency with the
ideology. The project was undertaken with passionate commitment to listen to the voices of women and to pursue answers in integrative, holistic, and reflective ways to the question as to:

... how [we] can help create a space for the mutual engagement of lived difference that is not framed in oppositional terms, requiring the silencing of a multiplicity of voices by a single dominant discourse (Lewis and Simon, 1986, p.216).
CHAPTER 3: THE WOMEN AS INDIVIDUALS

I met Amanda-Leigh, Ellen, Joan, Alison, and Louise at Geography 12 Provincial Exam marking committee sessions held in Victoria, BC, in February and again in July every year. As women, we were members of a visible minority in a gathering of some of the province’s best-known geography teachers; women constituted up to 25% of geography marking teams of 30 or 35 people. I met Tammy, a geography teacher who has also been a member of marking committees, at a summer institute for social studies teachers at Simon Fraser University. Women were also underrepresented in this context.

The women in this study are all white and middle class by profession, though one can claim working-class roots. One has French-Canadian heritage; two grew up abroad; the others are Anglo-Canadian by birth. They range in ages, marital status, teaching experience, and experience of the education system. All have been involved in Ministry-level social studies committees, amongst other "leadership" roles. All are strong, self-confident, well-travelled, dynamic women committed to education and learning. All have excellent academic credentials from which they derive pride and self-esteem. They come to the field of social studies teaching with an extraordinary love of geography, though their paths into, and in several cases, out of, the field are all quite different.

Like history textbook sidebars which tell the stories of visible minority experiences, these stories represent narratives marginal not only to a master narrative of men’s experience but, in many ways, to the experience of most women in social studies teaching. The following are their personal stories, shared with me over several conversational interviews which richly describe the particular personal perspectives and experiences they bring to their teaching lives.
The Life Story of Amanda-Leigh:

Amanda-Leigh is the youngest of the group. She and I became good friends over several shared marking sessions. The daughter of a well-known government bureaucrat and his professional wife, Amanda-Leigh is 30, single, the oldest of three children. She has a lively sense of humour and our conversations are interspersed with her ready laughter.

We talk in the living room of her one-bedroom apartment centrally located in the affluent community where she grew up and now teaches. Given her sense of the importance of community, it was no surprise that she should live where she works and where she feels integrally connected. The apartment reflects her relative youthfulness and her active lifestyle: there are family photographs, a collage of photos prepared by students, stuffed animals, running shoes by the door. It was difficult to catch her at home as she’s usually away at the family’s ski cabin on the weekends or busy on weeknights with friends, workouts, and other activities. The dining area is her den, containing a desk and books -- prominent in her bookshelves are the provincial government geography manuals.

It does not take long to identify her strength of character, the very strongly-held principles which underpin her existence both as a woman and as a teacher and which were inculcated in childhood lessons. Amanda-Leigh is very clear about these. Canadian to the core, Amanda-Leigh is fiercely proud of her family. Her growing up she describes as

...extraordinarily stable. [There was] a phenomenal sense of family. I’m one of three children, the eldest daughter. My sister is 27; my brother is 21. I have the same parents I started with; [they] have an amazing sense of family, a strong sense of values, right or wrong, religious values, upbringing, citizenship, community.
As a family, they attended church and participated in the neighbourhood and community groups; Amanda-Leigh was a Canada Cord Guide, her mother and father both actively involved at senior levels with Guides and Scouts. The children all played on school and community teams.

Amanda-Leigh has no trouble identifying the most significant influence of such an upbringing in her life: the inherent sense of self-worth. Strong family values of honesty, loyalty, Canadian-ness, and commitment to whatever one undertakes transcend her personal and professional life. She speaks of "giving back what you have received, be it from a friendship or a family member or the community or the school." She talks about the phenomenal sense of work ethic, of fireworks and "Happy Birthday, Canada" cakes, of the privilege of carrying a Canadian passport, of the importance of becoming bilingual, of trips to Canadian historical sites and to a French cemetery on the anniversary of D-Day, of mother’s lessons on Nellie McClung and the suffragettes. She was instilled with the sense of responsibility,

...to [our] government, to the world, the democratic process. You cannot just accept what happens, you have to figure out why it’s happening. When you cast a vote, it better be an informed one and you better make sure you vote every time you have that opportunity .... How could you live with yourself when you don’t cast a vote when you have that opportunity?

Amanda-Leigh has travelled everywhere with her family, she said. The children bore half the costs of the trips, though most people find that hard to believe:

If you asked my parents what the intended learning outcomes were for travelling, [they were] to broaden their kids’ horizons, to instill in their children that they were not better than anyone else, that they were to never presume that because they were white and ... spoke English, that made them better than anyone else. They worked so hard to make their kids understand that it doesn’t matter who you are, what colour you are, what religion you are, that everybody is important.
Amanda-Leigh’s elementary and secondary schooling saw her emerge, not unexpectedly, as a high-profile, involved, and committed citizen of the school community. She played volleyball, got involved with students’ council and grad committee; she was “more of a doer, making it work as opposed to going against it.” She was, for the most part, a “Pollyanna.” She remembers only once challenging a teacher over an assignment he said she hadn’t handed in.

Her favourite teachers were those "who knew me as a person first and a student second." Amanda-Leigh wrote to her History 12 and Geography 12 teachers when she became one "because they were interested in me as a person." The woman who taught geography brought it to life for Amanda-Leigh; she was not a "sit in the row and lecture" kind of teacher but one who took students out to see and study the community. The man who taught history provided the model of classroom desk arrangement, in two U’s, that Amanda-Leigh uses herself.

I think that the thing that I respected most were the teachers [who] did not presume that they were better than we were. They looked at us and thought, what can we do to help these kids learn? Now maybe that’s an educator reflecting back and putting terms and words onto a situation but teachers that really cared about their kids and the content came second. They’re the ones I cared about the most.

Though science was an all-female department at her high school, the teachers were, in Amanda-Leigh’s view, "females who believed in the ‘content at the expense of the learning’ idea." She was unquestionably a Humanities graduate.

Nothing is particularly remarkable, in Amanda-Leigh’s opinion, about her time as a post-secondary student; nothing had a "passionate impact on [her] development." She thought briefly about taking a year out, but her parents would have none of it. "In your next life!" they said. Working part-time for a trust company, she was offered a management training program; her parents counselled her to continue her academic program. Amanda-Leigh had wanted to be a
teacher. She briefly considered a career with External Affairs but came to see it as a "system that was ... controlling, ... bureaucratic, ... ladder-oriented." It wasn’t what she wanted. She completed her B.A. with a double major in history and geography at SFU.

Amanda-Leigh spent a year at Laval studying French. "As soon as I got to Laval, I knew I wanted to be a teacher." Ottawa University had a great Teachers’ College; she graduated B.Ed., magna cum laude. "My parents thought," she said, "that the more universities you [went] to in different provinces, the better off you [were]. [You had] a better understanding of the nation." She returned from three years of teaching in eastern Canada to work in the affluent school district from which she graduated. This is her fourth year of teaching in BC.

As a single woman, Amanda-Leigh skis, swims, reads, enjoys meeting new people, and continues to travel in her summer holidays. As personal accomplishments, those things about herself in which she takes particular pride, Amanda-Leigh lists, "Department Coordinator at 28. Schooled in three provinces. Travelled extensively." "Pollyanna," however, is adept at pretending sometimes:

Everything’s okay. Everything’s going well. Let’s just have fun. Let’s [look for the positive] ... it’s almost a negative connotation because, instead of clearly identifying the factors that are problems, you’re willing to gloss them over for the sake of everything looking wonderful ... sometimes trying to make sure that everything is going well for everyone, at the expense of what your own needs are.

Amanda-Leigh presently shares her life with close friends, male and female, and family. She talks of bouts of being lonely, finding that married friends reinforce her singleness. Teaching has, at times, made her feel as though her life is closing in, not branching out. Often late home from school, she has coached volleyball, supervised dances, and assisted with musicals, graduation, and awards. She is very committed to developing as a professional and often attends
conferences on innovative directions in education. "It’s easy to substitute work for a social life," she said.

The Life Story of Tammy:

Although Tammy has marked provincial exams, she finds it difficult to conceive of how she could go away to Victoria, given the responsibilities of single parenting. We are, however, old acquaintances from the 1988 Social Studies Provincial Assessment Team where we worked together creating the assessment tool. I have not been to her home before but I feel welcome immediately; Tammy has a vivaciousness and an openness that made the prospect of our conversation fun.

Tammy is 39, divorced, and the mother of a 10-year old son, David. She enjoys reading, writing, swimming, music, and activities with her son. She volunteers at the local shelter for battered women. Her home is in a rapidly growing area near Vancouver. She commutes daily to a nearby community with her son who attends school there; she had not been happy with the neighbourhood school. Tammy’s home is five years old, immaculate, bright, and ordered. Our interview was conducted under the gaze of a very large champagne poodle.

My first questions about her childhood brought tears. Tammy was the third child in a traditional French-Canadian family where her mother stayed home to raise the children, first a son, then two daughters. Her brother had been born severely physically and mentally challenged; this had been her mother’s greatest sorrow. Tammy and her older sister Crystal are both extremely successful in their careers, but there is a very strong awareness in both of them of their mother’s disappointment that such a handicap should have been visited upon her only son. Much of the family’s energy was spent in meeting the needs of the oldest child. Tammy described the family as not one that demonstrated affection or that had avenues for expressing love.
The girls did much to fend for themselves and developed a kind of intellectual/emotional interdependence which still characterizes their relationship. "We get along really well," said Tammy. "We never fight and never have." Crystal, five years older than Tammy, would teach the younger one, assigning her reading beyond her high school level, books such as Plato’s *Republic* which had been assigned in Crys’s first-year Political Science class, so that she could have someone to talk with about it. The older sister guided and mentored the intellectual development of the younger. Crystal is now a partner in a law firm in Vancouver. Both girls shared a love of music and learned to play the piano; Tammy has taught piano as well.

Tammy noted periods of strain in her relationship with her mother during her growing up, though these feelings belong to the past. As a traditional French-Canadian wife and mother, Tammy’s mother had never been able to consider life options such as those pursued by her daughters. Tammy had not lived out the lot of married women in leaving her husband; though the family is "lapsed" in its Catholicism, Tammy spoke of the sense that, for her mother, the duty of women in life is to endure. The family socialized mostly with relatives.

Tammy spoke lovingly of her father; he was always quietly there for his daughters. He called them his "penguins." Though Tammy was not sure of the derivation of this term, they do share a love of their pets which she speculates is the only way he has of showing affection. There was no doubt that she and her sister are the two most-loved people in his world. When Tammy’s marriage was in trouble, he took her on a trip to China and Thailand; when it broke down, he found a house for her and David and became her mortgagor. He arrived with a small moving van and other members of the family to move a few possessions to the new house the day after Tammy called.
Tammy’s father was, she said, a "natural geographer." Her love of geography came in sharing his natural curiosity about places and people, about landscapes and rocks. He helped her with her rock collection. She and her sister have travelled all around the world with their father, enjoying his amazing capacity to gather and store data about the differences and similarities of cultures and lifestyles.

Asked from where she derived her self-esteem, Tammy very readily acknowledged that it came from her schooling, her academic success. She knew she shone at school and was fiercely competitive in the academic context. Tammy found her voice as a student. Her friends were the "odd" ones, the wounded ones who needed her strength and her support. She talked of the sense of social justice which became readily apparent in an incident in grade 8 where she spoke loudly on behalf of another student who had been physically and mentally mistreated by a teacher. There were no women social studies teachers at all, "just very boring men."

When Tammy finished high school, there was no money for her to continue her education. Tammy could not see anything in the area where she grew up that she wanted to do, so she left for the Northwest Territories. It was there that she became a member of a minority, one of the few whites in an aboriginal community, and there that she derived her commitment to issues of social justice and equity. She earned enough money to carry on her education.

The same voice that she had found in high school and which called for social justice characterized Tammy’s days at SFU. She spoke of her challenge to a history professor whose ideas on women she found unacceptable; he had started his course with statements that higher education was really the domain of men and that women’s presence on campus denied men their rightful place. Other lessons, such as the one on Hitler and masturbation, had been equally offensive to her; she had made a point of being visible in leaving the lecture hall that day. When
she had submitted her final paper, the professor told her that her mark had already been determined, that he wouldn’t need to mark her paper. If she chose to challenge the mark, he said, he also sat on the committee and would see that the mark stood. She received a D. She had gone to the head of the History department who read her paper and changed her mark to a B; she was sure the professor was never informed. He had continued to cause problems for a number of years thereafter, Tammy said, "before the department got rid of him."

Tammy enjoyed university and was excited by academic life. Her love of the challenge of ideas and of the dialectic and discourse which surrounded the Simon Fraser University academic world of the early 1970s came, she thought, from her French Canadian roots. She recalled her sister’s bringing home the SFU intellectual elite of the rebellious ’60s and the dynamic discussions which took place in their living room. French Canadians, she explained, loved to discuss ideas, loved the passionate exchange which was somehow removed from the personal and emotional.

Her love of geography was confirmed in a first-year course in physical geography, the same course and professor that I too had loved. Though I was a contemporary of her older sister, we were able to share other stories of professors we’d had in common and enjoyed and in whose classes we had expanded that love of geography. We were made to feel our importance as bright young women. Neither of us remembers any women faculty in the department; there were very few women students.

At 20, Tammy married; her husband was 15 years older than she was, a widower with three children ranging in ages from 10 to 14. At 20 she was mother, housekeeper, and wife, as well as a full-time student on campus. The excitement and challenge of her academic world counterbalanced a marriage she knew almost immediately was wrong and the duties of her roles
in their home. The duality of this existence stole her twenties. At 30, she said, she looked more like 40. Her husband had expected that she would stay young and slim and energetic; she had gained weight and been drained of her youth and her energy. Hers was not a supportive marriage; her husband’s personal problems with alcohol and his abusiveness strained the seams of the family. Besides, she embarrassed him, she said. He had been president of a business management association which held its Christmas function at a prestigious professional men’s club. She had refused to enter by the side door as was customary for women. They had spent that formal evening in mutual rage.

When Tammy left her husband 15 years later, her own and her son’s lives threatened, the disharmony between her personal and by then professional life was unbearable. Her teaching about equity and justice and women’s issues played discordantly against the way she lived her life when she went home. It has been five years since she left and she is just now recovering a sense of herself living one life, not two; her social life is not a priority. She is content with her work, her writing, and her relationship with her son David.

Tammy began a program of graduate studies at SFU after her marriage ended but gave it up in order to be more of a mother for her son. She is not sure she will ever return to it. In her fourteen years of teaching, she has given workshops on topics ranging from "New Trends in Geography Education" to "Children and the Law"; she worked on the Geography 12 Curriculum Revision Committee, as well as the most recent Social Studies Provincial Assessment. At school, she was the Yearbook Advisor, sponsored the school swim team, and ran the Debating Club. "Her girls" won the Law Cup for public speaking. In addition, she has written resource materials for the Legal Services Society and currently writes under contract for a textbook publishing company. Under doctor’s orders during the period of her marriage breakdown, Tammy gave up
sponsorship of many of the school’s extracurricular programs, though she continues her commitment to Amnesty International. She has, she says, a tremendous sense of her responsibility to help people in other countries who are legally and socially disadvantaged, for whom existence is writ in terms of "life and death." By comparison, she said, the other school activities seemed frivolous.

The Life Story of Joan:

Since the outset of this study, Joan has given up teaching social studies and geography; she is currently a vice-principal at a high school in the rural environs of south Vancouver Island. She has held the position for seven years, teaching Geography 12 part-time until this year. At 41, she is married, the mother of boys who are 11 and 13. Our first conversations took place at her home, child-focused, functional, spacious, and abounding in evidence of an active family that really enjoys the outdoors: the camper, motorbikes, golf clubs. The house, which overlooks the Georgia Strait, sits on an acreage, a hobby farm with a horse, dogs, a turkey, and some chickens; like Joan, the house is bright, open, efficient, unpretentious, and full of life. Joan is economic in her use of words. Nothing is stretched beyond the answer. When our interview was over, Joan took the boys out for a round of golf.

She is the middle child; there is an older brother and a younger sister. Though all three were born in Canada, her parents were post-war British emigrants. Her father served in the British Army in World War II, finding work thereafter with the federal government and then with the provincial Attorney-General’s department in Victoria.

My brother and I fought all the time because there was a lot of competition. My sister and I are very good friends now. My father’s dead .... I wouldn’t define my relationship to my parents as really close because they were reserved people .... My mother finds outward shows of affection hard. It wasn’t part of her family background at all. If you hugged mother, you rumpled her dress.
Aspects of Joan’s growing up were quite traditional and British: English riding, the pony club, family meals of roast beef and Yorkshire pudding on Sundays. There are inherited family heirlooms in her house. But there were non-traditional aspects to her growing up as well. Joan’s mother had received a scholarship to university; though the family would pay for the brothers’ education, "they didn’t think a girl needed one ... you weren’t supposed to aspire to university." Joan’s mother put money away for her children to go; "she wasn’t expecting you were supposed to just marry and have children." There were no female children in the farming neighbourhood, so Joan played with the boys all the time. The themes of her childhood were themes of farming and outdoor activities. "I wasn’t an inside person. I wasn’t interested in cooking, in cleaning. My room was a perpetual mess. [And I was involved in] music." Joan ultimately completed her grade 12 in both piano and woodwind instruments. There were no restrictions, and Joan had no sense that there were things she couldn’t do.

Elementary school was incredibly easy for Joan. She was accelerated, finishing grades 1 to 6 in four years; she was 10 when she entered high school in grade 7.

I found junior high really hard. If I had not been in sports and band, I probably would have found things harder because, socially and emotionally, I was not at the same level as the other kids ... I got picked on quite a bit. I wasn’t tall. I was late to grow. I am tall now.

She came to loathe the phrases "immature" and "not working to potential": "Whose idea of potential and for what goals?" she said.

Her interest in social studies did not come from her junior high teachers. "God, we had some awful teachers." She spoke of doing well "for revenge. There’s got to be something better than these guys." Joan was interested in travelling and in finding out more about the world.

And I found history -- people -- interesting. I used to read Mary Stewart novels. Travel books. It was more of a self-motivated
thing than an externally motivated thing. Certainly not from junior high.

Senior high she found to be both enjoyable and easy. She didn’t do homework. She continued her piano, played with the school band and the University of Victoria orchestra, played First United basketball, was on the Junior Olympic Track and Field team, played for all the school teams, and had her own horse as well. She wrote for scholarships in grade 12 (100% in Math 12) and received a full scholarship to university which paid for all of her undergraduate education. Of her teachers, she says:

I wouldn’t say they were the most inspiring teachers, in some cases very traditional, but they were very caring people, and that’s one thing I’ve thought is really important.

Of her social studies teacher, she noted that, while he did not know how to present the content well, he was really nice and he obviously enjoyed the material. She thought there must therefore be something to it.

Her undergraduate university years were a "write-off." Joan travelled, played sports; she started out in Math and Physical Education. At age 19, Joan had completed a B.Ed. in Social Studies, consisting of 12 units of Math, 15 units of geography, and 18 units of history, and her teacher training program.

At 21, Joan got married. Her husband, supervisor of facilities for a nearby school district, does not hold traditional views of women and has always been encouraging and supportive, believing that people should do what makes them happy. They travelled extensively when she wasn’t playing sports. Joan has competed nationally and internationally in three different sports, including riding. After seven years of marriage, Joan took some time off to have children. Returning to teach part-time was made easier by the day care available at a neighbouring farm. The children still spend time there; they were there the day I interviewed Joan, hauling hay.
She returned to complete her Master’s degree while the children were young. Her degree work, not surprisingly, focused on Gifted Education.

I had a cast on my leg while coaching and everything else at the same time. I enjoyed it. I really liked the people in the program, taking the courses as a mature person, finally not being immature. I didn’t find it difficult. I found it easy.

Her Senior Girls’ Basketball team went to the provincials that year; her lowest mark was an A-.

She remembers putting the children to bed at 8 p.m. and working until one or two in the morning. Yes, she got tired but, once in a while, she could spend a whole day sleeping and get caught up to go again.

When Joan decided to go into administration, her husband downscaled his stressful job. It was "her turn"; he would be more available for their two sons. They are encouraging their children

... to do the best they can so that they have as many options open as possible. But I also think it’s important for them that they choose a career that makes them happy, that fits what they want, not what I want. We stress that you’ve got to learn to cooperate, to be tolerant, to do those things that you have to do whether they’re boring or you think they’re silly. There are certain things in life that you have to do. Like the house, it’s everybody’s responsibility ... and most of the time, they get along.

The boys do the laundry. They have no sense that there’s anything men or women cannot or should not do. As parents, they had wanted to be young enough and have time to play with their children.

Now we go out and play golf together during the day and I coach the older boy’s basketball team which is lots of fun. I just really enjoy doing things with them. I don’t regret it at all, and I think that if I had it to do all over again, that that time frame is suited to what I was doing.
While she is no longer teaching Geography 12, she acts as a consultant for the young man who replaced her. She is the school’s computer expert. She referees and continues to coach her son’s team and another school basketball team. Joan’s educational leadership and creative input are directed in such innovative programs within the school as the computer technology and enrichment programs.

The Life Story of Ellen:

When I first got to know Ellen, I was struck by the fact that, though she seemed extremely quiet and reserved, she spoke with a firm authority on environmental issues that gained her great respect amongst other members of the marking committee. Beneath the reserve, there was a good sense of humour, a keen mind, and a pragmatic approach to life. I realized later that it was Ellen whose name I had been given several years earlier at a Social Studies Summer Conference as the chairperson of an environmental advocacy group which actively lobbied for protection of wetland areas. Ellen is no longer teaching social studies and geography, though she finds ways to incorporate her strongly environmental perspective into her current teaching of Science, Science and Technology, and English.

A New Zealander by birth, Ellen is 44 and has lived with her SFU professor husband in Canada for 12 years. They have no children. They are avid outdoorspeople. Ellen told me about their Christmas holidays; they had helicoptered into a remote valley near Nelson in the Kootenay region of BC with friends and a portable cabin, spending every day skiing the pristine slopes and working as a group on preparation of festive meals. The walls of their suburban home are adorned with photographs that Peter, her husband, has taken of the mountain peaks they have climbed. The peaks are in BC, the Himalayas, New Zealand, and Tasmania. The bungalow is clean and uncluttered, practical, decorated without pretentiousness; it is located on a large
wooded lot. They are keen gardeners. The gardens in the summer produce vegetables and
berries; Ellen had gone home from Victoria on our day off in the summer marking to pick the
red currants which would be lost otherwise, as Peter was out of town. A recent home renovation
project saw the addition of a small arboretum off the living room, which is full of the fragrant
rare plants of their native New Zealand.

We had tea in the dining room in the late afternoon of a work day. Peter would be home
in two and a half hours. There was a roast in the oven and rhubarb cake, which I enjoyed before
I left. We chatted about our lives since we’d last seen each other nearly two years ago. I
recalled how fascinated we’d been by her stories of trips to wilderness locations, the places we
taught about that she had seen or kayaked or climbed. She had promised us postcards from her
planned fall trip to Asia. My card came from the Great Wall of China.

She was born in the tiny remote country town of Greymouth on the South Island, the first
of three children in her father’s second family. He was a bank manager, a conservative and
reserved man who loved to take his family on drives through the New Zealand countryside.
Ellen had three older stepbrothers, though one has since passed away; they were, after her father
died, like surrogate fathers. She was 21 when her father died. Ellen felt that her relationship
with her mother became close only after her father’s death and is angry sometimes that she was
deprived of the potential of their relationship when her mother died suddenly in a car accident
three years later.

She had more living to do. It deprived me of a relationship. It’s sad for me. She had wanted more out of life. It’s part of the
reason I postponed having a family and ended up not having one.
I felt she’d given everything and had nothing.

Ellen gets along well with her younger sister and brother and was present at the birth of
her sister’s daughter in whom she takes a special interest. They all love the New Zealand
countryside; on her recent trip home, she and her sister took a nostalgic journey to the Kaikoras, mountains "beautiful and dear to me. It was the highlight of my holiday to be there with my sister. Hiking up the gorges and looking at the flowers and the whole ecology." She and her brother had gone whale watching.

Ellen’s childhood memories are of summers spent outdoors, on rivers and in the mountains, roaming the countryside near Greymouth. She played the piano. She was supported in her development as a student by parents who took her to compete in track and field or to sit university entrance exams. She said that the education available was not as good as that in larger towns, and her parents had wanted to pay for extra tutoring to close the educational gap. They hadn’t had a good science tradition at her school, for example, which had begun the limiting of choices for her before she attended university. Ellen finished top in her school at age 16.

Ellen remembers four good teachers. One was the head mistress, a stern figure with grey hair kept in a bun. In her algebra class, "God, we got in her class and we shut up and we did our algebra. But I liked her. She was very no-nonsense." Ellen also spoke of enjoying her English Lit teacher, an Englishman whom all the girls swooned over.

They all liked him so I wasn’t going to. Anyway, I really did well in his courses. He realized we didn’t have much of a school library and there wasn’t a library in the town. He would just say, here, I think you should read this. So he would take my school bag at the end of the school year and fill it up with books for me to read over the holidays. I loved his class. He wrote textbooks. He stimulated our ideas.

Ellen credited two good geography teachers, both men with really genial personalities, for her winding up in geography. She had enjoyed studying other countries and was fascinated by the history and politics of other places. She wanted to travel.
The New Zealand government paid for Ellen’s teacher training: her fees, travel expenses, and a living-away-from-home allowance.

You had all your pocket money and you had a job at the end. You had to work off your bond, so if you got married and were a girl, you had a year to work off. If you were single or were male, you had three years to work off. You graduated from university and you walked straight into a job. That’s pretty unreal.

Restricted in her choices by the weak science background and by Wellington University’s program requirements of two teachable majors, Ellen was channelled into the Humanities. She loved Biology and Psychology and probably would have left geography after her second year.

Geography was predominantly male ... all elderly men, some with a marked whiskey indulgence! There were some good scholars, some quite recognized, but it wasn’t a terribly dynamic environment, except for Dr. Bird.

Dr. Bird introduced Ellen to Biogeography. Ellen read Rachel Carson and was inspired by other books about environmental issues. She started a Master’s program part-time in the Environmental Sciences at Christchurch University while in her sixth year of teaching.

While at Wellington, Ellen’s athletic abilities particularly in high jump qualified her to compete at the Commonwealth Games. However, that came to an abrupt end after a number of serious injuries. She and a friend began bushwalking, extended outdoor hiking excursions that took them to Tasmanina and Australia. She took a mountain leadership training program, including intense orienteering, navigation, map reading, search and rescue techniques, climbing skills, party management, group psychology, and geography. She pointed to the mountain peaks on the walls of the dining room. "Spectacular," she says. "Kayaking and mountain climbing are a special force in my life." In New Zealand, she ran a school outdoors camp; now, more conscious of legal liability and more bound by time in teaching, she restricts herself to leading
trips for a local Mountaineering Club. It was on one such excursion to the top of the Minarets that she met Peter, at the time a geologist in his first posting at Wellington University.

With a B.A. in English and Geography and a teaching diploma, she taught geography, science, and English for four years in a country town. Deciding to improve her teaching qualifications, she completed a B.Ed. in Urban Education. In her fifth year of teaching, she moved to a special project inner city school with a high migrant population and many inter-ethnic problems. Here, almost immediately, she was offered the additional positions of Senior Mistress and Geography Department Head concurrently, as well as teacher. She declined the Senior Mistress position, the most senior woman in the school responsible for counselling and educational leadership, preferring to lead the Geography department and pursue her environmental studies. Ellen and Peter were married during the five years she taught here. She applied for and became the Senior Mistress as well as Geography Department Head at an all-girls' school.

Peter's commitment to wilderness issues cost him his job; his tenure was not renewed.

Geologists did not get involved in conservation or wilderness issues then. The area that we loved most of all in the New Zealand Alps was under threat of development and he questioned a lot of these .... [He was] one of a number of academics who got themselves in trouble with the mining establishment.

When Peter accepted a post-doctoral opportunity at Simon Fraser University, Ellen gave up her teaching career and her incomplete Master's program to join him in Canada and to start again.

"Marriage," she says, "has had quite a profound effect on me and where I'm going." In the early 1980s, teaching was a "closed shop," though she substitute taught in several districts for a while. "Back in New Zealand, I had had hopes I'd wind up a principal, getting into the upper levels of my career." In Canada, her career path in the public school system did not resume for five years. She began the Master's program over again, this time in Environmental
Management at UBC. She worked for environmental advocacy groups. "I wanted to feel that I was making a contribution." She worked for two years in the planning department of the Ministry of Lands before provincial government layoffs cut her position. She taught night school. Peter was supportive of her new directions.

In 1985, Ellen was hired to teach social studies and geography in a Fraser Valley school district. She transferred schools within the district to teach social studies and geography but now teaches Science, English, and Science and Technology; she has also taught junior high math. In her questionnaire, she writes, "School staffing changes made it necessary for ‘flexible’ people to be ‘placed’ into English Department." Ellen coaches basketball and is involved in public speaking. Being practical, she said that she likes the school and will stay. She has taken some courses at UBC in Counselling Psychology with a view to becoming a counsellor:

One of the best courses I’ve taken at UBC was the Role of Teacher in Guidance with Diane Pollard; she’s just great. That’s an interest. It gives me another option. Some of my friends have taught English at my school for 27 years. They may be happy but I couldn’t be happy. I like to have those extra strings to my bow. I feel I’ve got too many scattered strings.

The Life Story of Alison:

Alison lives in neat, bright apartment in an upscale Vancouver suburb. The apartment is full of items collected in her many travels. The carefully tended geraniums abound on her patio. There is a sense of quiet and order in her life. She is 52, single, and a long-time teacher in a large urban district. We have tea. Alison has a strong presence; she is bright and crisp and independent and outspoken. She is also, it turns out, quite a wonderful storyteller with a knack for the re-creation of the colourful in the stories of her life.

I know from her questionnaire that she is interested in classical music, theatre, reading, walking, gardening, and current events. She had been teaching for over 30 years; she taught
three years in the UK, four in Winnipeg, two in Germany with the Department of National Defence, and eighteen in her present district. In Winnipeg she held the position of department head for three years; two years ago she became department head of social studies at the large academic high school where she has taught for a number of years.

Alison is English, the first of four daughters in a family of five children. Her childhood years were spent in a coal-mining town in the north of England. Describing her mother as "larger than life," Alison spent much of her early life reacting to her mother and mother's lot in life. "In order to find yourself, you have to be away from her ... to put some distance [between]." It was one of the reasons Alison came to Canada.

Perhaps the strongest influence in her life was her grandmother. "We are a family of women ... the men don't seem to live long. In my memory, it is a female dominated family with very strong, capable, educated women." Women provide the continuity in a family bereft of males. Her grandmother had three daughters, the oldest of whom was 4, the youngest 11 months, when she was widowed in World War I; it was fortunate that she had been educated and could turn to teaching. When, in the late '20s, the daughters needed educating, her grandmother sold her property and moved into rented housing. Alison's mother became a nurse; another sister, a teacher; the youngest, a pharmacist. With the capital from the sale of her property, her war widow's pension, and her teaching income, grandmother was the only family member with any money during the Depression. When others in the family were out of work and experiencing hard times, Alison's grandmother helped support them too. Women in the area had to become the mainstays of the family, with the men out of work in the mines.

Alison developed the theme of "strong family women" in a brief history of her mother's side of the family. Descended from a prominent family in the area, Alison can trace her ancestry
back for several hundred years. The family lost its financial prominence during the Jacobite rebellions, when one unfortunate fellow was the last to be beheaded in the Tower of London as a traitor in 1746. That side of the family had fled to France in the early 1700s, returning to England during the French Revolution and the Reign of Terror. Their property had been taken and distributed by the government. "The males were not particularly sensible even three hundred years ago," she says wryly. They survived through the female side.

Because the women had been left with the responsibility of the family, she says, "one of the values I grew up with was a tremendous responsibility for those who were less fortunate, for those in need -- you help them." Alison's mother and grandmother were both highly respected for the care they gave to others.

We lived in a very poor part of the village. There were no houses, no building [going on] after the War. For the first three years we lived with my grandmother in her home. Then my father got a terraced house in an area where people all left school at 14 to work in the coals mines, before the National Health. My mother, with training as a nurse -- she'd never worked as a nurse -- was the first stop in the village if the children were sick with TB or diphtheria. My childhood memories are of going to the door to requests for mother to come and see the sick ones in the village. She's still doing it, even though she's crippled with arthritis and in a wheelchair. She organizes everybody and everything by telephone .... The value I grew up with is that one has an obligation whenever it's needed to help people if you can .... it's something you learn to live up to, a family thing.

Alison was ten when her father died; her mother miscarried the child she was carrying. She remarried shortly thereafter but was often sick.

She took to her bed. That's what they did in those days. Somebody else had to look after everybody else, and that was me. I looked after the family; only, of course, she kept me away from school. One day, I remember my grandmother came -- we'd moved to this very old stone house and grandmother lived in the next village, two fields away. Grandmother, retired by now, walked along. I was at the grammar school. She had words with
mother, told her not to keep me away from school. When she retired she had had to give up her girl in service. Instead of just going there for weekends, I just stayed there. I always found it rather nice that I didn’t have to get up and make everybody’s breakfast -- I wasn’t Cinderella -- grandmother made my breakfast and my lunch.

After Alison went on the college, her younger sisters moved in, not so much by design as by overflow.

Memories of schooling at the fee-paying Auburn Wood are of the perils of being known by her mother and her grandmother. "There were occasional unpleasant times when my mother took exception to something a friend (one of the teachers) had done and would haul herself up to school to give the benefit of her opinion. Normally it was fine." When the family moved to another village, Alison was nine.

I hated that school. I didn’t do any homework. At one point I refused to go to school. My grandmother wouldn’t let me do nothing. My mother finally sorted the problem out. The teacher backed off. We used to have tests every week and were seated by how we ranked. The ‘bad’ ones were seated at the back of the room. We were told we were bad. I was always at the back. I just absolutely hated it. I wouldn’t do any work. Fortunately, there was the old 11+. In the area, the only chance out was the 11+. I acknowledge that it had problems, but I won’t speak against it: for the poor kids of the area, it was the means out of the area and the kind of lives that their fathers and grandfathers had lived and, believe me, they didn’t go back. Of 70 kids, 9 passed. The great disgrace of the whole school was that I passed, whereas I hadn’t been anywhere near the kids who had done their homework and who were seated at the front. If it had been teacher-recommendation, which it later was, I don’t think anyone would have recognized that I had any intelligence.

Her love of history? "If you live in the area and have a family which is a victim of history, you are aware of it." Of geography? There was curiosity about what lay outside of the area. There were trips to visit family in London.
We travelled by coal boat out of the Tyne, up the Thames. Grandmother would take the family and the dog; she would take a cabin on one of the boats. That was not the customary thing in the village. Many had never been further than Durham or Newcastle.

And the family were avid readers, even her father. His ninth birthday present to her was a trip to the library. The world outside, she thought, always seemed so exciting.

Alison won a scholarship to a college at Cambridge where she studied to become a teacher; it was not a degree-granting college, offering instead a certificate of education. The County scholarship paid her tuition and 100 pounds a year to live on. It was the only way she could have gone; she had had to qualify for the living allowance on the basis of need. When the A-level results were released, the girls had done much better than the boys; all but two of the girls were channelled into colleges of education. "The boys who had achieved less than we had were encouraged to go to university." It was, she said, "a mindset that prevailed" in the late '50s. Her family was happy that she would follow the tradition of teaching.

Of the program of study, Alison remembered with visible excitement a historical geography assignment where she studied the rise and decline of mining in the area in which she lived from the Enclosure Act of 1750 to 1950.

It was interesting because one of my professors was Professor Smails from Sidney Sussex [College, Cambridge], the authority on resource industries within the Industrial Revolution. He was very good. I had the opportunity to go into the reading room of the British Museum to study original documents -- census data, the actual Enclosure Act. I found that exciting.

She also remembers the women scholars. She recalled the experience of attending a lecture where, not until the very end, did she understand what the woman was talking about. "I realized there were large gaps in my education and, if I wanted to be knowledgeable, I had better go about filling them in myself."
She started teaching immediately in the village where she’d grown up, thanks largely to the connections of her paternal grandmother who had known someone important on the school board. Her father’s family was well connected to the socialist political structure of the village; it was a simple case of who knew whom.

To be elected to the Council, you had to be socialist. I got my first job, not because I was a brilliant student at college, which I wasn’t particularly, but because one of my grandmother’s friends was on the school board. It was in a very convenient location in the ‘best’ school in the area.

Though her other grandmother had been the teacher, she was an "old-fashioned Conservative" who didn’t like that kind of politics; neither does Alison and cites this as the reason she does not espouse particular party politics. She is a political independent, making her own informed decisions on relevant issues.

Alison moved to Canada, choosing Winnipeg because it was "in the middle," though she admits she didn’t know what it was in the middle of. Life in Winnipeg was wonderful. Alison loved the culture and the people; it was the first time she’d lived in a community with non-Anglo-Saxons. She was fascinated by the many cultural groups: "they were so interesting, and I had so much to learn, and they were so kind." Here Alison began to complete her B.A. in Geography on a part-time basis while working. She chose it because it is a "European subject."

She was nominated by the Winnipeg School Board for a two-year appointment to the Department of National Defence in Baden Baden. She lived in a small German village in the Black Forest, learned to speak German, and travelled to Africa and the Soviet Union, as well as other parts of Germany. "I had to [learn German] for survival, and that has given me a perspective on how difficult it is for immigrant children who come to our classes."
Alison came to BC to teach in 1975. Having completed her master’s thesis in social studies curriculum in 1982, she has lots to offer me of her knowledge of teaching social studies and the teaching experience in BC as it differs from other places she has taught. Currently, in addition to being head of a large social studies department and teaching social studies and geography to both regular program and International Baccalaureate students, Alison is a teacher representative to the Canadian Geographic Society and has recently been asked to do some writing for a publishing company. She has, for eight years, been a director of a Canadian Studies project with the national Ministry of Education, and she serves on the education board of a provincial utility company. Additionally, Alison has held various executive positions with the BC Social Studies provincial specialist association.

I recognize in Alison a very British reserve, a boundary that I do not feel comfortable in crossing to probe the more personal side of her life. Asked what she felt passionately about, she did not hesitate: social justice, she said.

**The Life Story of Louise:**

No study of B.C. women social studies educators with a geography specialty could have been complete without Louise. More than once, I was asked if Louise would be included in my research. Louise is the closest thing to “Mrs. Geography” in the province. There is no question: she commands respect and love from men and women in teaching. There is much about her that is special.

Our interviews were conducted in her quiet and comfortable home which overlooks the Gulf Islands and the fields and gardens which are at the heart of her view of life. I had been here before; every summer, the geography markers look forward to Louise’s barbecue, her home-made breads and pies made with the summer’s berry crop. For years she lived at the lower end
of the property and dreamed of a house at the top; this is an old house we sat in, one that was hauled in from the nearby gravel pit as it was developed sixteen years ago. Louise did the roofing herself. Nothing about the house and its gardens suggests it has been relocated. We drank tea. Louise put on classical music. Her baby grand piano filled that part of the front room that would be a dining room; a room to the side of the kitchen now serves that function. The gazebo, with its stained glass windows, was another of Louise’s dreams, fulfilled with the cooperative efforts of friends; it sits at the grassy edge of the garden and overlooks the vegetable garden and berry patch.

Louise is 53, a widow with three children ranging in ages from late twenties to mid thirties. Under personal accomplishments on the questionnaire, she listed raising three children, each of whom has completed university. Louise was widowed when she was 28, her husband killed in a racing car accident. She was left with the farm, three very young children, and an incomplete university education. In recent years, Louise has entered into a "partnership" with Bob, a retired law enforcement officer; their life together has given her the contentment of relationship missing for so many years as she met her other life challenges with her quietly unflinching sense of the rightness of things. Everything, it seems, will happen in its own way in its own time; there is a flow to life which Louise respects.

Louise was an only child until she started school. Born at the start of the war, she had lots of her mother’s attention while her father was away with the Navy.

I was always close to my mom and we cooperated. My mother and I have never had an argument. She’s taught me everything important -- making bread and growing a garden and [other things] I like. They encouraged me -- bought a piano when they could hardly afford it so I could take piano lessons. They were always proud of what I did.
Her father’s being away then and through much of her growing up has had a profound effect on her later life, she speculated. His returns in uniform were always happy times; she noted that Bob may be part of her positive association with men in uniform.

Louise was good at school and loved it. After the war, her parents had bought a small farm. The two-room country school put the students of grades 4, 5, and 6 together; Louise was advanced from grade 4 to grade 6.

Socially that was not a good thing for me because I wasn’t ... very grown up, just intellectually quick .... Then for quite a few years in school, I hit the average more than the top of the class because I had missed some crucial things. I didn’t really apply myself and learn study habits and work properly until about grade 12. Then I found I could do well in school.

She was happy when the family grew to include her younger brother and sister. Today, they are a closer family than average, all living within twenty minutes drive of each other and seeing each other often. Louise’s children are close to their grandparents too.

Finishing high school before she turned 17, Louise was "chronologically way ahead of myself." The nearby college was offering a one-year training program to address the shortage of teachers in BC, so she went straight into teacher training. She intended to marry her boyfriend who came from a farming family.

I think I looked for the attention of an older man. What I liked about my boyfriend was that he was from a dairy farm family. Everybody was there for every meal. The father was never away, and I really liked that because I missed my father a lot.

Pregnant before the year was finished, Louise completed the training and practica, married, and jumped into motherhood and farming life. Two years later, she had another child; she worked really hard on the farm but accepted a former principal’s invitation to try some substitute teaching to supplement the family’s income. Mostly she found herself in high schools
and discovered with joy that this was no problem, despite the limited nature of her training to
teach elementary school. She was bright enough to handle everything -- Home Economics, shop,
French -- but she really enjoyed history.

It was really good for my feeling of what I could do. There was
nothing I couldn’t do. It was really neat. I didn’t really have any
exposure to geography until later, but this principal had been my
geography 12 teacher in the old curriculum, the ‘capes and bays’
program. I still see him. We’re still friends. He’s also a gardener.
He’s retired now .... I guess I’d have to attribute my teaching to
him.

The farming life was precarious. Louise had discovered that a basic teaching certificate
was available with two additional years of university. She challenged the first-year history exam
and received an allowable credit, based on her success. She proceeded to register for academic
courses to begin in September at the University of Victoria but discovered that summer that she
was pregnant for the third time. She inquired as to whether this might be a problem.

Well, old Ferguson was Dean of Education at that time, and the
lady put in this little note to him, and out came his response.
"Well, of course not. You can’t be a student. We can’t have a
pregnant woman as a student." I said, well, I beg your pardon.
You know, I’m not sure why you’re concerned. "Well, it’s just not
policy." Well, I’m taking a list of academic courses, and I don’t
know why you’d object, and I’m not going to be in a classroom,
so if I want to work hard ... "Well, no, absolutely not." So I
insisted on an interview with him, and he really had no actual
reason to refuse me, so he reluctantly signed my admission .... He
said, "You’ll never make it, you know. You’re just being stupid,
and I was just going to save you some time and money" .... Then
he made some comment about getting lots of exercise on the new
campus, so I just left him. I’ve never thought about the man since.
But in a way, it made me decide to work hard ... I got really high
marks. And I loved it, just being able to study. It was just lovely.

Her husband saw her education as only an insurance policy for the family. If something
happened to him, she could teach. Pregnant, she prepared all the meals, worked around the farm,
looked after two small children, and studied. "It just became a challenge for me .... I quickly
learned I could do anything I set my sights on, which was a nice feeling." In the late summer of 1967, the same principal who had asked her to substitute phoned to ask her to teach Home Ec half-time. The family decided that Louise could handle the extra work. When she arrived in September, the job had grown to full-time: Child Care 12, Textiles, Socials 11, Algebra 11, Modified Math II. She had lots of help from others in the school. She never went to bed at night without the next day's lessons planned.

I thrived .... I certainly didn't know anything about learning theory, how kids learned. I handled each class as a large group of very nice young people. But when we were farming here on this property, we would have acres and acres of strawberries and loganberries, and we would have up to 40 pickers a day, most of whom were teenagers, and I managed them. I'd look after the wages, bookkeeping, their day from dawn to dark, and I could get along with them. I kept them really disciplined. They were here to work and they worked and they liked it and they liked us. We were young people and I didn't think handling a class was any different than handling a field full of berry pickers. I...taught them the way the better teachers had taught me and learned by the seat of my pants.

She was asked to stay on another year; though her contract was temporary, there was still a shortage of teachers.

Two weeks into the second year of teaching, with children then 3, 8, and 11, Louise's husband was killed. Her family and friends rallied to her support. One friend, seeing the need for the security of a degree, got her special permission to enroll late in a geography course at UVic. Her mother assumed childcare responsibilities while Louise worked and attended evening classes. During that year, someone was with her every evening until the children went to bed. Louise learned to compartmentalize her life.

I was so full of grief and things were hard at home. But I went to school and thought school, and I went to university and thought university, and I came home and thought kids. The kids went to bed and the family friend or whoever was over went home, I did
school work, went to bed at midnight or 1 a.m. and slept. Some of my friends ... thought I was quite robotlike .... My mother-in-law always thought of me as like the female Canada goose that would never re-mate. I wasn’t really thinking like that. I was just being pragmatic like my mother. This is what I can handle. I used to cry between school and university, going to class.

Louise recalled the sympathy, something that really only made her sad. She rankled at the injustice of society’s treatment of divorced women who, she thinks, are treated cruelly by comparison. "I saw a lot of that and it’s really unfair. I was treated so gently. I guess it’s just the way life doles things out to you."

With teaching certificate in hand, two years of academic work completed, and two years teaching experience, Louise switched to an Arts program with a major in geography. Her principal adjusted her timetable to allow her to take daytime courses. She held on to the land.

My sense was not to sell the land, not to do anything quickly, to let the kids have animals, be farm kids and we did all that .... They say they had a great childhood. They were allowed horses and beef cows and sheep and chickens and dogs, and they loved summers, and I had quite a lot of time with them in the summers. I think the other good influence on them was the whole family learning together.

In the last year of her degree, she did nine units while working half-time. She never got less than an A-. She and the children studied at home together. "They found learning easy, and we always helped each other with projects. That continued right until the girls finished university."

How rich the experience was to have them both return home while they completed their degrees at UVic. We became three adult women, best friends, scholars together ... and we grew much more understanding of each other.

Both of Louise’s daughters read a lot about spiritual and personal development. Both have recently taken courses in Women’s Studies. They love to share their readings and their learning with their mother. She loves it too. She is also very proud of her son, a geophysicist, and his
wife, a geologist, whom Louise welcomed to the family. Their daughter has brought another joyful dimension to Louise’s life. All of her children are accomplished musicians, as is Louise herself; she had hoped that one of them would pursue a career with a professional orchestra.

Louise was a member of the geography curriculum revision committee. With its heavy environmental emphasis, the course allows for "passionate" teaching about the natural world, very much aligned with Louise’s worldview. She has marked exams for 14 years. She has worked for years on school and district committees. She has been the Pac Rim coordinator for her school district. She has organized student travel programs and run student clubs. Twice she has been on the Accreditation Steering Committee for her school. She was a department head for three years.

Louise spoke warmly about important relationships in her life. She was first attracted to the study of geography when she took a course in cultural geography. It was a study of geography through novels, one a week for 13 weeks. The professor from Berkeley became really special for her. She took as many courses as she could from him. Though he didn’t stay at UVic, he and his wife and family have kept in touch through the years. Another really special man was the principal who had first invited her to teach and whose support enabled her to finish her studies. She spoke of her respect for her colleagues. The men with whom she taught provided her with the repartee and company that filled the void in her social life for many years. She continues to value these relationships and those with her women friends; creating space in her life for friends is important to Louise. And she has created space in her life to enjoy her partner, taking a semester off last year and a whole year off now. She is too young to retire just yet, but there is time and space and the personal resources now to celebrate truly loving someone where that had not been possible for so many years. They travel and spend weeks on his boat
during the summer. She has recently added a greenhouse to the farm and hopes one day to teach others about organic gardening.

There is a serenity and a clarity about Louise, an overriding awareness of her deep inner need for harmony which has guided her through some very tough times. She backs away from conflict. She is guided by a worldview grounded in caring both for other people and the natural world. She refers to herself as an "original Earth Mother."

**Conclusions**

These are six stories of women’s lives. All are quite different, yet the stories weave a fabric marked by integrated patterns and threads of commitment to teaching and learning, of brightness and the desire to be recognized for that, of resourcefulness in dealing with complexity, of leadership in the field of social studies education, of the love of geography and the natural world, of the formation of gendered and political perspectives, and of a sense of the importance of understanding teaching as a reflection of one’s life experience as a kind of praxis.

Amanda-Leigh came into teaching with a strong conviction that she had something to give back to teaching and to schools. She lives what she teaches, a basic respect for our own and others’ cultures and for democratic and inclusive visions of society. She has had reason to become, through her experiences as a social studies teacher and educator, increasingly sensitive to the gendered, politically exclusive, and contradictory nature of these concepts in schools.

Tammy, as a teacher, is perhaps the most conscious of and passionate about building gender-sensitivity into her teaching. Underpinning her teaching are the ideologies of critical citizenship which constantly seek to challenge the status quo and thereby transform it to tell a story more inclusive of women’s understandings and experiences. Her own personal history consists of stories of fighting for equity and recognition. Challenging the status quo, however,
is not without problems for women and can harshly restrict the ways in which they are able to participate in the educational community.

As a teacher of social studies, Joan articulated her initial understandings of curriculum and teaching as gender-free; such an approach is grounded in the traditions of individualism and progressiveness which sees gender as irrelevant and subordinate to the uniqueness of each individual (Morgan, 1992). She is mindful of the culture within which she has been encouraged to develop her multiple talents and within which she has taught and administered successfully. She has had cause to reflect on and reconsider these understandings during the course of this study.

In teaching, Ellen works very much as she did in her capacity as an environmental advocate, always mindful of the social constraints, particularly as these are applied to individuals. Challenges must always be attentive to the traditions and rules of the dominant social order, though these may not be in the best interests of all participants within society. As a woman, she is isolated and located as subordinate to those whose stories of the culture predominate; as an individual, she has accepted that she can make small personal and classroom changes which reflect her political understandings of the social value accorded women’s work in society.

Alison’s teaching is about educated citizenship and takes place in terms of articulated notions of social studies curriculum and pedagogy as gender blind (Morgan, 1992). Young people are empowered through knowledge. That knowledge can take the form of multiple perspectives, one of which may be a woman’s perspective, but it is not her business to impart particular gendered or political perceptions to students. Gender imperils the individuality which one is taught to value and is an impediment to the conduct of one’s life as an educated citizen. Though, in her words, in teaching, gender ought not to be a factor -- and in terms of her
classroom, is probably not -- Alison has nevertheless encountered contradictions in her understandings of the traditions of citizenship which would suggest that the models she uses are cast in masculine images and do not work for women.

Louise consciously includes the principles of women’s culture in her stories of teaching social studies. As a woman, she models the maternal, nurturing, and intellectual capacities which, translated into a social vision, depict the world in kinder, gentler terms. Her classroom practices and her presence in social studies teaching offer hope for building more gender-inclusive curriculum and pedagogy. Yet she understands that she is very much a product of rigid socialized gender role expectations that women, to be accorded the privileges of citizenship, are nice and do not speak against inequity and the dominant order. Though her teaching is informed by women’s political understandings, she avoids the politics of teaching.

In these ways, teaching for each woman is a political process informed by a political curriculum. This study, in examining the politics of women’s teaching, seeks to move, borrowing from McIntosh’s (1983) phase analysis of curriculum, from phase two where a handful of women are added on to the master narrative of social studies teaching as sidebars to phase three which explores the gaps and biases and political implications for women of teaching and leadership in social studies. Of course, the goal is to negotiate inclusive terms for women’s equal participation in social studies and social re-visionings.
CHAPTER 4: NEGOTIATING THE CLASSROOM

The women of the study each bring quite different personal perspectives and worldviews or ideologies to the classroom. These, combined with their knowledge of and experience in teaching, form what Clandinin and Connelly (1986) have termed "personal practical knowledge."

Coming from social studies educators, these women’s narratives, embedded as they are in different cultural and professional contexts, incorporate diverse and particular notions of citizenship. They negotiate a social studies curriculum and pedagogy which explicitly intend to enable the learner to play a productive role in Canadian society and act with some sense of a broader, global perspective" (Ministry of Education, 1993b, p.13). For each, the personal is political, forming an ideological frame of reference or worldview which underpins their socialization of students and strongly influences their own construction of meaning in the various arenas of their school experience. In this study, an important aspect of this worldview or ideological frame of reference is its gendered nature, particularly as it shapes and is shaped by curriculum and pedagogy. This chapter will examine the particular personal practical and political knowledge and understandings that each brings to her pedagogical and curricular transformations.

PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Feminist pedagogy, in Briskin’s (1990, as cited in Manicom, 1992) view, is not a set of instructional techniques but a political standpoint by which to connect the classroom to the outside world by "[informing/reforming] teachers’ and students’ ways of acting in and on the world" (p.365). It is teaching with the political intent to transform the world. In practice, it is manifested as transformed classroom practices, as re-visionings of the social world, and as gender
initiatives or projects within educational contexts. Manicom (1992) identifies several themes which permeate the discourse of feminist pedagogy.

The collaborative or maternal/nurturing theme runs through much of the literature of feminist theory and research. Noddings (1984) argues for the incorporation of an ethic of caring: "It is time for the voice of the mother to be heard in education" (p.200). Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) describe connected teaching as knowledge which is assisted in its emergence by midwife-teachers. Ruddick (1980) differentiates maternal from scientific thinking in its primary focus on the preservation of the vulnerable child. Drawing on psychoanalytic theory, Gilligan (1982) incorporates the themes of separation and attachment that characterize men's and women's patterns of individuation and of their moral development. The relational-as-feminine theme is woven heavily into the literature of feminist pedagogy. Women, says Shrewsbury (1987), seek to build connections. Schneidewind (1987) identifies feminist processes as the skills of effective communication, cooperation, conflict resolution, the integration of theory and practice, networking and organizing which have the potential to provide for critically conscious women significant personal and collective power. Noddings (1992) calls for an extension of the notion of citizenship "to absorb much of what is now considered private life into public life" (p.235); the study of self in its physical, spiritual, occupational, and recreational dimensions would surely be social studies and the heart of the curriculum. "Education for responsible and caring community participation should be a fundamental goal of schooling" (Stanley, 1992, as cited in Bernard-Powers, in press). Women's identity, such discourse suggests, is defined in relationship. This work suggests that women seek connection; women provide nurturance.

Maher (1987b) warns, however, that gender models of pedagogy run the risk of "[subsuming] all differences into a male/female dichotomy" (p.98). They minimize the reality
of women's oppression and have little to say about power relations in classrooms and in schools, nor do they speak of differences among women. Martin (1985) documents the historical separation of education for productive and reproductive processes in her argument for the inclusion of women in the educational realm and in the definition of an educated person. Briskin and Coulter (1992) point to contradictory feminist perspectives and diversity of voices; maternal metaphors "romanticize" women's teaching, creating a "reactionary profamily ideology" (p.254) which denies the real experience of family and teaching for many. They describe instead multiple feminist pedagogies. Martindale (1992) interrupts the maternal theme in women's teaching, reminding us that the classroom is a workplace where women's work can become invisible and devalued.

The paradox of teaching as "the female authority figure" is discussed by Culley, Diamond, Edwards, Lennox, and Portuges (1985) in terms of the academy. Citing de Beauvoir in The Second Sex, they illuminate the nature of the conflicting roles where ideas of feminine and maternal images in teaching work against women's capacity and aspirations for achievement.

In our culture, the role of nurturer and intellectual have been separated not just by gender, but by function; to try to recombine them is to create confusion. Our psychoanalytic models are primarily useful when talking about feelings as distinct from abstract ideas or information .... It is hard to know, in the finite world of the classroom, how to fulfill both functions. Some of us are more drawn to one role -- mother or professor -- than the other. Nevertheless, we would not be teachers now if we had not, at one point in our lives, had a powerful commitment to the idea of being intellectuals. As a result of our successes in the system, we are more deeply and passionately ambivalent about the intellectual life than our students can be. The mutual enterprise of the classroom, the kind of openness, freedom, and flexibility it demands, is thus made more difficult by the realities of what we have become in order to achieve our educational goals -- and even by those goals themselves .... Thus, the context in which we teach tends to limit and corrupt our ability to deal with the issues ... especially if we think of ourselves as isolated nurturant or therapeutic figures (p.13).
Another theme in the discourse of feminist pedagogy is women's place in relation to authority. In classrooms and in schools, women negotiate ways to express themselves as and with authority. Much of this literature has focused on democratization of classroom processes and issues of voice in respect to women's claiming authority. Gilligan points out that women speak "in a different voice." Spender (1982) advocates that women find every opportunity "to articulate their own experience, to describe and explain the world in the way it impinges on women ... that women demand some control" (p. 96). Explains Maher (1985), "a pedagogy appropriate for voicing and exploring the hitherto unexpressed perspectives of women and others must be collaborative, cooperative, and interactive" (p. 30). Lewis and Simon (1986) examine ways of overcoming the silencing of women to find a common language. They argue for "a pedagogical project that allows a polyphony of voices" (p. 218). Ellsworth (1992) talks about the "defiant speech" of survival for those oppositional groups who cannot interrupt or be heard above the dominant language of schools (p. 102). Ellsworth links issues of voice within critical/democratic classrooms to notions of citizenship and to the public sphere by identifying the assumptions for classroom interactions:

All members have equal opportunity to speak, all members respect other members' rights to speak and feel safe to speak, and all ideas are tolerated and subjected to rational critical assessment against fundamental judgements and moral principles (p. 106).

Bernard-Powers (in press) argues for citizenship education that she defines as a "partnership in the vast system of beliefs and understandings about gender, social class, ethnicity, race, sexual identity, and levels of enabling that influence students' experience in schools." Such a conception of citizenship merges the public and the private, the personal and the political, adding powerful and transformative dimensions to social studies teaching. It also suggests that women's notions of citizenship might redefine the goals of democratic citizenship formally inscribed in
traditional social studies curriculum and teaching as the creation and enactment of national or public identities and political processes for individuals within the state to include the personal and collective responsibility for building caring communities.

PEDAGOGY: THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

In beginning this look at the women's instructional negotiations and styles, it is important to identify commonalities as well as differences by which to link and also to distinguish their experiences in teaching. The questionnaire responses (see Appendix II) provided a starting point for analysis of their practice of teaching as well as for our conversations. As noted earlier in this study, very few women teaching social studies in BC have acquired the specialist status of teaching senior social studies courses, in this case, geography. Most women teaching secondary social studies teach junior social studies and so may be unfamiliar, by virtue of unequal access and different academic background, with the geographic view of social studies and with the particular and holistic understandings of curriculum and pedagogy that are expressed and enacted by the women of this study.

Although the 1989 BC Social Studies Provincial Assessment Report describes a pattern of "inadequate academic background in the disciplines comprising social studies" (Cassidy and Bognar, 1991, p.69), the questionnaire responses showed that, by comparison to the Assessment profile of BC's social studies teachers, the women of this study have more than average experience in and academic preparation for social studies teaching. They have greater experience in teaching senior social studies courses. Some have experience in teaching more than one senior social studies elective course; one has taught all four senior courses. Their teaching profiles indicate that they have not been bound by "subject loyalty" or the singular identity as social studies teachers (Bernstein, 1977), each having experience teaching other disciplines, including Science, English, Math, Physical Education, Home Economics, counselling, and outdoor
education. Like many women in the work force, they have all experienced career interruptions due to pregnancies, trans-continental moves, educational, travel, and personal leaves, in-district transfers, and periods of alternate employment. They have all had leadership experience in working with Ministry of Education curriculum and/or assessment committees; all but one have held department head positions. While it is difficult within the scope of this study to determine how representative this characteristic of teaching flexibility and leadership is for women in senior secondary social studies teaching, the data suggest that flexibility and multidimensionality are characteristic of women who assume leadership roles in social studies teaching.

The questionnaires indicated that, in their practice of teaching, the women of the study used a wide variety of learning activities. Students learned a great deal from group discussions, film or video, labs, library research, guest speakers, and field studies. Students, they felt, particularly enjoyed group work and field excursions, though they were uncertain how much students enjoyed doing library research. They felt that debate, simulations, role play, and cooperative games had value for student learning; they attributed some value to textbook activities for student learning. Rated as having little value for student learning were worksheets, lectures, and giving notes. Very unenjoyable activities for students were worksheets and textbook-based learning. Computer programs were not used often, probably as there are problems with access to hardware, with finding software suitable to the curriculum, and with limited teacher expertise/interest. Their use of learning activities was dependent upon professional decision-making which considered class size, student variables, classroom dynamics, and, with particular reference to Geography 12 and its extensive examinable curriculum, the pressure to cover the content.

The provincial assessment found that "many teachers do not use classroom strategies to foster critical thinking, particularly at the secondary level" (p.13). In answers to questions aimed
at determining the role of critical thinking in teaching and evaluating social studies students, the women of this study indicated in their written responses that they incorporate strategies to foster critical thinking by developing student self-esteem, giving them the space and the confidence to express themselves in an informed way, by offering a variety of points of view and resources, by challenging their ideas and support for these, by focusing on current issues, and by creating open-ended questions which emphasize the process and reasoning students employ more than the right answer. For the most part, critical thinking is evaluated in students’ written and oral work, though professional judgement was also included as a response.

Nor, in terms of their teaching practice, are the women of the study representative of the teachers described by the Provincial Assessment Report:

[The] most commonly used classroom strategies in Grade 10 encourage passivity on the part of secondary students. Teachers most often rely on the textbook as the basis for classroom activity. Textbook use is followed by full class discussion, films or videos, worksheets, and lectures. These activities are teacher directed and dominated. It is difficult to imagine how critical thinking can be cultivated in this environment (p.76).

The women of the study exhibited both in their questionnaires and in their conversations a markedly strong resistance to the traditional transmission model of teaching social studies (though it might be suggested that no one admits to it!). Their teaching narratives do suggest that they are exceptions to the "resilient conservatism in the face of potential change" by which Bernard-Powers (in press) characterizes social studies teaching; they suggest alignment with the goals of current educational reform in BC, particularly in its learner focus, as these are articulated in Year 2000 documents, and with educational reform in the broader contexts described by Goodlad (1984) and Jenness (1990). Their pedagogies as described in our conversations would suggest a world transformed by personal political means but in quite different ways.
PEDAGOGY: THE CONVERSATIONS

The following pedagogical narratives have been articulated by six different voices and provide six quite different models of teaching social studies for women. Though there are commonalities which can be heard throughout, the differences are most clearly evident in the personal political agenda through which each creates and enacts the classroom experience. Says Osborne (1991):

Pedagogy is not politically neutral. It carries its own messages. It puts teachers and students into certain roles. It embodies particular conceptions of power and authority .... Pedagogy ... is a powerful form of political education (p.13).

The pedagogical models that follow can be viewed not only as different but powerful ways of teaching powerful knowledge but as describing different social models which reflect the understandings each has of personal and political power.

Democratic Pedagogy: Amanda-Leigh

Amanda-Leigh is very clear in stating her objectives as a teacher. Content in social studies, she said, is secondary to the processes, skills, and attitudes requisite for good citizenship. Citizenship is defined in terms of the classroom, the school, the community, the nation, and the world. The teacher and students together create a classroom community of equals, a microcosm of the democratic world that Amanda-Leigh believes works best, a world built on the respect, self-esteem, tolerance, and personal integrity which Amanda-Leigh was taught to value in her own life. With these qualities, she encourages students to grow, to think critically, and to act cooperatively. She stated that she always tries to have a minimum of three different teaching or learning strategies in a class hour; she likes to use cooperative learning activities. She puts the hour's learning outcomes on the board for students to see as they arrive.
Amanda-Leigh described the ways in which she personalizes the learning for her students. She makes a point of greeting each one individually as they come in and consciously tries to address each one personally during the hour. Taking attendance is not a priority; she often finds herself filling that in at the end of the day. The first five minutes are for discussion, "getting a sense of where they are in their day." Social studies is, for her, probably one of the few subjects that students have in an eight-block timetable that validate their opinions and provide them with an opportunity to get comfortable with stating an opinion and supporting it. At the same time, Amanda-Leigh works hard to create a challenging environment where students can feel confident in taking risks while learning to enjoy learning.

Amanda-Leigh consciously incorporates critical thinking as a learning objective: "There isn't a subject or an idea or a value that I'm uncomfortable teaching. I love challenging them." Students learn to substantiate their opinions:

I have always asked for explanations of people's statements. I am not very accepting of somebody making a comment without being able to justify that. And that translates into my classroom. "It sucks," is not an acceptable answer to what did you think of whatever we're talking about.

Underpinning Amanda-Leigh's teaching are the principles of the Year 2000 educational reform document which focus on the learner as a whole person.

I don't think I can begin to teach unless the students in the classroom feel they belong, so that's my number one goal, that they have to feel that they're a member ... Without that, they won't be there. They will just be warm bodies in the classroom .... It almost seems you have to let go. It seems to come intuitively to me, letting go of the content. It should not be the driver of your experience in the classroom. The community comes first and then the learning will come on the heels of that.

She makes evident in her approach to teaching the principles of democratic education. Everybody is important in her classroom, she said. She models and expects respect for self and
for one another. Mutuality of respect, community processes, personal integrity, and participation are reflected in her statement, "It’s the learner first and that aspect of the community for me is who the learner is. That transcends the entire curriculum." She wants her students to go away from her class with the ability to participate as informed citizens in a democratic society, knowing what their responsibilities are to fit into it. She hopes they will not be passive but active contributors. They will resolve conflict through peaceful means: "Because my parents brought us up to believe that what we had to say was worth hearing, you should endeavour to give that respect to the other person." Students will, she hopes, cast informed votes, be tolerant, carry with them a lifelong love of learning, and understand their responsibilities within the environment. The closing statement of her principal’s report, written at the end of her first year of teaching, captures the ways in which Amanda-Leigh embodies the personal and the political in her practice of teaching; he wrote, "The students will learn a great deal from [her] modelling of her attitudes towards people and cooperative society."

Osborne (1991) looks at the political nature of pedagogy as it embodies particular notions of power and authority. Teachers’ worldviews shape their social and political conceptions of good teaching and their instructional practice. He links the practice of teaching for democratic citizenship to a conceptual framework rooted in inquiry learning and in critical and feminist pedagogies. All, he suggests, emphasize critical thinking and reflection and, at the same time, address the participatory agenda which underpins democratic citizenship and its ideals of freedom and justice for all. Amanda-Leigh’s description of her teaching reflects the intersection of these pedagogical approaches; her pedagogical practice incorporates the liberal notions developed in her childhood of democratic citizenship; citizens have a responsibility to be informed and to actively participate in the community which sustains them. In her stories of the classroom as community, Amanda-Leigh lives out the family expectation that, as a responsible citizen, she give
back what she has received and live out the strongly-held values of commitment, honesty, loyalty, and respect in her work.

**Critical Feminist Pedagogy: Tammy**

In many ways, Tammy’s style of teaching reflects similar principles to those incorporated by Amanda-Leigh. When I asked her what I would see if I came to her classroom, she said I would see kids who loved the opportunity to challenge ideas, who came in the door looking for that challenge they knew they would find with her. She said other teachers often drop in to hear the discussions and to contribute. Student teachers and those new to the school are encouraged to come to see her classes in action; colleagues drop in to hear the discussions. "They come in and feel quite free to contribute to the flow of ideas and information." Usually they come to see the interaction between students in what Tammy describes as an informal, yet a respectful, environment where students feel safe and confident in expressing their views on all kinds of issues. She places topics relating to social justice high on her teaching agenda.

She described her classroom as having large tables; it was designed specifically as a geography lab. Students sit around the tables wherever they want; she has no seating plans. Tammy encourages them to move around and meet the other students in the classroom as the school year progresses. While she allows lots of room for class discussions, she also gives students a lot of choice.

Do you want to do this independently? do you want to do this in small groups? do you want to do this in large groups? do you want to have a whole class discussion? I find at the beginning of the year, they want to work independently and in small groups. By the end of the year, they will almost invariably want a whole class discussion. I’m not sure why that happens, but it seems to be a dynamic for students to get involved. Those who just want to sit back and listen can; those that want to be very verbal can do that too.
Tammy talked about using the debating model with students in social studies, geography, and law to analyze social issues. Students, she said, learn from their participation in the development of argument, the give-and-take of debate, and the achievement of some kind of resolution. "I try and really encourage that model to come through in virtually everything that I teach, whether it is regular social studies curriculum or law." It is the same critical model that Tammy herself used in her life as a student and that she internalized with the passionate yet impersonal French-Canadian exchange of ideas and with the radical living room debates of intellectuals she had remembered from the sixties and seventies. It is the same model that exposed the contradictions in her own married life and which has served to empower her to deal with her personal issues of inequity, some of which are discussed in the next chapter.

Tammy talked about beginning the school year in each class with the cooperative development of classroom rules.

I live by them and I tell the students immediately that they can call me on anything that I'm not doing and that in their minds is not done democratically .... Secondly, I give avenues for those challenges. The avenues can entirely circumvent me or the system. I tell them that there are counsellors available, that there are other people in the department that are available, that their vice-principals and principal are available, or the Board Office. And I tell them what the avenues of challenge are. It seems fairly important that they know that (a) they can challenge, and (b) there are avenues to challenge something if they feel something is unfair.

Within the context of a cooperative, democratic, and challenging classroom learning environment, Tammy described making herself available to students. "I don't think it should be a mystery who I am or what I am. I think I should be a whole person." Attentive to the social inequities of schooling, Tammy also takes a special interest, as she did in her own high school days, in the "odd" children in her classes. The counsellors often place them there, knowing they will have a good chance of survival in her care. Tammy does not see their problems as anything
but her challenge to overcome. She is familiar with the social services available to disturbed adolescents or those with problems with the law. She accesses the resources required to help her deal with their classroom problems. She works hard to find a common ground, a space that is comfortable for the individual and the whole group. She prefers the challenging ones to the "wet lumps of Kleenex."

I try not to be abrasive with children who are unhappy in a situation. I really try to give them room to try their wings, to flutter against me sometimes, and that’s okay. They need the opportunity to flex. I try to give them space and let them feel that they can come out with the Big Picture. It doesn’t matter in terms of day-to-day stuff. It seems to matter sometimes to some children that they get that chance at succeeding in a power relationship and they succeed in challenging.

Weiler (1988) examines the complexities of negotiating structural forces in teaching from the perspective of a feminist teacher. Within the classroom, critical feminists "seek to redefine curriculum and social relationships [but] ... find themselves in conflict with existing partriarchal ideology and hierarchical relationships"(p.101). Feminist teachers like Tammy create classroom discussion where "it’s okay to be human" (p.122) in terms of relationships; the focus is on the issues of human existence.

For these teachers, the goal of teaching is grounded in a respect for the human value and cultural worlds of their students, and what is encouraged is the development of both criticism and self-criticism .... Feminist teachers share a commitment to a more just society for everyone, but they also have a particular sense of themselves as women teachers and are conscious of their actions as role models for students. They define themselves as gendered subjects and are conscious that their actions in the classroom have particular meanings precisely because they are women. This consciousness makes them consider both the content of their teaching and their own actions and appearance (p.115).
Tammy's classroom agenda is driven by a powerful personal political commitment to the incorporation of social critique and analysis in working for a more just society. Critical educators, says Bernard-Powers (1993), share the belief that:

... critical questioning of the content and process of classroom curricula is a linchpin in a democratic classroom. It is the means by which multiple lenses and layers of complexity can be illuminated, including the opaque assumptions of classroom relations and norms (p.9).

**Inquiry Teaching: Joan**

Joan, the vice-principal, does not translate her experience of teaching in feminist terms; she has not been conscious of gender as a factor of her personal life or her teaching career. Hers is a practical pedagogy, borrowed from models of, as she says, "what works" for her. Joan's stories about teaching depict a personal worldview and perspective which accommodates difference in seeking to create enriching and dynamic learning situations where students have different opportunities to be "the best that they can be." Joan, who was gifted at academic subjects, athletics, and music as a student, knows the importance of success for motivating student achievement and interest.

She described a practice of teaching that is very interactive and learner-focused, where there is always recognition of individual learning styles and program modifications required to accommodate the range of learning abilities. She recalled the last time she taught grade 9 social studies. Students were involved in cooperative learning, journal writing, role play, drama, and reading novels. Because of her expertise with computer technology, Joan has developed individualized and enriched learning materials for students to use on the computer.

The thing you have to remember is that not all kids learn in cooperative situations, not all kids learn from lectures, not all kids are visual learners, so [you have to] tie a variety [of strategies] together to help as many kids as possible.
Joan resisted the notion of gender as a factor in the relationship she has with students. "I've always thought it had more to do with my particular personality," she said. She was not conscious of being a role model for young women in teaching, though it was apparent that she had had a powerful impact on several.

I don't remember consciously [being a role model for girls]. I remember it being pointed out at different times. I can also remember different students coming back ... I apparently unconsciously said to them, you can do anything you want to. I think that's a favourite phrase of mine. You can do anything you want to. You're only limited by your own fears. It was never a conscious thing. I guess at that time it wasn't so publicized. It wasn't something I thought consciously of when I decided to take whatever I felt was the next step I wanted to take in my life. That was the parameter I lived by: if I wanted to do it, I could do it. That's the one thing that girls have come back with. I've written letters of recommendation for two girls who have become vets, three girls who have become doctors, and one who's become an engineer. The reason they've asked me to write the letters is because [they say] I wouldn't have done this if you hadn't said that. I never consciously intended to have that effect on them.

Joan also resisted my attempts to typify her in the emergent tradition of feminist teaching and leadership, preferring a more eclectic description. There was little in her pedagogical narrative that could be claimed as maternal. She described her teaching in oppositional terms, depicting two models that don't "work for her."

One is called Captain Video. That's self-explanatory. We have the video, we have the worksheet, we have the test. The other is just a very boring, textbook, question-and-answer, all knowledge level, and we expect the regurgitation. The kids sit in the rows and [it's all] very traditional. I think you and I grew up in an era that should have been traditional, but I think people even then had a little more variety in it than that. It's almost a lazy style ... the easy way out. You don't have to prepare much if you do that. So we'll read chapter 7 and answer the questions at the end. I don't like that at all. I think that does more to kill kids' interest in [learning] than anything. It's the same as showing a video for the sake of keeping them quiet for 15 minutes. I don't think I ever show a video in its entirety. I certainly never show them without stopping them. Most of the time, I'm showing excerpts.
Joan’s description of how her love of literature and her interest in people were integrated into the teaching of social studies revealed a lot about her pedagogical style. While British and European history can be really exciting, she said, Canadian history is not “that overwhelmingly interesting.”

Somehow guys like John A. Macdonald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier and some of the others don’t come across as very interesting. They’re certainly not written up as interesting in the texts, but there are ways of presenting it. One of the things that we did is role-playing and the other is to take novel material, rather than the textbook material, and use excerpts from novels as the reading material for the course. And all of a sudden, that person has a life instead of a date and a time in which they were involved in writing the Constitution, being a Father of Confederation. So they become three-dimensional, instead of two-dimensional. Kids get a lot more interested in the person. The other thing we’ll have them do is picture what the person was like. What do you think the person is like? A discussion of people is what history is all about. People precipitate the events. People are what history is all about. So we have to find out what the people are like to know what’s going to happen. [And I like] comparing too. What were the qualities of this person? do you see those qualities in any people that are around right now? I like to do that with Hitler. Do you see those qualities in any person who’s a world leader right now? how can people know those qualities and avoid what happened happening again? [I like to make] it relevant to what’s happening right now.

Joan’s stories depicted a woman who negotiates the world of teaching with ease. In the same way that, as a child, she saw few barriers to developing her potential, as an educator, there have been few barriers to her advancement or growth. Being a woman has in very few ways restricted her opportunities to excel. Though she is aware of ways in which the experience of schooling can be limiting for women and girls, her pedagogy embodies an egalitarian vision of education and of society. Students are empowered by the self-esteem which comes from success in learning. Good teaching, in Joan’s terms, is providing opportunities for success. Classrooms should encourage all to pursue opportunities for both individual and multidimensional growth and movement; students are encouraged to grow through inquiries which address differential learning
abilities and styles. Each has the opportunity, to the best of his or her ability, to grow by exploring many different possibilities for learning.

Despite Joan’s resistance to the concept of a feminist pedagogical style, her teaching style conforms to the feminist model of inquiry teaching as defined by Maher (1987a). The model for inquiry, says Maher, offers tools for problem-solving but, in seeking one best solution, is limited. Feminist pedagogy reframes experience in women’s terms; it recognizes differences. As a way of extending the inquiry learning, the feminist perspective incorporates a focus on "people," men and women, both as learners and as subjects for study.

In this way, students are involved in the classroom as whole people .... We live in a society whose problems are exacerbated by divisions of race, gender, and class, to name three of the most salient ones. The personal problems that plague us are those of understanding and reconciling different perspectives on the important issues of love and work and challenging those who profess impartiality and objectivity as they undertake to speak for everyone. We need classroom exercises in feminist pedagogy to help students and ourselves listen to and come to terms with our differences and multiple capacities and social responsibilities within ourselves (p.192).

Through an understanding of classroom multiplicities and differences, Joan works out in deliberate and self-conscious practice the goal of empowering students through knowledge and processes of inquiry. In so doing, she re-creates the notion of human possibility which underpins Maher’s model of inquiry teaching.

**Connected Pedagogy: Louise**

Perhaps the most conscious inclusion of the feminist pedagogical principles defined by Noddings (1992), Shrewsbury (1987), Schneidewind (1987), Kristeva (1986), and others is found in the teaching stories of Louise. She, like the others, is a strong, knowledgeable woman who has infused her teaching with her own love of learning. What underlies Louise’s teaching perspective, however, that differentiates her from the others is the strength of her personal
conviction that life and schooling need harmony, a rhythmic coexistence in schools and classrooms to be created and preserved as much there as in her own life. Louise readily admits she avoids confrontation. She believes that her approach to life, essentially a pragmatic one, of just setting your sights on something and managing it in your own time and in your own way is the important message she gives to students. "I really respect the power of the human mind for that." In her own time and in her own way, Louise has managed a lot, completing her education, raising three children on her own, and managing a farm while she carried on her teaching career. She is always attuned to the contributions of others, friends, family, and colleagues, in the rhythm of her life. There are spiritual and maternal elements which are woven into her stories of creating harmony, a gentle but consistent threading through the concrete and particular challenges she has encountered.

We discussed teaching styles. Asked what she would define as a good social studies teacher, Louise emphasized humanness. The men and women she has known in social studies teaching whom she respects for their teaching have all been humanists:

You have to have a real curiosity about people, about why they’re different, and a real ability not to be judgemental, not to jump to conclusions but to live a real tolerance for differences and variations and be a really healthy person [yourself] in relationships with other people and with young people and with the world. The curiosity and the tolerance and a desire to know more about something, to ask questions and know that there isn’t a finite answer but just to keep looking for more answers ... that’s why we’re social studies teachers and not math and physics teachers.

For her, the difference is a worldview of the infiniteness of human possibility. The world is not black and white. She prefers the open-ended inquiry-directed nature of social studies teaching today. She translates this into her own experience:

In social studies we’ve changed quite a lot. My learning in high school was that things happened and the English were always right and nobody else could challenge that. It was the feeling of
superiority, the European way was the correct way -- let me colonize the world. Only later, through university, were my eyes opened to just how biased and prejudiced that was. I started reading a few things by French-Canadian authors. It opened my own eyes ... my high school, although I enjoyed it, was really quite shortchanged in what I was allowed to learn about that curriculum. Today's [curriculum] is wonderful. I was lucky to work with people who were also curious and well read. To be well read is really essential. If you can’t be a well-read person, even just journals, if you haven’t time to read books, you shouldn’t really be a teacher. A person who is using [his or her] notes from 15 years ago, I don’t think, is being a good teacher. And I’ve had very few of those that I’ve had to work with .... There are not very many I know who do it that way mostly because it’s no fun for the teacher. But we’re all good at lecturing -- I often give a lecture lesson because it’s an efficient way to do something, introduce it. I used to do it more than I do with the new social studies curriculum. I used to do it quite a bit and figured I was fairly good at it. Kids found it really interesting but that was a teacher style. I can do that any time I need to. Trying to keep the kids involved all the time in active learning is harder work for the teacher. The other was easier.

She described her style of teaching which has evolved from her early days of seeing groups of students as "a field full of berry-pickers":

I think that variety is important. Keeping kids’ interest is very important .... Teaching is much harder than it was twenty years ago. More is expected from the teacher in terms of the individual student’s needs. We used to teach a class as a group and now I find the pressures on the teacher harder .... I’m a friendly authoritarian. I tell them I maintain a matriarchal not-quite-dictatorship. I’m maternal but I have the authority. I like organization, so I have a plan for the month and the students will know where our overall plans are. I do involve them quite a bit in making decisions. When would they like a test, or when would they like to do some group work, or how does it fit with their other school life? What might we do this week ... we could do this or that, so how do they feel? And I build in a lot of variety. I will sometimes have them take notes for 15 or 20 minutes while I explain things or do things as a base partly because so many of them are going on to university and it’s a useful technique and partly to increase their listening skills .... A typical lesson will have three or four things unless it’s been decided that it’s research day or it’s a group project day. I like to put up my plan for the next
few weeks on the board and say ... here are our objectives ... I consult a lot with the kids.

In Louise's teaching there is powerful evidence of the negotiative and integrative capacities of feminist pedagogy. As Miles (1989) says:

The female characteristics, concerns, and abilities marginalized in industrial society are necessarily central to the building of a new, more fully human society. The holistic, collective, intuitive, co-operative, emotional, nurturing, democratic, integrated, internal, and natural are affirmed against the over-valuation of the competitive, analytical, rational, hierarchical, fragmented, external, and artificial (man-made). Long-subordinated reproduction-related values and activities are affirmed as the organizing principle of an integrated non-alienated society in which the current deep dualities of life in our fragmented society are overcome (p.21).

Louise, in her teaching, tries to integrate the dualities defined by Miles: the public and private, production and reproduction, personal and political, means and end, man and nature, theory and practice, commitment and objectivity, mental and manual, emotion and logic, intuition and reason. We talked about the transformative agenda of feminist pedagogy, though many of the issues of feminism, she said, are quite removed from her own life. She talked about being attuned to an instinct and socialized as a woman for compassion and humanism:

These are difficult things to teach in a fragmented timetable. You also have to be the model. Your presence must speak all of these things. It's an intrinsic kind of thing. [With my students], I listen and try not to hinder their curiosity or their intellect or their feelings of worth. I think I did that by instinct until the vocabulary was there. As a child, I always felt heartsick at the underdog's situation. We're raised that way as women. I think I instill that in my students.

These goals of teaching for compassion and humanism are reinforced as a caring agenda in her teaching. Describing herself as a social democrat, she talked about working to build a society where good will prevail, where human energies are tapped to potential, where greed, exploitation, and the pursuit of profit no longer wreak havoc in the environment, and where people are looked
after. She knows that she is an important role model for students and that she has an important
task as an educator in fulfilling her social vision; so she seeks:

... to empower students with knowledge that they can make a
difference, that an individual can make a difference, that many
individuals together make a collective difference, [that there is] a
feeling of power in knowing that you have information and
knowing how to get more information, and then going out and
doing something good with it.

Shrewsbury (1987) defines the liberatory classroom as one where people connected in
relationship care about each other’s learning, respect differences, utilize and develop talents,
develop excellence that is not limited to a few, and practice integrity as the norm for that
relationship. Fundamental to this perspective, which she terms the "feminist perspective," is "a
commitment to growth, to renewal, to life. The vision itself must continue to evolve" (p.6-7).
In such classrooms, students engage in critical and reflective thinking rooted in the everyday to
seek ways of enhancing "the integrity and wholeness of the person and the person’s connections
with others." Where there is disharmony, says Miller (1986), teachers "confront the
fragmentations and move into new spaces, which provide room for the expansion that comes
when we are able to take actions that nurture as well as challenge" (p.119). Miller envisions
conversations between men and women as educators where the softer tones of women’s voices
will be recognized and released: "The spaces in which we talk create our connections and we
are touched -- by one another and by the making of our faces and giving of flower bouquets"
(p.121).

For Louise, educating young people is a holistic and integrated process. Her classroom
is as much a psychic space as a context for intellectual and social growth. Students "learn to fly
their own wings" in a non-competitive, encouraging atmosphere. The classroom is a place where
they can feel comfortable and where they have "half a chance." She uses a lot of cooperative
learning strategies. Attuned as she is to her own feelings in particular spaces, she knows that computer labs and science labs and discos and downtown urban cores make her feel uncomfortable. She brings the natural world to her working space:

I really work hard at maintaining an environmentally happy classroom, with plants and always flowers from my garden. They bring me flowers too. [It has] interesting displays and their work on display. [It is] a fun place to come into ... I am really a non-threatening teacher to students. I have very big classes and a wide range of abilities, kids that in some schools wouldn't have stayed. I have encouraged that because I feel that the more people know about the world, the better place it would be because of that.

**Social Science Pedagogy: Alison**

Alison’s teaching style is informed by her graduate work in social studies curriculum and by her sense of herself as a strong, knowledgeable, independent person. Academic strength means a lot to her and it means a lot to the very academic students of her school and programs. As an intellectual guide for her students, she draws on her knowledge of the world which is both academic and experiential. She has travelled to a lot of places and lived in many different cultural environments. The broad scope of the curriculum requires, in her opinion, the breadth of personal practical knowledge she has acquired. The content is, in her view, a means to achieving the goal of intellectual strength. The new curriculum which came in after 1982 has meant, she said, a refocused curriculum and the introduction of new teaching methods.

There are fewer people handing out worksheets every day or who are lecturing constantly or dictating notes or having kids write notes, but that’s almost an accident, not by design. It’s just that many of the older teachers who followed those procedures have retired and the new people coming into the profession ... belong to a different group of people [whose training at the university is different].

In her own teaching, Alison likes to incorporate themes and connections between the social science disciplines which underpin her view of current social studies curriculum goals.
When she teaches geography, for example, she is able to integrate her understandings of history, economics, and political science, her experience of 30 years of teaching, and the knowledge she has gained from her extensive travels. She discussed how she teaches grade 9 social studies, a fragmented curriculum she connects and transforms by focusing on revolutions. Teaching revolutions, she said, requires an understanding of the interconnections of geography, history, economics, systems of power and class, the distribution of resources, politics, cultures, education, and the spread of ideas and technology. It also requires the practical knowledge of how students learn.

I teach grade 9 as the year of revolutions. We start off with the Industrial Revolution which, in fact, has created the revolutions that are going on, violent or otherwise, throughout the world .... [Then I] go through the democratic revolution and the civil war in England. Then I can do the American Revolution and then I do the French Revolution .... When we start off with the Industrial Revolution, I start off with the geography of Europe, and we can do geography as we do the revolutions. Then, all of a sudden, halfway through the year, the curriculum demands that I change and go to Canada. But I'm not talking about the Industrial Revolution in Canada. I have to go back to the beginning. So somehow or other I have to find a connection and I do it through economics and through the discoveries: what were the native people like when the European explorers came here? And I look at the economic development of Canada .... There's so much to do and so you have to be very selective .... To know what you are doing demands a high degree of knowledge of an enormous number of things, but at the grade 9 level, you have to be very sure that you direct them into areas where they're going to find these answers or at least to find sufficient material that they are going to be able to think at their level.

Alison, unlike her mother and her grandmother, does not portray a maternal role in her community, the school; though she is concerned and approachable, she is most comfortable with the role of the scholar, providing students with interesting and challenging learning opportunities and the benefits of her expertise. In her English way, she maintains her personal distance. Students see her as a knowledgeable person, she says; in teaching, "gender ought not to be a
factor." Alison is outspoken on the issue: she is not a feminist, though she brings a woman’s perspective to the classroom. I can find little that represents themes of mothering and caring in her perceptions of teaching, though one could make the case that she incorporates the caring theme in more abstract ways, in caring for students’ intellectual growth and for issues of social justice in the global sense. But to do so is to overclaim the case. She is the traditional scholar. It is her job as a teacher, she believes, to bring all perspectives to students and to have them see men and women as persons, as equals. She is adamant about the essential sameness of men and women as teachers. Underlying this, I have the sense, is the view that being different as a woman means being inferior.

I think if you allow students to treat you as something less, you get the treatment you expect. I think [it’s the] treatment of students [that] causes the problems. I honestly find it very difficult to answer those questions because I don’t have discipline problems. My classes are full. I never expect to have discipline problems. I would treat the students as I would have them treat me; it just doesn’t happen. I don’t let them come in and keep their hats on in class. They may argue, but they take them off. They just do it because they want to be there .... I don’t think that, in any teaching that I have done, there has been any difference between successful male social studies teachers and successful female social studies teachers .... They are respected as scholars and teachers, not because they are men or women. There is no difference. They may have a different point of view, but I don’t think it is necessarily gender-derived. It has to do with one’s experience .... They are respected because the students perceive they can learn from [them].

In her classroom, in my study, and in her own life, Alison is a political independent; feminism, like the other "-isms" of the political sphere, has no place in her perception of pedagogy and the classroom experience. She chooses her own ground on any issue after examining the evidence of her own personal knowledge. She is not afraid to express herself; to her it is a matter of equity: "I’m an equal to anybody." The social studies classroom should not cause problems for women such as herself who teach social studies from the perspective of being
a strong, knowledgeable, independent woman with the capacity to think critically about issues pertaining to curriculum and to the teaching of young people.

Alison draws on her understanding of other cultures in adapting the learning to classrooms with very high numbers of ESL students. She integrates their multicultural perspectives into her creation of curriculum, designing inquiries which allow students to build on their unique knowledge and experiences of the world. As well, she believes we should have common goals as citizens. Underpinning her concept of citizenship is the image of the students at the centre of ever widening and interconnecting circles which represent the community, the province, the nation, and the world. Students are given the knowledge and skills to make informed and independent decisions about their places in these public and interconnected communities as Canadian citizens. In discussing how she teaches for social change, she also framed her notions of citizenship as a woman’s perspective on its traditional assumptions of the rights and responsibilities of individuals in relation to the state:

What we’re doing now is allowing people to keep their cultures separate and some of those cultural ideas are an antithesis to what Canadian laws stress .... That’s what I mean by constructive social change. It’s not my idea to tell someone their cultural practices are all wrong, but sometimes the traditions that have developed in the light of a specific history and geography and spatial context are not applicable to Vancouver, and one of those things is the treatment of women.

Our discussion has been grounded in her theoretical and abstract understanding of social studies curriculum development, an essentially political process with which she is uncomfortable. She explained that the curriculum mandate of the Ministry of Education is often not reflected in curriculum as it is developed by teachers. In her graduate thesis research, she had examined the three traditional definitions of social studies, as citizenship transmission, as social science, and as reflective inquiry:
I think basically social studies has to be [about] citizenship. Whatever tradition you take, the ultimate goal is citizenship, however you interpret it. But that’s also a problem I have with social studies. I’m not sure that we should be in the business of citizenship education ... it changes with the general political consensus of the times ... it represents the mainstream of thought within the province .... As I told you before, I am not comfortable with politics in education. My interpretation of the curriculum guide is that it has tried to move to the third tradition, the critical inquiry. I certainly support that and I try to teach that. At the same time, you cannot have critical inquiry unless you have a skeleton of structure in order to make a critical inquiry ... some sort of combination of the second (social science) and third (reflective inquiry), in that you’re showing students where to find the knowledge that they need in order to be able to do [reflective inquiry].

Alison’s practice of social studies teaching is a negotiation of the three traditions with greatest emphasis on the social science tradition. Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) describe the social science tradition as one which "incorporates the inquiry techniques of anthropologists, sociologists, archeologists, historians, geographers, economists, psychologists, political scientists, and others" (p.62). The concepts of given social science disciplines equip young people as scholars to gain new knowledge by which to make sense of a complex public world and to participate as informed Canadian citizens. Her practice is also perhaps a somewhat problematic negotiation of the traditional tenet of social studies teaching that the political should not be seen to be political and nor should those who teach it.

Disconnected Pedagogy: Ellen

Little in the literature of feminist pedagogy describes Ellen’s experience of teaching, the sense of disconnection that comes from career interruptions and frequent changes of curriculum. This disconnection, which Ellen defines as a kind of isolation and disquiet, is heightened by her personal practical knowledge in which is reflected the difficulty of her cultural transition and the loss of confidence and lack of support she has felt in her teaching experience in BC. Ellen is
quietly reflective about her teaching experience in social studies. Since the start of this project, she has been reassigned to teaching Science and English. She is uncomfortable with the more challenging and critical approaches to teaching that characterize Tammy’s and Amanda-Leigh’s styles but holds strongly the conviction that individuals as citizens can work within the status quo in reasoned and systematic ways to bring about change. Like Louise, she does not find confrontation easy. Like Louise, she loves the quiet, harmonious spaces in life. Her teaching style reflects this:

What I’d want to be modelling [for students] might be intellectual curiosity, but also compassion. Compassion for each other and for humanity in general, to overcome closed minds and prejudice. And a caring for the environment and a willingness not to sink into apathy, to have some feelings for the personal, to be willing to put some effort into making a small personal change. When I show my ... videos [of an environmental clean-up project I was involved with], I say, look, we won some court cases. We did this clean-up by the river, and you can make a difference.

Reflecting the amount of change in her teaching assignments over the years, she talked about needing time to develop confidence in the curriculum knowledge. Once she has developed "curriculum confidence," she could feel comfortable enough to do a whole range of activities in the classroom from debating to labs to field trips. Debating lessons work really well for her. She measures student involvement and participation as evidence of success. In her understated style, she says of her creative writing program in English,

I don’t think I’m doing anything special with this particular English class but they all love creative writing. They feel really encouraged. I can generate a lot of enthusiasm. By the same token, I’ve got the same level class where nothing seems to get them going. It depends on the situation.

Ellen attends in her teaching practice to the dynamics of the groups she is working with. A particularly interactive strategy may work well with one group and not another. Her best lessons, she thinks, are those that allow her to bring her experience of the real and natural world
to the learning. She also likes to bring in guest speakers, friends and contacts from her work with environmental advocacy organizations. Ellen most enjoys field trips, like the one she took with students to Still Creek to give students an understanding of the relationship between pH and temperature and water quality issues and the raising of the salmon.

That is to me a really high point in teaching. One time I gave a slide show, when I was teaching the geology part, of my trip down the Grand Canyon. It’s through outdoor visual focus that [my teaching] works best.

She was sorry that, due to her reassignment, she could not share her slides and her experiences with students in grade eight social studies when she returned from her three-month leave to travel in Asia recently. The most important thing in her teaching, in Ellen’s opinion, is that students learn to think critically:

The questioning/critical thinking angle [is most important]. In the end, I push an environmental line. I try not to [be too strong] .... Keeping a thinking mind about what they’re listening to and inquiring about: that’s probably the most important thing in the long run.

When asked what most suits her to working with students, she responded,

Love of learning is number one. I’ll learn as much as the students will. A real commitment to learning and when I see young people learning, I really enjoy it. For example, I gave my grade 10s raw data and they could analyze some fairly detailed statistics with E-coli tests for water quality. I was teaching them good science writing (she shows me the reports she has home to mark). [I get excited as] it’s not just the really bright kids, wanting A’s.

Her background in English, her love of the environment, her understandings of complex issue analysis, her knowledge foundations, and her lifelong pursuit of learning are integrated in her stories of her teaching practice.

There is a tension in Ellen’s discussion of her relationships with students, a tentativeness and discomfort that pushes her to explore both gender and cultural dynamics in teaching. She
described herself as fairly conservative in her approach to teaching. She likes discipline and structure, she said; she likes students to be on time to class.

There wasn't a lot of discipline in one of the schools I was working in. I ran afoul of a group of parents and they basically worked for getting me a forced transfer. One of the kids walked into my class and hit the nearest student. His parents wanted him removed because I was being too tough, questioning him for this. His parents said he couldn't take my discipline, so he was removed from my class. That forced transfer is a black mark on my record and, for that reason, even if I wanted to do something, I wouldn't be considered. I have to be realistic .... The kids saw me as a nasty old biddy and they were really resentful of basic discipline. Some see me as a nasty old disciplinarian.

Her relationships with students also reflect Ellen's personality and experience. Ellen's personal reservedness makes it most comfortable for her to maintain a personal distance.

I don't think the kids see me as a mother figure or necessarily warm or empathetic .... I'm just a person but a bit more aggressive because of this New Zealand background. It's caused real problems .... In order to assert myself, I don't smile as much. I look stern. I don't tolerate as much. Over there, a lot of it was based on physical stuff -- hitting. But that was not my style.

She doesn't like to "fuss over" kids, as some parents do, she said; she doesn't like being fussed over herself. "I just gradually get to know and trust adults. I let the students come to me." And some do come to her because they know that, underneath the apparently stern exterior, she cares and she will listen. In her own words, she has been a "listening post" in students' lives.

Ellen talked about her involvement with an ESL student who had come to Canada without his family and whose experience of loneliness and overbearing cultural expectations had brought him to her on the verge of a breakdown. She talked about another boy who gave a really "whacky" speech in the public speaking contest one year who returned the next to help her sponsor the contest. She has consciously tried not to get overly involved with students' lives and their issues. She had been very involved in her earliest years of teaching in New Zealand. One
boy who had been quite reclusive and who was experiencing severe emotional problems went on to take the national title in orienteering after Ellen had involved him in her outdoor orienteering program. Her sincere interest in students’ emotional development is reflected in her continuing to take counselling courses at UBC. Her present role is primarily their intellectual and experiential development, though she is available for listening if they choose to approach.

The models for Ellen’s teaching are found in her images of the very traditional "beloved old math teacher,” the male teachers of her high school years, and the male models for teaching who had dominated her early career years in New Zealand.

[The school in New Zealand] was very sexist. At lunch time, the men used to sit around the table and tell filthy jokes. If you went to the men’s staffroom, if you were young, you got your bum pinched. If you were old like the head mistress, you got the most foul joke told in front of you so that you would cry and get out. They did not want to have the staffroom integrated. We had this almighty fight to have a male/female staffroom .... Just disgusting, to survive these very macho men. Their way of teaching was through sheer toughness. So if you could intimidate the kids, then you were strong and a good teacher. Unfortunately, that was the model where I started off. Somewhere in the back of my mind, it’s been softened by some of these Canadian courses in empathy. It’s a different style. I think that, [in spite of] my being a woman, I did model myself on these quite strong male aggressive models.

More naturally comfortable with the role of intellectual guide and with keeping a personal distance, Ellen now works on allowing warmth in her teaching. "You just don’t feel connected. That’s why I liked Diane Pollard and her course [in Counselling Psychology] at UBC. She’s a very warm, empathetic person. I’d really like to be like her." Jungian psychology has taught her that some "feeling" types of students require attention in the affective domain; others, the "knowing" types, are happier in the cognitive domain she had previously focused on.

I can see what some of their psychological critiques are, the validity of that, and I believe that there’s some essence in that. I certainly know when I go into a classroom, I’m not really into complimenting the student in the front desk wearing a fabulous
new shirt, but now I actually try to do things like that. I'll walk around the room and look at each kid's work and make some positive comment whereas in the past I probably didn't because I always felt that if someone wants to tell you something they will.

Though not an uncaring person, Ellen has had to learn to broaden her personal teaching style to incorporate the more maternal, caring, connecting aspects which would seem, based on her experience, to be more politically expedient for women in Canadian classrooms than the traditional style of the authoritarian transmission model with which she was culturally and professionally more familiar. She has worked hard to learn how to incorporate and be more comfortable with a pedagogical style not naturally her own.

Lacking strong gender models for teaching and professionally isolated from other women in her teaching, Ellen is caught in the tensions and contradictions of gendered professional and cultural expectations of women teachers. These identities do not allow for her different way of establishing and expressing authority for knowledge. For Ellen, the difficult and complex process of negotiating cultural and gender expectations in the practice of teaching has made her acutely aware of structural and social constraints in identity-formation. She is left feeling disconnected and uncomfortable in the tensions created by the female maternal/nurturing and male intellectual/authority models which frame women's teaching (Culley et al, 1985).

Conclusion: Women's Different Pedagogies

No one style of teaching social studies emerges from these women; diversity of style and methods, a focus on students' and their own intellectual growth, an explicit intention to convey the love and challenge of learning in classrooms, and a stated preference for non-traditional methods of teaching seem the predominant characteristics of their pedagogical approaches in social studies. Some tell stories of classroom processes which are more democratic than others. The maternal/nurturing theme which so characterizes the literature of feminist pedagogy cannot
be imposed as a generalized characteristic of their styles. Though it appears as a strong theme in some of their teaching stories, it is non-existent or faint in others. And to see their capacities only in the reductive roles of nurturers is to devalue their contributions as strong, intellectual, and knowledgeable women to the teaching of social studies and geography. Rather, in varying degrees and complex ways, they integrate and negotiate traditional, innovative, academic, political, social, critical, feminist, and maternal pedagogical perspectives that provide different kinds of challenging learning environments for students in social studies. That each has a notion of teaching social studies as citizenship education is apparent, but equally as apparent is that citizenship means quite different and personal things to each. To generalize is to neutralize the richness of these stories as models of teaching. To deny the validity of each woman’s contribution to social studies teaching is to limit the transformative possibilities of understanding the diversity of the social world.

The women of the study have all had leadership roles in social studies teaching. In every story we have heard strong, knowledgeable women discuss their personal practical knowledges which they engage in enacting their teaching of social studies. Each story has something of value to add to what we know about social studies teaching. Wilson’s (1993) research on teacher leaders, those perceived by their peers to be hard-working and highly involved with curricular and instructional innovation, showed that they work in creative ways with students of wide-ranging abilities and backgrounds, are outgoing and available to other teachers as a resource, and are active participants within school communities. She found that teacher leaders sought challenge and growth in their teaching, are risk-oriented and collaborative, and are committed and competent. They do what they do in schools both for students and for themselves. Yet, Wilson hints at the politics of teaching, suggesting that, within teacher culture, there are tensions which surround these very characteristics, both with colleagues and administrators. Those whose
teaching could model the way and "encourage the heart" of schools are not likely to do so, preferring a live-and-let-live attitude. Yet in describing the feminine or transformational leadership style, she expresses the hope that:

... the school of the future will be a formal but nonhierarchical system that nourishes informal arteries of influence, a place where the pulse and rhythm of good teaching and learning are driven by the capabilities of teacher leaders. It seems to me that only then will the potential contribution of these teachers to their schools be realized. Only then will we genuinely begin the work of fashioning school environments within which it is possible for every student to achieve (p.27).

A BC Ministry of Education newsletter *Ministry News* (April, 1993) cites research (Leithwood and Dart, 1992) showing that women as transformational leaders are generally more positive in response than men to the implementation initiatives of the *Year 2000* reform program in BC. Formal inclusion of women’s ways of teaching social studies has implications for the success of proposed new directions in social studies. As role models, these women’s pedagogies provide alternatives to the dominant traditional models which have described social studies teaching for decades. The stories of those who have leadership roles should be encouraged for their transformative capacity.

**CURRICULAR PERSPECTIVES**

Critical educators are concerned with the politics of curriculum. They see that curriculum, like pedagogy, is not neutral. They ask whose knowledge is it, and for whom is it intended? They challenge the concept of curriculum as something linear and bounded which is conveyed, covered, measured, taught in boxes of time, and assessed (Miller, 1990). They resist curriculum mandates which "administer only one set treatment" (Wood, 1990, p.100) and which cast teachers as curriculum workers, calling instead for more inclusive and visionary educational objectives.
where teachers and students share in the democratic creation and enactment of curriculum possibilities (Miller, 1990; Greene, 1990; Apple, 1990; Erdman, 1990).

Feminist concerns with curriculum are critical, but they also see the mandated curriculum as gendered. The "one set treatment" as it is developed by curriculum frameworks, textbooks, content, and classroom processes is neither gender fair nor culturally inclusive (Bernard-Powers, in press). Curriculum, feminists say, reinforces cultural reproduction of gender stereotypes (Luke, 1992; Riddell, 1989, 1992) and constructs what is worth knowing and how it should be known in male terms (Gaskell, McLaren, and Novogrodsky, 1989). Women's knowledge, concerns, experiences, and ways of knowing become marginalia (Luke, 1992).

The literature suggests that women understand curriculum as a construction which can be transformed in women's terms to reflect diverse human possibilities. Themes of connection, integration, holism, negotiation, collaboration, nurturance, and collegiality which permeate the discourse of women's pedagogy suggest that women are not comfortable with the view of curriculum as finite, bounded, fragmented, immutable, and isolated from real-world and learning communities. Rather, they approach curriculum in inclusive and synthetic ways, "as a shared process .... in which teachers and students engage to order and make sense of the world" (Wood, 1990, p.107; Erdman, 1990) and as a form of human praxis which is personal (Greene, 1990), reflective, active, connecting, interpretive, and shifting (Miller, 1990). Curriculum, for Aoki (1990), reveals for good teachers a tensionality marked by the differences and difficulties "between the world that is and the world yet to be ... between the mandated curriculum and students' own vision of curriculum" (p.112). In facing such tensions, teachers "indwell authentically in the life of difficulty, [they do not] betray it with easier technical solutions" (p.113). Women may also experience tensions surrounding the constraints of technical and
rationalizing aspects of curriculum (Tetreault, 1987b; Casey and Apple, 1989; McLeod, 1988; Wilson, 1993; Weiler, 1988).

The literature also suggests that women have much to offer by creating a social studies curriculum which has transformative capacity in making "education for responsible and caring community participation ... a fundamental goal of schooling" (Stanley, 1992, as cited in Bernard-Powers, in press).

If women's culture were taken more seriously in educational planning, social studies and history might have a very different emphasis. Instead of moving from war to war, ruler to ruler, one political campaign to the next, we would give far more attention to social issues (Noddings, 1992b, p.68).

Women's culture and values place private concerns with social and family welfare, child care, domestic violence, and sexual harassment, for example, and particular concerns with peace activities, the environment, and community organizations on the public agenda for citizenship education (Bernard-Powers, in press; Kilgour, 1992; Martin, 1982, 1985; Noddings, 1984, 1992a, 1992b).

While there were significant differences in teaching styles, more commonalities amongst these women could be found in their transformations of and responses to curriculum. This section begins with an analysis of the women's responses to curriculum questions within the questionnaire. The commonalities emerged as four major narrative themes across the different conversations; each added new dimensions to the questionnaire data on women's curriculum perspectives. Three of these themes suggest the ways in which women enact curriculum-as-possibility. The fourth theme, discussed separately for its focus on tensions, looks at women's discomfort with the "business" of social studies teaching, in particular, the teaching of senior courses which are subject to provincial assessment. Here, the conversations began to explore the
tensions of difference and difficulties faced by the women as they create and enact social studies curriculum within varying degrees of constraint.

**CURRICULUM: QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES**

I began the study of the women’s curriculum understandings and perspectives by looking at the questionnaire responses (see Appendix II) which focused on the present BC social studies curriculum. One question sought their responses to a list which asked them to rank aspects of the present curriculum as being most important, moderately important, or least important. The women showed their understanding of present curriculum foci as follows:

*Level of Perceived Importance in Current Social Studies Curriculum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Global Awareness</td>
<td>Report Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Studies</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and Responsibilities</td>
<td>Social/Cultural</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Inquiry Learning</td>
<td>(Humanities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The Teachers’ Curriculum Understandings

However, open-ended questionnaire responses indicated what aspects of curriculum they felt should receive more emphasis. Five of six listed Geography. Three listed Global Awareness. Also mentioned were Community Participation, Inquiry Learning, and Law. Humanities was added to the list, reflecting the *Year 2000* reform for social studies education in BC. Less emphasis was suggested on Canadian Studies, History, and content.

In understanding this response, it should be noted that, within the field, there is some agreement that history and social studies are often synonymous in the practical curriculum. With
many more social studies teachers being prepared in history than in geography and with a preponderance of history in the junior curricula in particular, many students do not receive even the allocated time suggested in the BC curriculum guides in acquiring geographic skills and understandings. The women’s questionnaire responses reflected this concern for the lack of geographic emphasis. Further, the embeddedness of history and Canadian Studies, linked to traditional pedagogical strategies of transmission such as text- and content-focused lessons, seemed problematic for these women in social studies teaching. Their concerns with the present curriculum and its implementation included poor texts, the lack of curriculum integration, the amount of content and emphasis of content over process learning, the over-emphasis of history at the expense of other curriculum foci, the lack of geographic background of some teachers of social studies, and the lack of geography in the junior grades which shortchanges some students entering Geography 12. These responses were further developed in our conversations.

The concern with lack of geographic focus is perhaps predictable, given the academic orientation of the study group, but it is matched in the results of the Provincial Assessment Report:

> Teachers at all three [assessed] levels would like to see an increased emphasis on current events, global awareness, and environmental issues. Grade 10 panel members and teachers would also like to see more emphasis on geography and geographic skills (Cassidy and Bognar, p.13).

Global and environmental emphases are encompassed in geographic learnings; environmental awareness was not included in the list of questionnaire choices for present curriculum foci but should have been, given its geographic implications. Current events also often focus on world events which lend themselves to geographic understandings.

The women responded positively to questionnaire inquiries about current educational reform goals in BC of integrating social studies with other curriculum areas. Given the
multidimensionality and flexibility of their teaching careers in terms of other courses and disciplines taught, this response suggests that it is easier to think about integration when one is familiar with other curricula.

The summarized picture of women’s understandings of the broad goals of social studies showed the following: most important, they felt, were the notions of teaching social studies to encourage inquiry and critical thinking and to facilitate understanding of global concerns; of secondary importance was teaching to promote attitudes of tolerance and understanding; next was to prepare students for participation in society; then, to facilitate positive and constructive social change. Clearly, the least significant factor in teaching social studies for these women was the transmission of a nation’s cultural legacy. One added the goal of respecting and understanding the natural world and its importance.

CURRICULUM: THE CONVERSATIONS

In analyzing the interview data, I have focused on ways these women negotiate the curriculum and the intentions of the curriculum guides to overcome perceived emphases and omissions. The conversations illuminate these women’s ways of thinking critically about the explicit curriculum of social studies in BC.

Theme: Curriculum Autonomy

Perhaps the most striking aspect of their curriculum creation and enactment is the sense of autonomy each has within the classroom in teaching social studies. There is very little sense of their being constrained by the mandated curriculum for teaching social studies, grades 8 to 11.

With critical inquiry as the curriculum goal, which Alison views as the "framework," she can decide how she will sort through the content, "translate it, transform it, in one way or another," to achieve the knowledge and skills objectives articulated in the curriculum. Her comments reflect her sense of independence:
Because there is so much material, I select what I think is important to achieve the goals that the curriculum wants. But someone in the next room who has a different base of knowledge chooses something else. Now we all do it according to our experience. So what my students get is the result of my experience. What the students of the person across the hall gets is the result of that person’s experience.

Inevitably, Amanda-Leigh said, you have to "streamline" curriculum, bypassing some events and highlighting others to incorporate creative or process approaches: "I don’t lecture. The transmission of content is instantaneously reduced because, unless you’re lecturing, you are never going to get through all that content."

Amanda-Leigh discussed the collaborative way in which her department transformed the grade 10 curriculum for social studies the year they decided to create a UN General Assembly:

We basically streamlined [the BC Economy] unit which is 30%, almost 40 or 50 when you add the Pacific Rim. We taught it but we really streamlined it into primary, secondary, and tertiary industries and the big industries in BC. We probably didn’t provide the kids an excellent understanding of forestry and mining and tourism in BC, but partially that comes from the fact that the textbook is inadequate at the grade 10 level. We didn’t have the resources and didn’t create the resources to teach the unit. So we went on to the General Assembly and the UN which fits better into the grade 11 curriculum, but that curriculum is absolutely packed full. We really focused on the 15% curriculum [allocated to] current events in social studies 10. We translated that into a General Assembly at the year end so the kids actually put forth resolutions on current events facing the world, be it literacy or sexism or driftnet fishing or clearcutting .... sometimes I wondered if we were operating within the curriculum guidelines ... and I didn’t have any problem with that because what we were doing was just so valid .... My feeling is that the curriculum guideline is a recommendation. It is not carved in stone. The reason the curriculum is designed as it is is so that kids are given certain skills and processes and content to move to the next level. I see that as a continuum. I don’t think you stop learning in June. So I don’t think the kids who left grade 10 going into grade 11 were shortchanged at all. The grade 11 teacher will be able to go from where they are.
To Amanda-Leigh and her department, the content was the vehicle by which the learning took place. They facilitated that learning.

In terms of curriculum enactment, Joan used examples from her teaching of grade 9 social studies and History 12 to demonstrate her resistance to both the mandated curriculum and traditional pedagogy. There is further evidence of her focus on involving the learner and her understanding of learning theory. Her curriculum enactment represents an integrated, holistic, humanities approach, very reflective of the practical aims of Year 2000 reform:

I just think [the grade 9 curriculum] presents a very narrow point of view and I would want to have them bring in two or three different points of view. I also find the text extremely unreadable for most grade 9 students; it’s about five years beyond some of them. And [the course] seems to be such a hodgepodge. We have selected three things you should know about. It’s compartmentalized. We’re going to have geography. Okay, now we’ve done geography, now we do the Industrial Revolution. Okay, now we’ve done the Industrial Revolution, now if we have any time left, we’re going to do socialism, democracy, and exploration .... When I find omissions, I try and find some other material. It doesn’t have to be text reference material. I taught History 12 for a while and one of the things I used to like doing was to give the kids a list of novels that were related to that and have them read any two of them. That’s the whole business of the two-dimensional text figure versus the three-dimensional live person that [I’ve] talked about. I’d like to see more of that in all the history courses.

Joan also discussed her implementation of the curricular goal of critical thinking and her focus on multiple perspectives. She has taught with Louise, whom she describes as a great influence on her teaching:

I think Louise and I have very similar values. We certainly don’t agree necessarily on worldviews or politics ... but both of us are willing to allow the students to disagree with us too. Our view isn’t the only view. It’s just one view. I don’t have any problem at all with my students [disagreeing] -- in fact, I’m more than happy if they’ll disagree and stand up for why.

Joan illustrates this process with an example of curriculum negotiation in Geography 12:
So much has been made of the greenhouse and carbon dioxide effect. I'm not totally convinced that it's happening. I'm totally convinced that we could do things that would be better for our environment than what we're doing. Certainly, burning down the Brazilian jungle is not the best thing ... so I provide them with a model that disputes [the greenhouse effect] and shows that throughout periods of geologic history this atmosphere has gone from methane to having carbon dioxide to an oxygen-carbon dioxide balance. In fact, the ocean's ability to increase its absorption of carbon dioxide is relative to the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere at different times. That's a very legitimate model, too. So the kids start arguing with you because of what they've read, but at least then they're thinking about it, and they're also thinking about the fact that every time something like this is done, it's one person's interpretation of a study and data can do anything you want them to.

She is concerned in the present curriculum with the de-emphasis of geography in the junior curricula of social studies which creates weak geographic understandings for students entering the senior elective. The base of geographic knowledge also provides students with an understanding of current events. "Maybe when they pick up a newspaper and they read about the confusion in the Middle East, they'll be able to find the Middle East on a map!" We laughed about my experience of students entering Geography 12 whose exposure to geographic concepts seemed to be "the place where history happens, the annual review of longitude and latitude, the annual map of Canada ... one teacher added wind and currents because he was a sailor!" She responded, "And don't forget time zones because somebody took a holiday!" One of her roles as a social studies educator, she felt, had been to share her knowledge of geography with colleagues.

It is important for Joan that students see connections in their learning. She "hammers in" the theme of interconnectedness in her approach to social studies and geographic understandings: nothing happens in isolation; everything is related to something else, is influenced by and influences something else. The "gifted" nature of her own eclectic experience of schooling is
reflected in her teaching perspective and practice. Her literary, technical, scientific, mathematical, historical, and geographic skills are strands she weaves in dynamic ways into the fabric of her transformed social studies.

The curriculum also allows Louise to "fly her own wings." Though the curriculum is weighted towards history, Louise sees herself as autonomous in transforming the body of knowledge. "We’ve got such autonomy in our district that I could teach [geography] for 50% of the course and no one would challenge me." Her love of geography is the basis of her re-created curriculum.

I love geography so much that I really emphasize it at every grade level. I could bring geography into every lesson. I think those of us with the geography training do, and I find the kids like that a lot because it makes the real world have meaning. I think we have an advantage over those who have only history training.

In her department, all the teachers have incorporated as much geography as they can. One focus is historical geography. Students look at the flow and impact of people and of historic events on landscapes.

I like seeing the impact of history on the land itself ... the cultural geography and the way the people place themselves on the land and what they do with it. That leads me into how do they manage the land? What is their feeling of harmony with the land? Now I think it’s almost brought me full circle with today’s environmental problems because where there’s disharmony, there are problems .... Any future developments have to be in harmony with nature. You’ve got to understand ecology which brings us back to the course. I’m so lucky to teach Geography 12 where kids can get exposed to that .... I’ve never really had to teach anything I couldn’t get excited about, so I’m lucky.

Louise teaches current events from both geographic and political perspectives. Students learn where things happen as well as what is going on.
Theme: Environmental Awareness

The themes of environmental protection and understanding of the natural world permeated all the discussions of ways in which curriculum is crafted according to personal knowledge. Ellen, the most committed environmentalist in the personal/political sense, "pushes an environmental line," though she acknowledges the constraints imposed by the political context of schooling in giving voice to her passion for the natural world. She says one must be equally as careful not to be seen to be indoctrinating students in the environmental as the fundamentalist religious view of the world, for example. As a social studies teacher, she emphasized wilderness and its value to humanity. She is happy that teaching science courses has given her a curriculum in which she can share her understandings of the ecological, economic, legal, and social considerations in protecting the environment.

Alison uses her social science perspective to analyze the interconnections of the human and physical worlds, incorporating economic, social, and environmental understandings in examining such issues as mining and forestry. Amanda-Leigh, the democratic educator, incorporates awareness of the importance of the environment in a notion of environmental citizenship. Joan generates inquiries which examine multiple perspectives and understandings of the physical world and of environmental issues. Tammy provides the classroom context in which current challenges to the environment may be debated and critiqued, seeking to develop student understandings and awarenesses of the natural world as life skills.

Louise's love of the natural world infuses her approach to curriculum. As the Earth Mother, she brings it in in informal ways, sharing with her students a respect for the Earth "which is our foundation." She talks of feeling comfortable with that approach. Studying resource management or history, she will focus on how people looked at the earth and resources and their relationship to the whole. She reads them the wisdom of other cultures in relation to
Nature and considers the meaning of the word "recreation" which, to Louise, is "to re-create, find your real self, your inner self, a different kind of harmony." She attributed these holistic understandings to her geography professor at the University of Victoria.

**Theme: Inclusion of Women**

Another recurrent theme is that of the curricular omission of women, their perspectives, and their issues. The discussions which follow and those which I have previously included in looking at their instructional styles suggest other ways in which the curriculum is perceived of as exclusive and single-voiced. Though only one of the women had actually taken a course in Women's History, most others, aware of the absence of women in the social studies curriculum, had strategies for addressing gender asymmetry in their creation of curriculum. The questionnaire responses had suggested I would find a concern for the lack of women's stories and issues within the curriculum.

Louise talked about integrating a focus on women in holistic ways. She recalled a really bright young girl in grade ten for whom she created an individualized enrichment project to study Canadian history and geography and the roles of women as they are portrayed in the works of Susannah Moodie, Margaret Atwood, Gabrielle Roy, and others. In the end, when the student had finished, she gave Louise a copy of *Never Done*, a book about women's work. After grade 11, the student was accepted directly to Simon Fraser University. Now, with a career in writing for television, the student stays in touch with Louise.

She touched me as a teacher, thinking about people who have influenced me [in teaching] ... She made me explore far beyond what was there in the grade 10 [curriculum]. How could I keep this girl learning? I'd keep giving her more things and she would come back with what she'd found.

The theme of women's roles is also woven into Louise's curriculum fabric. In the population studies of the grade 11 curriculum, Louise looks at issues of the education of women.
She personalizes the learning for students, having them explore the histories of the women in their own families. She examines the changing roles of women in the world and the impact that has had on society and the working world. In keeping with her personal commitment to a non-violent existence, she does not glorify war. Hers is the gentle voice of a mother.

As a critical feminist educator, Tammy’s curricular transformations are underpinned by the particular political worldview which sees the world as a less-than-perfect place and which seeks to challenge the status quo in search of a better way. There is passionate commitment to addressing the imbalances of power experienced as much by women as by others who are disenfranchised by the master narratives of societies. Hers is the strongest creation of the feminist curriculum, the strongest "voice" for women and for other issues of social justice.

Aware of the inadequacies of many texts in providing multiple perspectives on global and social issues, Tammy finds resources which encourage students to think critically and to engage in very personal and meaningful ways with the curriculum. Poorly-written courses, particularly at the grades 8, 9, and 10 levels say nothing to women at all.

They’re fact-based, they’re theoretical, they’re abstract, and that would be fine if they were done in the context of some humanity but they aren’t. There is very little connection between learning about ancient history in order to learn more about themselves. To me, it’s profoundly feminine. The issues don’t seem to arise for the men in my department. I need to see the context of studying this material as being related to who we are, where the children are, where they can define more of who they are, and how they’re going to interact for the rest of their lives. It’s the only reason I can think of for teaching social studies. It doesn’t exist at the grades 8, 9, and 10 levels. You have to make it up. You have to bring in auxiliary materials. At the grade 11 level, the geography section does [women’s issues] very well. The history and government [units] don’t, but you can bring it in. You just need additional materials. There’s nothing for women. To be frank, [I think] that’s one of the reasons that students who are good at rote learning do very well in grades 8, 9, and 10 and then often have difficulty in grade 11.
The subject of Women and the Law is now associated in her school with Tammy; she is invited into the grade 10 Humanities program to introduce students to the issues in four hours while the other teachers cover her classes. Her discussions with them start with a video segment which depicts the legal realities for women in a Latin American country. A professor is exonerated in the murder of his wife. His impassioned act is culturally and legally accepted; she, after all, did not have dinner on the table when he was ready. The example provides the context for discussing women’s restricted and limited ability to act in society.

In another example, Tammy talked about how she has students in Law 12 look at four summaries of the Murdoch and Murdoch case. The case provides students an opportunity to examine issues of property settlement for women. Three of the summaries are written by men. Students have no trouble picking out the summary written by a woman. It tells the woman’s story, focusing on the details of the husband’s abuse and drinking and on the non-traditional aspects of the woman’s role in her marriage and day-to-day participation in the running of a ranch worth several million dollars. The wife who spent years running a household, raising children, keeping books, and actively engaging in other strenuous chores required in the operation of a ranch received $200 a month in a divorce settlement. She died in poverty.

Tammy told the story of a class discussion of conditions for women in Third World countries. A colleague had been present and had been moved to tell a story of his experience in the merchant marines. He told the class about the Asian women hired for very little pay, the only ones who would take the job of cleaning the ship’s bilges when the ship was docked in an Asian harbour. The women did an impeccable job, returning the stinking bilges to pristine condition, even waxing them afterwards. Then, as the ship left the harbour and the engines fired up, he had noticed all these little wrapped bundles floating in the water. These, it was explained to him, were the bodies of the girl babies which were thrown into the water and disturbed by the
undercurrents created by departing ship engines. Tammy's teaching style and issue-based approach to curriculum gave room and invitation for this kind of sharing; she had created the space for the telling of a story to enhance students' understanding of the devaluing of women's work and lives in Third World countries as no text or formal lecture could have done.

Amanda-Leigh's curricular transformations are mediations which reflect a woman's concern with creating for students' the picture of a world which is more democratically reasonable, balanced, and inclusive.

One of [my other objectives] would be playing down war, as opposed to highlighting it. If you were to articulate a difference between the male teachers in the department and me, it would be that I don't work hard at making sure those kids understand the military strategies. The Schlieffen plan just doesn't really cut it for me. I'm more concerned with why it all came about ... to play down war as an alternative to conflict. I try to role model and get those kids to think about talking through a problem rather than fighting it out.

Her mediated curriculum focuses on social justice issues such as the discrimination that indigenous peoples feel with regard to the legal system. She spends time developing the perspectives of cultural groups, of Asian Canadians, for example, in the building of British Columbia: "Who the hell cares about Onderdonk! We should look at who made the railway." And she attends to curricular omissions, including the women in history, families, values, and the environment.

Ellen gave two examples of the curricular inclusion of women: she had included women's issues as part of a fabric of social history. In studying Canada's historical development, she included a look at women's changing roles during particular periods, such as the wars or the opening of the west. She also had her student read the stories of the lives of the women who had political impact in Canada, including the wives of the prime ministers.
Though not a "feminist," Alison consciously looks at women's topics in her teaching when she considers it appropriate. In social studies 11, when students look at development issues, they may examine the allocation of aid money to "male" projects like big dams, machines, factories, and other big edifices. She notes that research shows that a smaller amount of money given to women and to education will have greater fallout for the community. She teaches wars if the curriculum encompasses these but tends not to focus on battles and specific weapons. She concentrates on what happened to people during the wars, the reasons for and the consequences of the war. When talking about aboriginal peoples in the grade 9 social studies, Alison will examine the role played by the Indian wives of the explorers. She thinks it was Mrs. Thompson who actually found the right river for David to follow. In current events -- she mentioned several recent news items as examples -- she tries to encourage students to consider other perspectives, including women's. Men, though well-intended, she said, do not see the limited nature of the media presentations of events: "It's never been pointed out to them that there are other points of view and that theirs is not the only one."

Prior to this research project, Joan had not noticed the absence of women in social studies teaching and curriculum. She alone had not consciously incorporated a woman's perspective in her teaching, though her curriculum transformations were extremely attentive to the diversity of human experience. She and her department, for example, had undertaken a collaborative social studies curriculum development project to meet the particular needs of the large population of First Nations students in the school by incorporating a unit of study from their heritage perspective into all students' social studies programs.

Nothing in these teachers' conversations about curriculum shared to this point reflects the conceptions which Miller (1990) presents:
Most teachers initially speak of curriculum as "content that we must cover or squeeze into" predetermined structures of time, measurement, assessment, or knowledge. One teacher spoke of ... "galloping across the curriculum" to reach the objectives that the "learning specialists" had specified. Other images that emerge in teachers' definitions of curriculum include those of entrapment or enclosure: They feel "boxed-in" or "confined" by the curriculum; some describe their work as looking for ways "out of" or "around" or "beyond" the mandated texts and performance objectives (p.87).

All view themselves as participants in a process of curriculum creation and enactment, embodying what Greene (1990) calls "curriculum as project, curriculum as possibility." Her post-modernist perspective describes such projects as ones "which ... enable students to find their voices, to think about their own thinking, to open themselves to others, to perceive continuities in their experience, to deal with disequilibrium and dissonance and chaos" (p.75).

**Theme: The Business of Teaching Geography 12**

The discussion of teaching Geography 12, however, brought to light the tensions and restrictions which create curricular and pedagogical dissonance for many of these women. Where they had freely discussed the autonomous nature of their approach to other social studies courses, discussion of teaching a course which requires students to write a provincial examination illuminates the contested terrain for women's teaching within the competitive context of standardized assessment. Explicit curricular and pedagogical objectives of cooperative learning, meaningful inquiry, and environmental citizenship are challenged by the need to cover content and to provide students with the academic knowledge and confidence to succeed in an exam worth 40% of their final standing for the course. Much of the exam focuses on students' higher level thinking skills grounded in the factual aspects of physical, cultural, and environmental geography. Teachers are extremely aware of the importance of exam results, used to measure in both formal and informal ways their effectiveness as well as to provide students with academic options on leaving the secondary school system. Of course, these tensions exist for many men
as well as women teaching senior examinable courses, but they may be particularly acute for women, given the holistic, integrative, and relational ways many experience classrooms and the processes of schooling.

A resource-rich and eclectic course, the content is massive: nine Ministry of Education binders (called modules) including videos, a physical geography textbook, and a supplementary global issues text provide the base of information. In addition, there is pressure to expose students to current environmental issues in both local and global contexts as some of the materials have become dated. The course is inquiry-directed and places heavy emphasis on field studies and field research which can create problems in the broader school arena as senior students are required to miss other heavy academic classes. Such activities must always be considered in terms of numbers of students and classes missed and planning time required to undertake excursions. Teachers make decisions about opportunities to include speakers or to have students attend environmental conferences or to take time away from content coverage to undertake research projects for competitions. There are critical tensions around students whose language or learning abilities restrict their chances of success. There is constant juggling of objectives of process, content, skills, achievement, and enjoyment of the discipline.

Yet this course allows for the passionate teaching of environmental issues and love of the natural world where teachers can "fly their own wings." Even the three within the study who no longer teach it return to teach mini-units or coach students for writing exams. Some struggle with the scope or nature of the curriculum but others feel bound by the ecological and social factors in which their teaching is contextualized.

Amanda-Leigh wants her students to leave Geography 12 with a love of learning. She noted that students and counsellors who timetable students perceive the course and her classroom as "a positive experience," an alternative for students for whom the rigour of some
provincially-examinable courses is unappealing. Her program, she is quick to point out, also attracts strong academic students. Her comments suggest, as others will as well, the broad range of learning abilities that teachers of Geography 12 must account for in their teaching of the course. The perceptions that the program, along with Law 12 and Western Civilization 12, is easier than the senior sciences and mathematics courses and that it requires less reading than history, for example, are commonly acknowledged ones within the secondary school system.

For Amanda-Leigh, the most important curricular learning outcome for students of Geography 12 is an understanding of their responsibilities within the environment; students are prepared to accept a role as environmental citizens. She described the contested nature, however, of living out that objective by taking students on a field trip which would necessitate their missing a math class. The math department, she said,

... [has problems] with our pulling their kids out of classes. We have an exclusively male staff in math, very old-school in their approach. The fact is they have 100 hours of curriculum and they want every hour. If you're pulling their kids out for something else, they will not accept that.

A math teacher complained to the principal when Amanda-Leigh took students out to study the Howe Sound watershed, questioning how she could possibly have the time in her curriculum to do that. Ministry guidelines for the teaching of social studies and Geography 12 place high value on such experiential learning. "A member of the social studies department questioned this math teacher’s understanding of the democratic process .... You have your humanitarians going against your math teachers." Reflective of her preference for mediating conflict, she said, "It’s okay to disagree with one another but you have to operate in a compatible, respectful framework to do that." Ellen too had described the perception that field excursions were "wasting time, not doing exam papers" as a tension.
Amanda-Leigh’s concerns also focus on the learner as he or she functions in the technical process of provincial assessment. She is perhaps the most articulate on the inauthenticity of the standardized assessment process; she has completed extensive professional development in matching assessment to curricular objectives, particularly for individual learner growth:

[The final exam’s being worth 40%] invalidates me as an educator. There are other ways of doing it. I am ultimately opposed to standards and product ... what product are we getting out of the teaching system? Where’s the accountability? [It bothers me] that the taxpayer can ask of you a statement at the end of the year [which makes you accountable]. That statement means nothing if you have no idea where the learner came from and where they got to. Our present system doesn’t facilitate that. We’re pretty good at meeting the needs of the fast learners and those who already know the subject. We’ve got that down to an art.

For her the process of teaching an examinable course is "loaded with tensions" which she finds "so controlling."

Echoing this focus on the learner, Tammy encourages students to stay and audit the Geography 12 course even if they have given up hope of passing. She accepts students as transfers-in from the senior science electives or mathematics, ones she describes as "needing a warm fuzzy place to go," reflecting her department’s philosophy that social studies, like society, should not stream or label into enriched and minimum essentials groups. She believes that both Geography 12 and Law 12 should be "inclusive rather than exclusive" for the importance of the curriculum content for students’ life skills.

Tammy’s critical perspective, like Amanda-Leigh’s, challenged the validity of exam-writing which she perceives as a "useless phenomenon." Students, she said, learn the skill of exam-writing, anticipating and decoding particular examination structures, a skill which has very little value beyond the provincial exam arena and for very few of them. Time is spent learning to jump the exam "hurdle to nowhere" by dissecting the wording of multiple choice or
essay-type questions in anticipation of the exam that could be spent really examining the course issues, the landscape, and people’s interactions with the natural world. In an exam-driven course, she said, you teach students to label, draw, and memorize. You are so busy teaching to the exam all the time that you cannot explore student interest or undertake application work. The exam is a "weight hanging over you." Though her students generally pass the exam, Tammy worries each year about students she knows understand the concepts and examples they will encounter on the exam but whose reading and writing skills are too weak to convey it well.

Joan illustrated her teaching of critical thinking in relation to manipulation of data with an example of environmental issue analysis in Geography 12. The curriculum is grounded in inquiry and analysis; she views her approach in this to be a negotiation of the curriculum:

Some parts of [the curriculum] are good, well done. Then there are other parts that I prefer to do in my own way. I do the physical geography my own way with labs and field studies and slides that I’ve taken on my own …. I prefer to do an overview of that. Then I start working in the modules (she is referring to the Ministry curriculum materials which provide the content base for Geography 12) and draw them into it. And then I require the kids to incorporate the skills that we’ve tried to learn into those studies. I know Louise does this too. We may take a map of the Carmanah and [the students] may have to determine the size of the area of the watershed: what area does it drain? where is it treed? what part of that [is MacMillan Bloedel] proposing to log? They would have to detail that [information] on a map, using the proper topographical skills and then interpret it …. I divided them into three groups: one group had to represent the Ministry of Forests, one group was the loggers, and one group was the environmentalists/preservationists. It was interesting to see how they drew the maps and created the statistical graphs to support these. So they learned it. They all had taken the same statistics. Every group had made them show that they were right.

Joan described student anxiety with her innovative approaches to inquiry learning in Geography 12. Students, she said, are very traditional in their perception of what is teaching. By grade 12, they have learned that learning is worksheets, note-taking, and regurgitation; "they
feel really insecure if that’s not the method by which they’re receiving the material.” When she implemented a new approach to teaching Geography 12 using the computer and individualized learning programs, students were not long in asking, "When are we going to start learning?" They relaxed when, the next day, she started to give them notes. As the exam date approached, she eased their tensions with more and more traditional "lockstep" classes. In an aside, Joan expressed hopes that younger students whose learning contexts are more consistently interactive and varied will not strain against secondary teachers’ efforts to implement more innovative learning strategies.

Joan spoke about other constraints she has felt in teaching Geography 12. She noted, in particular, students’ lack of geographic learning in earlier pre-requisite social studies courses, the lack of teacher background in geography, the imposition of exam specifications which dictate the emphases which each year’s course should take, and the pressure of time to accomplish course goals.

I don’t see a whole lot of geography in the earlier grades and I see even less of it at a school like ours where the people are not geography-trained .... so they don’t teach it .... Kids think you’re talking a foreign language. If you don’t have the basics of cartography and geography, then the rest of it becomes irrelevant. How can you talk about marshlands and the environment when kids don’t understand why that’s a marsh, what drainage basins are, or the water table, or terrain, [when they don’t understand] soil types that cause drainage problems .... Each year they tell us that these are the objectives that will be tested at the end. Well, I’m not going to throw out what I do because they’re testing that. At the same time, in fairness to my kids, I’ve got to get that in as well so I’d better have more time to get it all in.

Joan was happier with the previous curriculum which placed more emphasis on physical geography than the current course with its environmental focus; the revised curriculum presents another tension in the teaching of geography. The grade 11 social studies curriculum, she said,
provides students with a good grounding in human and environmental issues; there is, in her view, too much overlap.

**Ellen** described geography as "the best course there is in the schools." I asked her what aspects of the course most excited her. Her excitement was visible:

Resource management. [I liked] looking at the current channels and trying to give the students an idea of how the government is trying to meet the challenges. The whole idea of the geography curriculum -- looking at things like the BC Roundtable, sustainability, trying to confront the students with the challenges and trying to get them involved. That really excites me. I made them do these research papers and I had kids who weren't the biggest academic stars ... going down to the offices of the Environmental Assessment and Review at the federal government, picking up material, standing in front of the class, and giving really good presentations. What I liked best about that course were the presentations the students did. I didn't ask them to do videos but some of them did exciting videos and picked good topics like the Squamish highway or the location of the Coquihalla or wildlife population. They just seemed to know intuitively what was good and they did it. That was just tremendous.

For Ellen, the constraints in teaching Geography 12 are framed against the reality of no longer having the status or "notoriety of teaching the grade 12 classes," as she put it. The last year she taught it, 30 out of 33 students passed the exam with higher percentages than she had predicted; the three who didn't pass were all ESL students whose abilities with the language predictably impaired their chances of success. "I don't have any doubts about my ability to teach the course," she said.

Ellen framed her discussion in comparative terms which further reveal curricular tensions between the old and new geography curricular emphases. "I couldn't NOT teach [Geography] without doing Environment. I like physical geography too. To me, it's not rote learning. It's a lot more." As a physical geographer, the present teacher de-emphasizes the environmental management part of the course. "He asks the kids to read the newspapers." Time that Ellen
would have spent on wilderness and environmental issues is allocated by the present teacher to preparing students in exam-writing; students begin in mid-April to practice previous exams. The students do well: "You can’t help but get good results." Ellen is invited into his classes to teach environmental issues in three class hours.

Her comments, particularly in the sensitivity and defensiveness surrounding having the course taken away, illuminate the notions of status or prestige and of ownership within teacher culture associated with the teaching of senior academic courses. Her reflections also give voice to the tensions which challenge those with a passionate commitment to sharing the explicit objectives of the current curriculum with students who must also compete in the arena of standardized assessment. Under the pressure of provincial exams, the teaching is turned into "stand and deliver."

You know that you’ve got to cover these areas. You’re being unfair to the students if you don’t. It’s not that I object to covering the materials. I think all the materials are great, but you have to make some tough decisions about what you’re going to leave out and how much of April and May you’re going to leave for going over the past papers .... If you didn’t have to do that, then you could do more student projects and things that I like doing .... It creates stress, a sense of urgency. You are not as relaxed, [you’re] a lot pushier. You go into class on a day when students may not want to learn about the beauties of podzols and yet you have to stand up there and do podzols [and identify] horizons. [Then you have to identify] the type of exam question: where would this [soil profile] come from? which rainfall and climagraph would this correspond to? .... I think there is a place for some commonality of assessment when you’ve got government scholarships and competition to get into university. But it’s not a completely valid predictor. It’s a pressure. The emphasis that’s still being cast on it could be diminished.

Ellen would like to see more time to cover the content, the course perhaps taken over two years with the grade 11 focus on student-based activities. The last half of the grade 12 year could be spent, she thought, practicing towards some form of assessment procedure. She would have liked
the freedom to choose the day to teach about podzols according to student interest. She is thankful that the science curricula for her junior classes and for Science and Technology allow her to be passionate in her teaching: "Ironically, there is material -- population growth, environmental management, energy -- a lot of the material that’s in Geography 12 that I love to teach."

Alison's comments reinforce the more academic, traditional view of teaching and assessment in her approach to Geography 12. Her comments must also be contextualized within the highly academic environment where she teaches. She found nothing problematic in teaching a provincially-examinable senior course, though she considers the exam to be "airy-fairy." Her exams, she said, are more rigorous; students are trained to interpret data. The tradition of testing student learning is, in her view, a well-entrenched and valid one. She "forgets" there is an exam and does not refer to the exam specs or the curriculum guide, teaching instead what she thinks is important. She has been teaching geography all her life and is trained in the European tradition in which, she explains, geography, grounded in research, is a separate discipline, rather than the integrated and often subsumed form it takes in the social studies tradition of North American education.

Alison also wondered if there shouldn’t be some assessment of students’ reasons for choosing Geography 12. She has found that many ESL students choose geography, mistakenly believing it has less reading than, say, history. This comment provides an interesting comparison to the awarenesses of Tammy or Amanda-Leigh, for example, that Geography 12 is perceived of as a safe environment for and by students whose academic abilities are limited. It also suggests the very different composition of student populations and academic climates which frame these teachers’ experience of classrooms, curriculum, and schools.
Two weeks before the exam, she reviews some previous sample exams. Alison's students do well academically; the school upholds an extremely academic tradition, ranking high in provincial government exam and scholarship results. She consistently has a first-place winner in the national geography essay writing contest where the prize is $1000. Students are provided other opportunities to compete and are often successful in these, winning money and travel prizes. They are well-grounded in the nature of academic endeavour by the social science tradition of Alison's teaching.

Yet, there is no question about the others' commitment to students' intellectual achievement. In Louise's district, for example, where scholarship is prized, she enjoys encouraging and tutoring the scholarship students. She has loved being involved in the marking of provincial exams; she has learned so much from the experience, she said. She has had a passionate commitment to enacting the curriculum which she helped create. Her students generally do well.

The principal was just ecstatic. I could do what I wanted -- field trips, equipment. He never asked, how did I do it? what was I teaching? why did I do it this way? I was just allowed to free-float.

Annually, one of Louise's students also wins one of the national geography society's $1000 prizes for geographic research. Her students all undertake independent research projects. Geography classes are taken on field excursions. Their success and their enjoyment of the learning experiences she provides is important to her. On leave from the district this year, she is pleased that the principal asked her to come back to help the new geography teacher with his preparing geography students for the research essay contest and the exam in June. Their joint efforts have produced another winner, a girl who undertook a historical geographic study of a
small local island facing major development; tangentially, a teacher new to the course has also experienced success in the opportunity to learn from Louise.

Yet Louise feels confined in the freedom to explore student inquiry by the structure of the school day which fragments learning into discrete one-hour blocks:

> I don’t really like those constrictions, the bells ringing when I’m not ready for them and someone else’s imposition of that on me. I like more intellectual freedom than that. Something should end when it’s a natural time to end, not because a bell has gone.

> I think we use [one-hour blocks] in the wrong way. I don’t think there’s any reason in the world why really good scholarship students shouldn’t take all the minutes ... they need to do a good job on their essay. Who’s to say that an hour is the right time? Why do the statisticians think that’s so important?

She also has concerns about how exam results are construed and about the perception of some that geography is a soft academic subject. We value cooperation and learner-focused teaching, she said, but at the end, students "get a content-based exam ... that is used to judge teacher quality, quality results, and what students can do with their futures."

In concluding this look at teachers’ curricular and pedagogical negotiations, it is apparent that the analysis of the teachers’ experience of teaching Geography 12 is more multilayered than previous discussions we’d had about social studies curriculum and pedagogy. Their description of relatively autonomous work in the regular social studies classroom contrasts with the conflicted experience five of these women have in transforming their more cooperative, inquiry-directed visions of social studies teaching to the competitive arena of teaching a senior academic course subject to provincial assessment. Their sense of autonomy, agency, and control is more readily challenged by students, colleagues, administrators, even parents (as suggested by Amanda-Leigh’s reference to "the taxpayer") as the education system provides accountability. They become agents within constrained circumstances. Their discussions, diverse in perspective,
expose the contradictory nature of fundamental educational and social assumptions and procedures which intersect discordantly in the process of teaching and examining students at the grade 12 level.

The conversations expose the gap between rhetoric and reality where goals of cooperation, democracy, egalitarianism, and community face hierarchical school organization, competitiveness, authoritarianism, and selection (Weiner, 1985, p.111). Their negotiations in teaching Geography 12 necessarily demand more skillful balancing of the rational and the subjective aspects of teaching in a form of praxis. They expose the dichotomous nature of being both scholar and woman (Miller, 1986, p.111). There is ultimately conformity; resistance creates the risk of being seen as deficient, as intellectually inferior, where achievement and compliance imply equality.

In the context of teaching for standardized assessment, the constraints of their working are not specific to women but are shared by educators who "live in a public and professional culture permeated by ‘an androcentric denial of teaching as personalized, nurturing work that bridges home and work place [with] the need to produce ... teachers who don’t contest their own lack of power’" (Lather, 1983, as cited in Erdman, 1990, p. 184). Yet, gender may provide another filter in women’s understanding, as five of the six women’s discussions of teaching within the social and educational constraints of provincial assessment suggest. Miller identifies this as the conflict between the nurturing and caring aspects of teaching and the goals of measurable learning objectives and student progress; it is a conflict, she says, of women’s "professionalization":

The acceptance of the notion of the professional status of teaching thus ignores not only the possible ironic and subtle manipulation of teachers by the external measures of success through the students’ achievement on standardized tests, but also the insidious lack of control over policy as well as curriculum creation (p.116).
Women, according to Miller, may experience alienation when "they feel they must sacrifice the nurturing aspects of their roles to the demands of ‘professional’ distancing that the tools of objective measurement dictate" (p. 117).

Naylor (1993) discusses the dilemma of technicism for teachers:

If the media were your only source of information, you’d think that much is wrong with our education system. TV, radio, newspaper, and magazine coverage touches a sensitive nerve with taxpayers and with parents at a time of change in education. They are persuaded by calls for greater accountability of the education system.

What does that mean to teachers? If we can learn from other jurisdictions, public demands can lead to significant changes in classrooms: more limited curriculum, increased testing, exclusion of students unlikely to pass tests, and teachers becoming technicians rather than professionals. Such changes have happened in some British or American schools.

The demand here for increased accountability for public schools was initiated by the federal government, corporate Canada, and senior university administrators. Corporate Canada is arguably the driving force for increased accountability (p. 1).

In Naylor’s view, the calls from government, universities, and "corporate Canada" for improved performance in the education sector are questionable, serving as they do their own visions of the national interest.

Corporate or conservative sources strongly support a concept of market forces: educational outputs can be measured, and productivity checked in the same way that business measures inputs, outputs, and profits. Measuring outputs by imposing uniform standards means more mandated standardized testing in schools, with teachers being required to teach to the test ... with disastrous consequences for developing higher-order skills or for recognizing individual students’ needs (p. 6).

Casey and Apple (1989) discuss the "industrial, military and ideological" roots of "the conservative initiative" which calls for excellence through standardization of curricular goals and materials. Professionalization in teaching imports business metaphors from industry. The blame
for the crisis of economy, cultural authority, and political legitimacy is assigned to schools and to teachers, most of whom are women. Importing business metaphors from industry, the drive to professionalize teaching by incorporating controls for effectiveness such as teacher-proof curriculum and standardized assessment erodes the quality of teaching:

Teachers are deskilled, losing the ability to make curriculum, and are reskilled as managers of classroom procedures. They thus lose even more power over their labour. Through the process of ‘intensification’ the quality of teaching is eroded, as teachers cannot find time to keep up with their fields, to think, to plan, to relax, or even to go to the lavatory. The understanding which sees the ‘teacher as worker’ reveals the sinister side of the technological solutions proposed under the ‘teacher as professional’ construction (pp.178-179).

Weiler (1988) too discusses altered images for teachers as education moves to increase administrative control over curriculum, quantify results, and test against uniform standards. In her terms, de-skilling, or removing the control of knowledge from teachers, dehumanizes and constrains teachers; it does not consider them to be scholars or independent authorities.

Increasingly they are seen as functionaries in a technocratic vision of schooling in which they have to meet certain prescribed goals (are the test results rising?); and women teachers are all too often seen as a traditional nurturing presence under the ‘expert guidance’ of male administrators and academics. But their valuable work as intellectuals attempting to encourage critical analysis of texts and society is rarely recognized (p.151). Eisner (1993) offers a personal perspective:

I cannot help but wonder whether this emphasis on standards is likely to move schools in the direction that I value. I do not value schools that regard children as an army marching toward fixed and uniform goals. Standardization is already too pervasive in our culture. We need to celebrate diversity and to cultivate the idiosyncratic aptitudes our students possess. Certainly, an array of common learning is appropriate for almost all student in our schools, but the preoccupation with uniform standards, common national goals, curriculums, achievement tests, and report cards rings in a theme that gives me pause (p.23).
He looks beyond standards for evidence of achievement to the quality of the workplace and the character of teaching in schools that "excite both teachers and students" about the educative process.

Discussions of five of the six women illuminate the contradictions of teaching when the notion of excellence is a matter of whose definition it is, and who has the authority to describe the ways in which it may be authentically assessed. Tetreault's (1987b) comment that gender is not often used to analyze excellence, in schools bears serious consideration in light of the ways these women define excellence as they teach for complex and integrated goals of intellectual attainment, critical thinking, environmental citizenship, social values of cooperation and caring, differences in the ways students construct knowledge, and the authority and passion of their own knowledge and ways of knowing. Casey and Apple (1989) suggest that women, with their "strong attachments to children" (p.182), need to find ways to give voice to the struggle against the gendered nature of schooling. The increasing social emphasis on measuring student success within competitive and narrowly defined educational limits serves to constrain those whose educational vision seeks to understand and celebrate diversity and possibility in teaching and curriculum. Within the paradox of conflicting educational directions, juxtaposed in uncomfortable ways in the arena of standardized assessment are messages that deny subtexts by which the women understand and enact excellence in teaching and learning; this denies them a major role in the public discourse of education (Kelly and Nihlen, 1982). Instead of controlling teachers' work externally and blaming them for society's problems, "we may first want to listen to them. Who knows, our society may learn how important 'women's work' is in the process" (p.184). Miller suggests that conversations, such as these about women's work in social studies,
expose some of the fragmentations both men and women experience in teaching and create a dialogue for mending the split.
CHAPTER 5: NEGOTIATING THE CONTEXTS OF TEACHING

The six women’s personal and professional narratives are contextualized within the particular and interconnected social and educational communities in which they are active participants. They experience and negotiate in diverse ways the political, professional, and social aspects of school, district, and other professional communities. Their identities as strong, knowledgeable women and as social studies educators are shaped by individual ideologies which have grounding in the complex and concrete particulars of their personal and teaching lives. They embrace notions of critical thinking and participate in the liberal progressive discourse of democratic citizenship and of social justice. Yet "teaching," says Manicom (1992) "is irremediably context-bound; context shapes what is possible" (p.366). The culture in which education and schools are embedded constructs and perpetuates male dominance and control (Gore, 1992; Spender, 1982).

This chapter focuses on the women’s stories of their careers and leadership roles beyond the classroom; the stories are about negotiating recognition for the authority of their knowledge of schools, of social studies, of teaching, and of leadership. The women’s multiple voices illuminate and interrogate the processes by which their identities as women teachers and leaders in social studies are experienced, ignored, or constructed within relationships of power (Weiler, 1988). I concur with the view stated by Freire and Giroux (in Weiler, 1988) that power is "both the medium and the expression of wider structural relations and social forms, [positioning] subjects within ideological matrixes of constraint and possibility" (p. ix). Walkerdine (1992) warns of the particular danger of women’s relationship to power "whereby power equals authoritarianism and absence of power equals helpful teacher and democratic relations (p.16)."

The progressive discourse of education, she claims, creates a "fantasy of liberation" for girls and
women who are confronted with the educational either/or dilemma of being "knowers" or "potential nurturers of knowers." It makes invisible the powerlessness of individuals within an "impossible dream, reason's dream of democratic harmony." The terms for their ways of knowing and/or nurturing are not always their own.

Analysis of the women's "situatedness" will incorporate the poststructural feminist standpoint (Luke and Gore, 1992) that the ecological factors for women's teaching are perceived and lived as both differential and gendered. In this way, their different locations and identities are illuminated, some of the different master narratives of power and authority as they are applied to women are explored, and the paradoxes of women's experiences within patriarchal institutions are made visible.

A poststructuralist feminist epistemology accepts that knowledge is always provisional, open-ended and relational. Our treks through language and master narratives on the way to this kind of knowing are located in historical and cultural context. This contextual character of all knowledge and knowing suggests that there can be no finite and unitary truths. So, for instance, while we might claim that male rule oppresses women in a near seamless historical and global patriarchal regime, the specificity of women's oppression as it intersects with class, color, nationality, history and culture implies that one theory, one method of analysis, or one concept of the subject cannot unproblematically be applied to all women in all contexts. Our poststructuralist feminist standpoints are grounded in the specific, emergent and conflictual history of the female-embodied subject (de Lauretis, 1990) and, especially, in our histories as academic women in education (Luke and Gore, 1992, p.7).

Women who locate their teaching in transformative social agendas for justice and democracy assume a political standpoint (Manicom, 1992) which challenges the singleness of theory, method, and concept that has described the generalized truths of knowing and knowledge in teaching.
As leaders, their stories are not representative of many of the women currently teaching social studies in BC; there are not many women visible in leadership roles in secondary social studies teaching. These are the stories of the select few who have become department heads or administrators or have served in some capacity on Ministry of Education Assessment and Curriculum committees. Again, it should be emphasized that their experience and understanding as related in these stories are not the same. Two kinds of stories emerged. Within these I found seven themes; five describe women’s experience as social studies teachers and leaders and two describe dimensions of women’s understandings of leadership and authority. Some of their stories are not encouraging.

STORIES OF "POWER WITH": TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Maher’s (1987b) discussion of the gender models of women’s teaching provides the frame of reference for looking at women’s experience of teaching contexts beyond the classroom. Women’s identities as they are constructed within these models are grounded in their relational capacities. Feminist theorists, she says, citing Gilligan (1982), Ruddick (1983), Miller (1976), Martin (1985), and Belenky et al (1986), offer the perspective of a particular philosophical and epistemological female style:

They argue that women’s ways of knowing are different from men’s, and that there are at least two ways of viewing any experience -- viewpoints that cannot ever be universalized as long as experiences are gendered. They have gone on to analyze the partiality of all knowledge, including its necessarily subjective roots. And by subjective, these theorists mean not only that all knowledge must be contextualized, and rooted in a particular framework and world view. They also mean that it always has, and indeed should have, an emotional component, a feeling component, that comes from the knower’s sense of purpose, sense of connection to the material, and particular context (pp. 95-96).

Women, suggests Maher, feel more comfortable constructing notions of power not in the competitive terms of "power over" but in more cooperative and empowering terms of "power
with" (Miller, 1976, as cited in Maher, 1987b). Wilson (1993) calls this a feminine or transformational understanding of power and leadership.

The most immediate context for all women teaching social studies is the department. It is their primary collegial context. Daily contact with the others of a teaching staff who share the same resources, courses, exams, and ideas is a teaching reality, one that most of the women have experienced as important and valued. Within departments where collegiality is valued, teachers find support, creative and intellectual expansion, friendship, and sometimes opportunities for enactment of their leadership abilities. Departmental leadership is customarily the first step on the ladder to administration. The stories related below describe the positive experiences all but Ellen have had in social studies departments.

In her third year at the school, **Amanda-Leigh** became the department coordinator. The principal viewed his coordinators as members of an administrative "team." The same cooperative, non-hierchical, democratic principles which govern her life and her teaching governed her leadership style. She was careful to speak for her department only after consultation: "They’re the department. You just happen to be the representative to the administration on their behalf." Amanda-Leigh facilitated a process of departmental engagement in collegial decision-making and sharing of ideas. Timetabling was a collegial process where each member got his or her first and second choices of courses and nobody had more than three preparations. A young department, they were friends and colleagues who supported each other. Amanda-Leigh never felt alone or undermined or threatened by the men of her department in her leadership role.

Similarly, when **Tammy** first started teaching, her closest friends were her colleagues in social studies teaching. The department members, headed by a well-known figure in teacher politics, were all men; they continue to provide her with a "touchstone":
[They] will be friends until I die because I know that they valued me as a human being. They didn’t say, well, she’s less than what she seems to be because of her gender or you can discount her because she’s younger.

Collegiality and collaboration were the trademarks of the department. As a group, they shared ideas and resources. Their families went on camping excursions. There was a social and professional interconnectedness that was grounded in respect and mutuality of endeavour. Here, she felt supported and cared for.

The present department at the school where Joan is now vice-principal operates on a collegial model. Though Joan no longer teaches social studies, she has taken her turn in the rotation of department head duties at the same school. She values collegiality. "It really helps if you get along with people. All of [our teachers] are men. I get along with them really well."

One of Joan’s roles as a social studies educator was to share her knowledge of geography with colleagues; "there’s a lot of acceptance ... we have a good group that way," though she could not say whether there was follow-through in the teaching. She continues to make her expertise available to the young man who has taken over teaching geography. As a department, they shared decisions about resources, materials, units of study, assessment, evaluation, and timetables.

She offered an example of a collaborative curriculum project designed to meet particular needs of students in social studies:

We have a large native population at our school and we decided to put a unit on native studies into every social studies program in support of their heritage. It used to be Native Studies and white kids could take it if they wanted to, but mostly native kids did. Instead of that, we said, it’s a part of the history and we put native studies in all the programs. Then we sat down and said, well, how are we going to do this? We, as a department, decided to allow time. We would pick up the extra time so that one person, Jack, could spend the time putting together the package and liaise with the native peoples and [we would get] the time back when when that unit was done. Jack took each person’s class and we set up a timetable for doing it.
Louise has always worked with men and women whom she respects as social studies educators for their humanism. She has had experience as the department head. Her colleagues provided her with many opportunities to share her geography expertise and holistic re-visionings for social studies curriculum; they were receptive to her input. She has known no barriers or impediments to self-expression in any capacity in social studies teaching.

Alison has been a department head for two years. She shares with her department members the opportunities which come to her because of her high profile in the national arena for social studies teaching. Her leadership style reflects a formal and courteous collegiality and a strong respect for the equality, integrity, and professional autonomy of the men and women of her department:

A: There are ten teachers. It's a bigger department than some elementary schools. I would create chaos here if I started to lay down the law. We get along, and this is a wonderful school to work in. I have wonderful colleagues. We get along because we all are courteous to each other and we all listen to each other's ideas, although we teach totally differently, every single one of us.

ME: How would you describe your leadership style?

A: I coordinate. I am the conduit through which ideas come and I distribute them to whomever. I certainly don't lead in the sense of [stating the policy and insisting they follow]. They would throw me out of the window or tell me to sit down because they are all capable people.

ME: Do you consciously work to maintain a collegial working environment?

A: Yes, everybody works at that and I just go along with it, as we always did. There really hasn't been much change [from the previous leader's style]. They come to me if they want things, and I facilitate their getting it. I often, because of my connections, particularly with the national organizations, get things sent to me to be distributed which I do when people want them. I encourage them to go in for various competitions -- like the historical geography contest ... and the forestry project ... we spread them out.
ME: Do you encourage their development as professionals?

A: Yes. I suppose you could say that. I am able to offer them opportunities for different kinds of experiences.

Alison is a facilitator within a department that has its traditions. I asked her about decisions regarding the allocation of courses within her department. Alison negotiates a discussion process with individual department members, seeking an optimal arrangement of desired courses and numbers of preparations. There is tacit agreement that certain members of the department are most suited to teaching the senior electives. Many of the senior courses at her school are taught by women and have been for years. Though there is less emphasis in her narrative on collaborative curriculum or course-sharing projects than in comments by the others, there is a strong statement of the importance of maintaining good human relations grounded in respect for difference.

For these five women, social studies departments have afforded friendships and places to engage in growth as competent professionals. They have been supportive places. All but Tammy have had the opportunity for departmental leadership. To varying degrees, the narratives suggest a facilitative, participatory, collaborative notion of the departmental context for the leadership and teaching of social studies. Helgesen (1990) describes feminine principles of leadership for business, noting that there is a "teacher-like quality": women emphasize maintenance of good relationships within organizations; as leaders, they are concerned with caring, being involved, helping, and being responsible; they view themselves as at the centre, not on top; they conceive of work relationships in horizontal terms as grids or networks, not as hierarchies; given the complexities of their lives, "they have no choice but to become well-integrated individuals with strong psychological and spiritual resources" (p.33). Studies indicate that schools where female values are predominant, have benefits for all participants (Shakeshaft, 1986).
STORIES OF "POWER OVER": TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Traditional relations of power are constructed in the vertical terms of "power over." Themes of collaboration, negotiation, sharing, and connection give way to transactions between those with authority and those whose subordinate position makes them the recipients of that authority. Wilson (1993) calls this a masculine or transactional leadership style. Bernstein (1992) links this leadership or management style to dominant economic ideologies which construct schools as agencies of symbolic control and which hold education responsible for the reproduction of individuals skilled in society’s productive processes. These skills are acquired in contexts where there is celebration of a "new individualism" and a dominance of the market analogies of competition for selective success or failure and not of collective and cooperative commitments to social relations and transformation.

Not all departments offer the kind of collegiality described in the stories told in the first part of this chapter. Some teachers have had quite different experiences within social studies departments, experiences that inhibit growth, are unsupportive and discouraging. In several instances described in our conversations, the lack of democratic, cooperative, equitable, and facilitative leadership has had powerfully inhibiting effects for women.

Joan worked briefly in a social studies department where there was little collaborative, collegial interaction.

J: In our school, teachers are very professional and receptive...

ME: Cooperative and collaborative?

J: Yes.

ME: Have you worked in contexts where that isn’t a characteristic?
J: Yes, I have. It was frustrating. You tend to shut your door and do your own thing, and it's not a pleasant environment. It doesn't provide the quality that kids can get when people cooperative.

ME: Was it discouraging for you?

J: I didn't stay there long enough for it to be discouraging. It wasn't where I felt I wanted to be to do what I wanted to do, so I applied for a different job after a year and left.

ME: You are happier in a place where you can exchange ideas?

J: Yes.

For Joan, there was the option of moving to another district. The stories told by Amanda-Leigh, Tammy, and Ellen of unhappy experiences within social studies departments also point to career decisions made for these women beyond the departmental level, that is, by administrators, which have, consciously or unconsciously, stunted or threatened to stunt their freedom to grow and move as social studies educators.

Isolation is a factor of teaching life for Ellen, as it is of her life married to a field geologist. She has never experienced working within a social studies department that has been collaborative, supportive, or collegial. Her sense is that her experience is commonplace, that teachers in BC, unlike those in New Zealand, work far more in isolation. There was very little sharing of resources when she taught social studies. Compared to the science and English departments where she teaches now, there was very little professional development in social studies.

Ellen described the factors of her feeling alone. Ellen felt exclusion as a woman; she recalled a department meeting discussion about a speaker from the United Nations. One of the men suggested that they didn't want the speaker because "she was old and ugly as sin." She and two other women teachers in the department got together to talk about concerns that they had
with such pervasively sexist attitudes that have, they felt, a way of percolating into classrooms. "We didn’t like that. We didn’t like the male clubbiness." The meeting and their discontent were kept secret. Nothing came of it.

Course timetabling, in Ellen’s experience, was not a collegial decision-making process. Courses were owned, particularly the senior ones. The notion of ownership appears to have gender dimensions. In her school, the men have taught all the senior electives for years, though a woman was recently made department head. The woman department head would like to teach history; another woman has a background which is suited to teaching law and would like to do so. The new department head would like to have Ellen teaching some geography again. Those decisions, however, are made administratively, and the new department head, in pushing the issue, would do so "to her own detriment," suggests Ellen.

Ellen concludes of her experience in social studies, "You’re working in isolation. You’re by yourself. You feel a sense of disquiet." There aren’t many opportunities to talk to other women about it; such conversations feel strangely subversive. Being practical, she has moved in her quiet way past the anger and disappointment of being reassigned, choosing to accept the situation, though there is strong awareness of the inequities. There is no avenue for appeal. She prefers the known to the unknown of another school. There are major construction changes due for the facility, and she would like to work in the new building. She carries on, working in her science and English classrooms now, to make the small but very personal changes for students who can help to make a difference.

For Ellen, the principal’s unilateral decision to move her out of social studies to a course load of English and science was a hard blow. A man whom Ellen acknowledged had both the experience and qualifications in the teaching of geography was given precedence over her after requesting a transfer to her school. Ellen learned very quickly that this decision was non-
negotiable and that the geography courses would not be shared and will never be shared as long as the principal remains at the school. The principal was "up front" (his words) with her: if she wanted to teach geography again, she’d have to transfer to another school. Though he apologized in private for the situation, Ellen still feels the humiliation of having a senior academic course taken away. She knows that her colleagues are unclear and confused about why she no longer teaches the course. Ellen speculated that the principal would like to have seen the load shared but that there was a kind of agreement or deal that would not be violated unless the teacher himself wished to share. The "new" geography teacher has several blocks of geography and teaches one other course of social studies. He will not hear of sharing the assignment. The courses are his. The concept of course ownership, paradoxically, did not apply to her. Ellen’s flexibility as a teacher made it expedient to reassign her. The irony of being forced to take second choice for being the more flexible teacher is not lost on Ellen. "I’ve got no power in that situation." Her voice, a quiet one, was ignored by the principal.

Her construction of meaning in this context is mindful of the hierarchical nature of power within the school; it acknowledges the fear of "backlash" and punishment for being "a bad girl," as she said. She has chosen the political expedience of becoming silent, of overcoming the anger, and of accepting the challenge to change. Her choice to move laterally within the school is practical; she had been "force-transferred" before and has known career interruptions as disruptive and distressing. Besides, she said, the teaching day is so very complex; it would take a "groundswell to raise the consciousness" and that could only be accomplished with more women teaching social studies. Women managing complex lives sometimes have to decide which is the biggest crisis or issue on their teaching agenda, she said.

Neither Tammy nor Amanda-Leigh chose acceptance; both were empowered by the strong convictions which underlie their critical pedagogies and their personal perspectives. The personal
had become political; the political became personal in the emotional toll that it exacted on each. In these examples of women teachers dealing with authoritarian impositions can be seen the detachment of rational "contract" language from the lived personal reality. "Board initiated" transfers are misnomers; these are usually initiated in fact by a principal dealing with a teacher perceived as difficult and have all the same stigma and personal violence within teacher culture that had been attached to the "forced-transfer" of previous teacher contract language.

At the end of her third year, Amanda-Leigh received a "board-initiated" transfer to another school. Her current department is very traditional, consisting of older men who do not work in a collaborative way. There are no exchanges of ideas or curriculum development initiatives. There is little social or professional interaction. Amanda-Leigh feels very alone. The collegial dynamics of her former department stand in stark contrast to her present feelings of isolation.

In Amanda-Leigh’s case, the transfer felt a lot like punishment. As a department coordinator, she was a member of the administrative team and expected to be "on side" with educational directions the principal believed were worthwhile for the school. "I was supposed to be a cheerleader," she said. She, supported by her social studies department, was on record as being philosophically opposed to a scheme to which the principal had committed his school. The opposition was supported by the BC Teachers’ Federation, in particular because it would create precedent for a two-tiered system of public education. All who vocally opposed the scheme received "board-initiated" transfers.

Educational reasons were given to explain the transfer: she would have an opportunity to share her expertise with other schools; she would develop as a professional, particularly in leadership qualities. But Amanda-Leigh was subjected to very unpleasant, condescending, and intimidating meetings with the principal, and later with the Superintendent, pressuring her to
come "on side" and develop as the "chosen one" on the path they had defined for her. They had, after all, envisioned her as one day advancing to administration. Things grew increasingly confrontational and uncomfortable for Amanda-Leigh. The principal tried to withdraw her right to participate in the provincial assessment marking committee. She was subjected to the principal’s anger; he shouted at her, pounded his fist on the desk, and paced the room while she sat. She was made to feel that she had been "a bad little girl," in ways she had never known in growing up. She grew quickly, however, and learned to ask a union representative to accompany her to meetings the principal would call her to without notice. Her actions were governed by notions of democratic rights and responsibilities, adherence to due process, and understandings of the process for educational reform. She very much saw herself in the positive role of an "agent for change" within the school; she has read Fullan’s work on educational reform. There is, of course, the irony of the principal’s positive comments in her teaching report at the end of her first year about her modelling of attitudes towards people and cooperative society which echoes throughout the narrative that follows.

The following is an excerpt from Amanda-Leigh’s letter of appeal to the board:

By transferring me to another venue, the board is clearly sending a message to other staff members, "do not speak out against any issue that is contrary to the mindset of the administration." The opportunity to question or debate the educational focus of the school without being punished will no longer exist. I am disappointed that I am being punished for having the integrity to speak out on an issue that I cannot philosophically believe in. I have openly exercised my deep belief in a democratic system and the adherence to due process by publicly voicing my opinion on matters pertaining to the educational focus of the school. As a Social Studies teacher, one would be hypocritical not to do so. It is my perception that, although I model this in my classroom, this is not an acceptable practice in interactions with the administration.

In one of our conversations, Amanda-Leigh had commented on the absence of women in social studies teaching. "Social studies," she had said, "lends itself to [including] the female
perspective of the world, not to exclude the male perspective." She had been concerned about how women are allocated to junior courses, "not allowed to teach senior courses because somebody owns them." Amongst other concerns with the intent of the transfer, she queried the educational rationale in moving the only "senior female Social Studies teacher in the district to a middle school," stating that she was the only geography teacher in the district to be involved in the Ministry of Education provincial exam marking committee, an opportunity which has afforded her important perspectives on the assessment process and on the curriculum as well as a place in the professional community and professional growth.

There is anger in her conversation about feeling threatened, unsupported, and personally attacked, not only by the administrator but by those who supported his initiative, by:

... being told you're out of line, you're too young, you're not allowed to do that, you're a product of the system, you're supposed to pledge allegiance to it forever. Being told you're hurting the school because you're going against what the school stands for. Being called into a principal's office and being told you're hanging yourself on a "falling star" when you're socializing with somebody on the staff that you hold near and dear to your heart, care more about as a person than as a colleague, and being told that they are the wrong kind of person to associate with.

She recalled being asked in her coordinatorship interview if she could be trusted. She had responded that she could be trusted to be a fantastic professional. That was apparently not the right answer as the question was posed again. "You know that you are up against ... a network of power that does not want to be eroded."

Tactics of indirect intimidation were not discussed in her letter of appeal, though the principal's lack of professionalism and inappropriately paternalistic manner was explicitly addressed:

It appears to have been difficult for him to recognize me as a colleague and working professional and not an upstart student challenging his authority. [He] has belittled me by addressing me
as "kid." I am also not comfortable with his putting his arm around me when engaging in a conversation. I have not questioned the principal’s authority, I have questioned certain decisions ... made without regard to due process and their impact on the educational focus of the school.

Pointing to his "hidden agendas dictating his personnel practices," she cited two instances where he had cautioned her against particular personal/professional friendships. In addition to questioning her loyalty to the school, he had accused her of "plotting the demise of the administration." His methods, she said, were "an insult to [her] professional integrity."

Though the transfer was enacted, Amanda-Leigh successfully challenged it in a grievance procedure that took eight months during which time she assumed a teaching position at another school. The emotional cost was high. When it became evident that Amanda-Leigh, supported by the Federation and legal counsel, would not back down on her right to express philosophical opposition and that she would not accept the Board’s educational justifications for her transfer, the Board settled. She will be reinstated as a teacher at her former school, fully recompensed for her department head’s allowance. Ironically, the principal and the scheme are both gone. She may apply for the position of department head again.

Amanda-Leigh had chosen to live what she had taught her students about standing up for what you believe, provided that you can justify it, as the right of an individual in a democratic society. The whole process violated her belief in resolving conflict in non-confrontational ways. "It’s a confrontational, unacceptable, archaic model .... It was a very costly personnel process," she said, describing the costs in emotional and physical terms, as well as financial. The winners are those down the line, though she knows that, despite "the tremendous [personal] pain incurred," there has been validation of the fact that she had been wronged. "Standing up for what you believe in, if you can support what you believe in and ... have a foundation on which to
stand, ... being an individual and true to yourself is absolutely critical." Amanda-Leigh’s story depicts a praxis-oriented approach to social studies teaching.

After Tammy’s re-assignment to her present school following her pregnancy leave, she was asked to assume an assorted teaching load of junior courses, including Home Economics, Drama, Math, and English. She was qualified to teach none of the courses. Contractually guaranteed only a job within the district, she was extremely upset at the prospect of returning as the mother of a four-month old to a new school and a hodgepodge of courses not in her field. Tammy sought the advice of her former colleagues and her local association. As a critical educator who taught students the avenues of challenge, she was prepared to challenge on a personal level what she saw as unjust and to risk the personal costs of being seen as a dissident voice. She fought the issue in a grievance with the School Board and lost. But a senior Board member approached the assistant superintendent and said, "She’s been dealt a bad hand so make the little girl happy. Give her whatever she wants at the new school." The assistant superintendent, in turn, phoned the principal, repeating the message. The principal phoned Tammy to say that she could have the biggest, best, newest classroom in the school and that she was to be the first on the new timetable: which courses would she like to teach? She was given an appropriate load of social studies courses. Yet, her victory was costly in terms of her image within the educational community; there were lingering resentments of her "use" of power to gain access to desirable courses. The real benefits, she said, were to be felt by other women returning from maternity leave.

In her present school, the social studies department at that time, again all-male, was notorious: the resource room had a door sign that said "Male Room" and offensive posters hung on the wall. Jokes and innuendo heightened her feelings of exclusion. There were signs of
relenting only when Tammy stopped attending department meetings. Some of the men have since moved on.

When asked if she’d ever considered departmental leadership, she told the following story. Shortly after she arrived at the school, an administrator with whom she had worked previously asked her opinion of ways to improve the social studies department, suggesting that he wanted her to replace the man doing the job. There was, in Tammy’s view, a lot that needed to be done and she was prepared to consider the job; she took the task of outlining suggestions for improvement seriously, compiling a list of twenty recommendations. The principal took the list to the then-head, telling him that these were ways that Tammy would clean things up in the department if she ran it. A year later, the principal relieved the head of his duties and replaced him with another man with whom he had made a similar deal.

It was intentional on the principal’s part. Since then, I’ve never had any aspirations to lead anybody anywhere. It felt like a sucker punch. It made a worse mess of the situation. I had my fingers well and truly burned.

Collegial relations have been strained since. Tammy thinks she will never be asked to be department head, though her input is considered: recently, the current department head came to ask her endorsement of a first-year male teacher for department headship next year. She was uncertain that he understood how his request tapped into the anger of not being acknowledged or recognized for her knowledge, experience, and qualifications and for the contributions she has made in academic, professional, and practical ways to the teaching of social studies.

Like Amanda-Leigh, Tammy misses the special and encouraging relationships of her former department and has kept in touch with them. Like Ellen, she too works very much on her own; there is a feeling of isolation. The men call on her to teach about women’s issues. They do not invite her collaboration in adding her woman’s perspective to their own curricular
transformations. Tammy has learned to confine her critical perspective to the curriculum and
classroom dynamics:

It's a pretty stable situation now. I feel like a bit of a badger. They know you're there, they know how you fight, and they leave you alone because of it. They just kind of respect your territory.

Tammy also recalled the principal who systematically reassigned the women teachers in the school to junior course loads:

He changed the entire structure of the school so that women were teaching only junior high school subjects .... The only exception to that in any department was in Home Ec and in Social Studies with me and that was because I was just so angry with him. I think I frightened him by how angrily I lashed out at him ... it certainly surprised him at the very least .... [He was] a real traditional kind of guy. I liked him because he would make decisions. Normally, for any issue other than dealing with women, he had a pretty strong sense of intellectual balance. He could support his decisions with good reasons. The only real exception I saw to that was his treatment of women on staff and it was characterized by the most appalling lack of sensitivity and chauvinism. It was just unbelievable .... The "old boys' network" was so strong at the school. This fellow was kind of a "classic" administrator who pooled young, aggressive, just-recently-graduated men around him and that was the entourage he constantly had. If he spoke to a woman, it was about what colour the lockers should be painted or where the silk plants that he was thinking about buying to enhance the atmosphere of the school should be placed. That was our realm of knowledge, I guess. He just absolutely refused to accept that women could do other things. He ignored it. He couldn't see it.

Tammy and I talked about punishment. Though there had been none with the principal described in her story above, there had been hefty consequences for her response to another principal. She spoke of him with dispassionate detachment and laughter. She recalled "watching him talk," though in fact, he had yelled at her within hearing of a class of 30 students. He had taken up a complaint from a male social studies teacher unhappy about something she had said in a department meeting; the matter of the male colleague's unprofessionalism in not approaching
her directly before going to the principal as required by the teachers’ code of ethics was not addressed.

The principal took it upon himself to ... tell me very strongly that I had no right to say anything to an older member of the department, that I had just better kowtow and be nicer and be more feminine with other department members and not as rigorous in expressing my opinion. I watched him talk for quite a while, and then I thought, why am I watching him talk? So I told him to come back when he could be more coherent. What an assinine thing to do to your boss, right? And I closed the door on him! .... The next year, did I suffer! I had 246 students registered in my classes. I had the largest class size by far .... He refused to do anything about it, refused to give me access to any kind of a marker although other teachers with large classes had markers. To this day, he still has trouble talking to me. I think he wasn’t pleased with my response!

Many of Alison’s experiences were discussed off the record, but she spoke with barely concealed outrage about the "old boys’ network" which operates, in her experience, not at the school level but in contexts beyond. Being independent and outspoken, she has challenged the status quo, her questions directed squarely at issues of power and opportunity used to constrain women, issues she had not known in teaching outside BC:

I got the shock of my life. I met this narrow attitude, this "myopia" .... I’d never come across this impression that I was totally insignificant and that all my learning was of absolutely no consequence, that my opinions were not counted .... It’s an attitude towards women because of the strength of the "old boys’ network" .... Women, to get where they’re going, have to be more qualified and more experienced than males. On the other hand, that makes them a threat. So it’s a Catch-22 and I don’t know how it’s going to be solved.

In Alison’s school district, those who seek leadership within departments are screened for a department head pool by a five-member selection committee in a process defined by agreement between the board and its teachers’ association. A young man with four years’ teaching experience was appointed acting social studies department head at a school in her district, a
young man not in the pool. The pool, consisting of Alison, two other women, and several men, was ignored in this appointment. Alison challenged the board's figures which showed that 30% of department heads were women, demonstrating that only 8.8% were women heading academic departments in the district. They thanked her for the information. A year later, she was appointed head of the department at her own school. Since then, she has applied for administrative advancement but is aware of the perception that she is "the pea beneath the proverbial mattress," as one board official called her. For her critical perspective on the misuse of power and authority in a number of situations, she had received a letter acknowledging her acceptance to the pool but including a warning to "conduct herself in a professional and consistent manner," which clearly meant to restrain her tendency to express opinions on matters of business-as-usual.

"I do not think there's a gender problem in the schools at all," she said. But she spoke of a "certain cameraderie" within male professional groups beyond the schools which works to identify as threatening strong women teachers who ask for their share of the power. She referred to power in the hands of those lower down the ladder in the social studies context as a "little boys' network":

If you point out that that is not necessarily the only way of looking at something, instantly you are not [seen as cooperative], that you are [trying] to change the requirements, and then you are a threat to them. So you're not allowed in the power structure. Once [they’re] in the power structure, as the "little boys’ network" is now, never mind the "old boys’ network" -- it’s just been taken over by the "little boys" -- they’re never going to let women in and social studies seems to be the worst.

These "little boys" show up in the lower level administrative role as participants and leaders in Ministry social studies committees and professional associations; it is here that she has
experienced being ignored, as well as denigrating and disrespectful gender jokes, both effectively trivializing the expertise and experience she brings to these contexts.

Cunnison says of gender joking,

[It] is almost entirely initiated by men. It is men defining women at work in sexual, domestic, or maternal terms, terms which detract from their image as professionals. As such it is a put-down, a way of controlling and subordinating women and one mechanism among others which militates against their promotion. The stereotype of the woman teacher is used to pass judgment on women teachers’ commitment, competence, and confidence (p.166)

Alison has little patience with the "silliness and the politics of the whole thing." Believing herself to be the equal to any person in teaching, Alison has exposed the contradiction that equality is defined by very clear rules articulated by those with vested interest in gender role expectations of compliance and obedience. She is, she knows, expected to behave herself on their terms for women’s behaviour; she has chosen to speak in the traditional, objective, and individual language that is reserved for men. Her self-identity as a strong knowledgeable person with the right to speak with authority and to seek respect as a scholar is a traditional choice, yet it confronts and is constrained by social constructions of women’s identities and manners of speaking. Her traditional choices, though entirely appropriate for men, are perceived as unbecoming in a woman and therefore invalidated.

Shakeshaft (1986) identifies the gender crisis in education; her argument extends to women’s experience of systemic gender inequity:

There is a myth that the culture of schools is female and that traditional female behaviour is rewarded while traditional male behaviour is punished .... The evidence shows that they are certainly not a nurturing environment for females.

Two messages emerge repeatedly from the research on gender and schooling. First, what is good for males is not necessarily good for females. Second, if a choice must be made, the education
establishment will base policy and instruction on that which is good for males (pp.7-8).

Educational goals, school structure, instructional techniques, classroom dynamics, curriculum, special education programs, and school climate, says Shakeshaft, are all limiting factors in the educational and personal choices of girls and women in schools. Females do not get either equal treatment or equal outcome in most schools. Discussions of excellence which have emerged in education since the release of *A Nation at Risk* in the US in 1983, she says, ignore the contributions of women in schools, rendering them invisible. "The unwelcoming environment that female students experience also surrounds female teachers and administrators" (Shakeshaft, p.502). Connell (1985) refers to institutionalized patterns of gender relations in schools as gender regimes, noting the strong link between authority and adult heterosexual masculinity where systems of power are administered by male officials, principals, and subject heads. Shakeshaft's discussion of whether the perception of location of the gender problem is in schools or within schooling parodies the conservative rhetoric which focuses on excellence at the expense of equity in the US. The hostile environment for girls and women is a major crisis and would be viewed as "an act of war" if such a limiting and harmful environment were imposed on males by "an unfriendly and foreign power." Schooling puts women as "truly a gender at risk" (p.503).

**NARRATIVE THEMES**

There are recurring and powerful themes of experience which are woven in as particulars throughout the collective narrative. "Our most salient gift here is our regard for the particular, that microscopic knowledge often ridiculed by men, which tells us that each event is different and deserving of full attention" (Nemiroff, 1987, p.535). Analysis of these themes untangles the knots of discontent and anger, removes the focus from the effects, and places it on ways in which distress and constriction have been imposed in conscious and unconscious ways upon women.
who negotiate personal and professional notions of participatory citizenship and democratic egalitarianism within master narratives of hierarchy and patriarchy. As a "consciousness raising" strategy, the effects, in their particularity, are essential. "When words disappear, actions dissipate," (p.535) as Nemiroff says.

Theme: Women and Anger

Women, states Lerner (1986), are socialized to be nice. We may keep our anger to ourselves to avoid open conflict, and "we may avoid making clear statements about what we think and feel, when we suspect that such clarity would make another person uncomfortable and expose differences between us" (p.5). Nice ladies are not angry; angry women become scapegoats "for men who dread female anger and for women who wish to avoid their own" (p.9). Women's anger is thus trivialized as "bitchiness" or as a "personality problem." Repressed anger, however, exacts high personal costs in women's emotional and intellectual lives. Learning to acknowledge anger, to identify its true sources, and to vent it appropriately to challenge, rather than maintain, the status quo means using "'anger energy’ in the service of our own dignity and growth" (p.10). In Nemiroff's (1987) words,

> We must not underestimate the energy trapped by women’s anger; we must draw upon it. Millennia of oppression create a form of existential anger. In women this is often turned into a self-destructive sense of despair and impotence. It is important for us to touch upon this anger, vent it, dispassionately examine it, and then redirect it as energy towards transformation in our own lives and the social order in which we live (p.539).

Tammy's and Amanda-Leigh's anger was ultimately transformative, but both would have preferred to avoid the combative arena of grievance procedures. Alison had not recognized how angry she was until she became involved in this study; she can hear the anger in her words as she reads. Her anger is re-directed to challenging the social order, as we will see later in this
chapter. For Ellen, this research project has been an opportunity, in sharing her anger, to overcome the discouragement which comes from turning anger inwards.

Their is the anger of not being acknowledged as strong, knowledgeable women passionately committed to issues of justice in ways that are not only professional but very personal and political. Culley (1985) argues for women's accepting the authority of their intellect, imagination, and passion; "part of that picture is the authority of our anger" (p. 215). The anger of these stories is essential for action.

Only when our anger has been felt and acknowledged, not denied, when it has been demonstrated to be grounded in a personal and collective sense of self-worth and not their opposite, can we hope that our students will join us in the remaining work ... of affirmation and social change (p.216).

Interestingly, Riddell (1989) suggests that younger women teachers are more likely to be aware of the contradictions inherent in traditional schools.

The fact that women do not share a common perspective on male/female power relations clearly makes it difficult for them to unite in challenging their unequal position. In turn, the lack of a unified political stance makes it difficult for individual women to challenge injustice (p.136).

Anger suppressed or isolated or negated has no potential for the transformative, collective affirmation of women’s worth and women’s work. The feminist agenda seeks to validate women’s anger by seeking change. However, as Connell (1985) notes in his study of gender regimes within schools, "the most common reaction to feminism among the men was scorn and disregard." He identifies a "ruling class style" of patriarchal response that assumes "women simply do not count in big matters and can be dealt with by jocular patronage at other times" (p.187). Another common response to issues of sexual politics was that of not seeing that there is any problem at all. Either makes for powerful opposition to change as called for by feminists. Both are powerful sources of anger for women.
The women's stories also provide evidence that women develop strategies to avoid others' anger, particularly the direct anger of men. Women's socialization to niceness and to attending to the feelings of others can make them uncomfortable with confrontation and aggression. Interestingly, some of these strategies have a "subversive" undertone to them. Meeting with other women to share common concerns, as Ellen did, or protesting offensive posters and jokes, as Tammy did, are indirectly subversive of men's authority to construct images of women, but these strategies also subvert the processes of dealing directly with their own anger and avoid risking the anger of men. Both Tammy and Amanda-Leigh remain extremely uncomfortable about having to resort to political measures to confront the anger of men who expected obedience. Examples of Louise's strategic and Joan's maternal versions of subversive avoidance of confrontation are discussed as aspects of leadership styles later in this chapter. Alison directly subverts the gendered expectations of women's niceness by refusing the role of "nice lady" when she starchily critiques inequity and injustice in relations of power. This refusal to play the appropriate womanly role, however, has consequences. She is viewed as confrontational, "the proverbial pea," a style which has earned her "expert guidance" (Weiler, 1988, p.151) in the form of the letter of acceptance to the leadership pool which implied she had been unprofessional and inconsistent. As a result, she is vulnerable to being the subject of jokes or explained away in terms of a personality problem, both strategies serving to obscure and trivialize the serious content of her message.

All the stories indicate that these women would prefer to negotiate agreements and understandings based on dialogue amongst individuals whose educational and social identities and voices are valued and respected equally. Negotiation is associated with women's culture; it is a process which recognizes individual and collective capacities to act upon the world, to be different, and to gain empowerment and self-esteem through success in effecting change (Kenway
and Modra, 1992). As women teachers and leaders, they are adept negotiators within the patriarchal and hierarchical content and contexts of social studies and teaching. They negotiate and construct meaning around complex structures of power. In their stories,

... we see ... a dialectic between agency and structure and the importance of mutual support and a critical understanding of teaching practice for [those] attempting to work politically within schools (Weiler, 1988, p.124).

Theme: Women's Discomfort

Women's attunement to the importance of the subjective aspect of knowing places significance on feelings of comfort and discomfort. There are several undercurrents of shared discomfort expressed in the narratives. It is significant that all but one of the women alluded to the "athletic" nature of social studies teaching. (For Louise, the men she's known in social studies teaching have all been humanists, though she did note the disruptive presence of "rugby boys" in her classes.) Rutter's profile of social studies teachers had identified the "coaching" characteristic of social studies teachers as different from other academic areas. Though we have all encountered the humanists in social studies teaching, many teachers do bring a social studies/physical education background to the BC secondary school social studies teaching context; identification of the presence of a "jock" identity within social studies, in juxtaposition with the humanist identity of which Louise and others have spoken, illuminates another contradiction and level of discomfort for women in teaching social studies. In further identifying social studies as an essentially masculine subject, Ellen said, "It's seen as a course that a PE teacher can pick up an extra couple of blocks in, [a place to] maintain some of those macho aggressive young guys."

Alison's talk of male camaraderie and the silliness of the little boys' games, Ellen's awareness of the clubbiness, Tammy's discussion of the Male Room, and Amanda-Leigh's reference to the team and to being required to be a cheerleader all suggest a pervasiveness of game rules created
in the patriarchal locker rooms of teaching. They denote harassment, create exclusion, press for silencing of women’s views if they are not perceived as being on side, and define women’s identity in the most repressive of male terms. As Riddell (1989) says, "Teachers of traditionally masculine subjects have more traditional attitudes to gender issues" (p.129); some of the stories indicate that the masculine leadership style which derives its metaphors from male sport and from business is also quite traditional in its attitudes to or understandings of women. Many male administrators come from the ranks of coaching (M. Sadker, 1985, and Shakeshaft, 1987, as cited in Sadker, Sadker, and Klein, 1991).

Joan has no false illusions as to how she got her first job. Though her teacher training reports were excellent and "got her into the category," it was her coaching ability that got her the interview. As an administrator now, she elaborated on hiring practices: with social studies and physical education constructed as a "natural" combination, the hiring of social studies teachers is often based on their coaching abilities. She knew of one instance where an excellent woman social studies teacher was not hired; instead the school hired a basketball and cross-country coach with mediocre social studies teaching skills, "strictly Captain Video," she said. "I think that’s wrong .... Where everything else is equal, and one can offer the additional parameter of being able to coach, then there’s nothing wrong with hiring that person.” For the present, she said, schools are communities and hiring is essential to meeting the needs of the extracurricular programs which are a vital part of the school community. Extracurricular sports were a benefit she wanted her own sons to have, she said. There is, underlying this, a notion, for Joan, that "anybody can teach social studies." Perhaps we need to change the university course combinations or change society, as she suggested.

Joan can play the games according to the boys’ rules but the other stories suggest that women’s rules of play are different and that they are uncomfortable with aggressive play and
Helgesen (1990) identifies the prevalent metaphor of team sports which constructs boys’ games as good preparation for business and which discredits the usefulness of girls’ games for leadership. Citing the work of Gilligan, Helgesen points out that girls’ games incorporate simple, fluid rules, are social, and emphasize improvisation, flexibility, innovation, creativity, role-playing, and cooperation:

Females learn to value cooperation and relationships; to disdain complex rules and authoritarian structures; and to disregard abstract notions like the quest for victory if they threaten harmony in the group as a whole (p.38).

Current leadership models are powerfully male; they make many women uncomfortable. Women as leaders are expected to play by the rules of the boys’ game, their own rules creating negative identities for them. Women’s discomfort with the sport and business metaphors of education is further problematized by the lack of opportunity beyond the classroom to create leadership games according to their own rules.

Discomfort, for women, is also experienced in the ways in which their gender makes them extremely vulnerable to what Weiler (1988) calls the "expert guidance" (p.151) of male administrators and academics. In these stories, the power of expert guidance cannot be ignored. Used positively, expert guidance creates opportunities and provides support; Alison and Ellen do not have stories like this to tell. Where it takes the form of "sanctions," such as gender joking, intimidation, threat, and "violent action" (as in respect to transfers), as it does in some of the stories told by Ellen, Tammy, Amanda-Leigh, and Alison, it can be termed "backlash," a powerful force that creates "a harsh and painful climate for women at work" (Faludi, 1991, p.363). Backlash works to undermine women’s momentum in the job market; it aims to silence their "different" voices and exclude them from a discourse which tolerates only conformity.
Despite clearly articulated policies of gender equity and gender harassment in education, women continue to be subjected to the backlash in direct and indirect ways.

Theme: Women’s Laterality

Another theme which recurs is one I will call "laterality" with reference to their career paths. The term emerges from a statement made by Tammy in discussing response to lack of recognition: "You know, Moira, we’re geographers. We’re quite lateral. You squish us in one place, we pop up in another!" For Tammy, moving laterally has meant taking on writing contracts with eastern publishers. For Alison, there are the "national arenas" of geography associations, writing for a publisher, and the National Ministry of Education. Amanda-Leigh is much more attentive to her personal time; taking care of herself is a present priority. But she has committed more of her time now to becoming involved with professional activities in social studies and teaching. She and Ellen both have taken more active roles in local teacher politics. For Ellen, the lateral move has also meant finding a place in her current teaching assignment for teaching her love of the environment, spending precious personal time in travel and wilderness excursions, and taking courses in counselling. Louise has chosen to move laterally to another phase and another focus in her life. Constrained by the increasing demands placed upon classroom teachers, by the artificiality of the technicism in teaching, and by the fragmentation of the teaching day, she has difficulty with the idea of returning to the classroom full-time and is currently negotiating with her school principal for a creative timetable which would allow her the personal flexibility to attune what she sees as the natural rhythms or inclinations of her life to the realities of teaching. Though Joan has since moved vertically, she had first chosen to move laterally in leaving the district where she had not been happy. Implicit in the notion of laterality is the sense of autonomy and choice, albeit in circumstances of constraint. None have dabbled long in the angry and dangerous realm of "becoming a victim." Women, say Briskin
and Coulter (1992), often resist the tendency to characterize women, themselves included, as victims.

Becker's (1970, as cited in Acker, 1989) notion of "situational adjustment" wherein individuals assess the requirements for success in various contexts and turn themselves into the kind of person demanded by the situation provides a curious dilemma for women. Where institutional structures, advancement procedures, and career opportunities are described in competitive and masculine terms, the images of success may tend to negate women's "adjustment" to the situation. Acker calls this "coming to terms with a situation unlikely to be changed by wishing it so" (p.14), a kind of resignation. But Helgesen suggests that women reach out, not down (p.27). When "up" is not an option, there is instead resistance to the hierarchical in the form of lateral adjustments by which the women seeking opportunities for leadership in their fields appear to find professional expression in their own terms.

For several, laterality can also be measured in the number of roles "juggled" simultaneously; those with demands of family, for example, may tend to make career choices which deviate from the male norms of traditional patterns for "career ambitious teachers" (Grant, 1989, p.41), further perpetuating the gender stereotype of career ambition as masculine. Women with children or of childbearing age have traditionally not been perceived as wanting to pursue career goals. Joan's career mobility was facilitated by a supportive husband, not a choice for Tammy or Louise. Grant (1989) cites research showing that "few women who intended to return to teaching after a period of maternity leave expected substantial help from their partners with either domestic or child care chores" (p.41). In Tammy's encounters with the arbitrary and informal department head selection process at her school may be read another story: while it appears that selection seems to mitigate against choosing women who have critiqued the status quo, there may also be traditional assumptions about career goals of women teachers who are
also mothers. Grant’s research showed that "combining teaching with the care of children has a negative effect on women’s intentions to seek promotion" (p.40). Regardless, from Tammy’s standpoint, maleness seems a requisite for career movement and recognition.

All the women’s leadership styles tend to be lateral; most preferred collaborative, collegial endeavour to "top down" management style. Helgesen, with an essentialist notion of the feminist principles of leadership, claims that women create webs which attend to social process for inclusion, connection, and communication. "Women are more likely than men to empower others and work collaboratively to achieve group goals" (Shakeshaft, as cited in Sadker, Sadker, and Klein, 1991, p.289). There is discomfort for these women when lateral department structures are weakly developed or non-existent.

**Theme: Women’s Nurturing**

The labour market is not governed by rules of competition "where everyone has equal power and competes with everyone else" (Gaskell, McLaren, and Novogrodsky, 1989, p.24). Gaskell et al identify "segregated pools of labour," gender being one category for organization. Such a system depends upon credentials and seniority and is structured by internal variables of workers’ power and employers’ interests. Women, channelled into traditionally female areas, have "flat" career structures. Female teachers, in the context of market metaphors, are cast as negative identities, depicted in "images of deficiency and deviance" (Casey and Apple, 1989, p.175).

Tammy, Ellen, and Amanda-Leigh all drew attention to women’s ghettoization into junior course loads. Interestingly, Ellen had recalled meeting Tammy at a conference several years earlier:

She said ... that male principals see the junior classes as the province of the female teachers because they’re mothering and
warm and that the females really don’t quite have what it takes for the grade 12 courses. This is the domain for men.

It was Ellen who asked, later in our discussion, about men’s responsibility for “fathering”? Casey and Apple comment ironically upon research which attributes women teachers’ lack of commitment to work to their obligations to natural roles of wife and mother.

[The research showed that] whereas women used the flexible structure of teaching for shopping, household duties, and the care of school-aged children, "few men mentioned compatibility with family life as an attraction [to teaching]. More pointed out that teaching schedules allowed them to undertake further study or do other kinds of work." Whose definitions of commitment are being employed here? (p.175)

Connell (1985) also alludes to the gendered division of labour in schools, identifying the ways in which it is crystallized by school timetabling procedures.

The collective teaching obligations of the school are divided according to the different contents of learning (‘subjects’), the age of the student and difficulty of the content (‘grades’), the presumed ability of the students, either generally or in a particular subject (‘streams,’...), and a complex set of rules about how much time, and what blocks of time, particular subject/grade ... combinations can claim of the pupil’s working week.

This carving-up of the total teaching effort of the school’s staff already embodies some important educational decisions about what is learnt and under what circumstances. There is an equally complex set of rules, understandings, and agreements about which teachers will do what bits of the total. Teachers are very conscious of who does the dishing-out, who has influence on it, what principles govern it, and are often far from pleased by the result (p.82).

School timetables in BC are tools for entrenchment of women’s nurturing identity. (One young woman, on hearing of my research, commented cynically about her junior status in an all-male traditional social studies department: "I’m taking my turn ‘breastfeeding’ the grade eights!") Counsellors who place problematic students in "warm, fuzzy" places, classrooms like Tammy’s or Amanda-Leigh’s or Louise’s which are considered safe or nurturing, are also agents in the
process of reinforcing gender role expectations and workplace inequity. Often, these are already large classes, and students who require additional attention are more likely to place an additional burden on those teachers who are viewed as "mothers" than on those who are not.

The stories of the six women of this study show that some women are nurturing while others are not and that some women are more nurturing than others. Nurturance, caring, and other associated feminine qualities may be viewed as women's natural attributes, aspects of identity which reflect personal choice, or socially constructed expectations for women. Each of these women, however, would be devalued as an educator and as a strong knowledgeable woman if her teaching were viewed only by its nurturing capacity for students. Teaching to nurture and/or teaching for intellectual growth are rather dimensions of a tension which surrounds women's teaching identities. Tammy and Amanda-Leigh have actively struggled to maintain their rights to academic identities which also exhibit caring qualities. Alison could not be described in nurturing terms. Hers is an active choice of the role of the woman as scholar. Ellen, despite her natural inclination to a more abstract and dispassionate academic identity in teaching, has had to accept the gendered constraints for women's teaching for intellectual growth and to work at incorporating more caring qualities in her teaching style. Her relegation to teaching junior courses in other disciplines might be considered in terms of who has the authority for social and scholarly expression. Louise and Joan construct their identities as educators in active and individual processes of synthesizing and transforming the either/or dualisms of masculine and feminine, the rational and the feeling.

The stories suggest that education is enriched by the diversity of women's ways of teaching. The differences, however, are significant in illuminating how women's identities in teaching are negotiated and constructed. The stereotype of women as nurturers is constraining. Riddell (1989), in a study of gender relations in schools, found that male teachers believed that
women's teaching was secondary to their reproductive roles, considering it "natural" for women to take full responsibility for children's upbringing. Yet, "belief in the importance of free choice [was] used to conceal the power of structural forces shaping people's lives and to justify sexual inequality" (p.135).

In reference to progressive pedagogies, Walkerdine (1992) notes that:

Women teachers became caught, trapped, inside a concept of nurturance which held them responsible for the freeing of each little individual, and therefore for the management of an idealist dream, an impossible fiction. (p.16)

Walkerdine challenges "the assumptions about the civilizing process and the place of the 'natural environment' in it" which underpin progressive pedagogies. Confining women to teaching younger children assumes that "women's bodies [are] unfit for reason, for intellectual activity. The possession of a womb [is] thought to render a woman unfit for deep thought" (p.18). She suggests that notions of freedom from overt control in teaching are "a sham!" Such overt controls, hierarchically imposed, represent unjust and oppressive notions of gender which can erode women's sense of agency in career growth. "Gender models" informed by cultural assumptions of women's "natural" abilities with children work to confine them "to the devalued jobs of teaching younger rather than older children," despite as strong a commitment as men (Gaskell and McLaren, 1986, p.25). Collegial decision making with respect to course allocation offers women a greater sense of autonomy. Unequal access to senior courses "owned" by men is a form of systemic discrimination which further devalues women's work and which attributes status and authority for knowledge to men.

Manicom (1992) takes issue with women's underrepresentation in senior positions and with the essentialist and egalitarian notions of feminist pedagogy which reinforce the stereotype of women's "natural" abilities to care, collaborate, connect, share, and know in "women's ways."
She questions the political assumptions of feminist pedagogical goals of analysis and solidarity, asking, "Who shares? Whose sharing is blocked? What is shared easily and what with difficulty? When is sharing empowering and when it is disempowering?" (p.376) The fact of these women’s stories being the stories of a few who have gained access to senior positions is directly linked to politically subordinating and socially constructed assumptions of women’s "natural" place or identity as teachers of the young and men’s "natural" place as the authorities for knowledge. Such assumptions underpin a man-made agenda and process which is neither natural nor neutral (Lewis and Simon, 1986; Lather, 1992). Currie (1992) asks, "Who shall educate the educators?" (p.358) Women’s challenges are often questions asked of authority from positions without authority. Questions form the language of critique and reflect the understanding that knowledges are partial, multiple, shifting, tentative, complex, contradictory, political, negotiated, reflexive, and irreducible to a single truth (Hoodfar, 1992; Luke, 1992; Kenway and Modra, 1992).

**Theme: Women’s Voices**

The women of the study speak in different voices and different intonations from different places in teaching. Their actions and words depict women whose work is valuable and highly political. Their stories speak to students and other educators about the tensions of the search for personal empowerment through recognition and acceptance on their own terms. Yet opportunities in teaching to give voice to shared awarenesses and concerns, as well as shared joys, are hard to find. Women’s storytelling has a long history, but isolation and underrepresentation work effectively to silence the stories of women teaching social studies. Their narratives create a conversation which spans differences and distance.

Their stories are partial, but their collectivity suggests some truths about women’s voices. The women in social studies partake in a triangular discourse with authority, as women teachers
 integrally attached to political subject matter and working within the politics of institutional settings. There are, however, simple rules for their participation, rules which can be derived from the stories themselves and which women know well. Women, as working professionals, may speak when symbolically transformed as "mothers" or "playmates" (Martindale, 1992, p.334) or "cheerleaders" (Wilson, 1993). They may not interrupt or contradict (Lewis and Simon, 1986; Lewis, 1992; Ellsworth, 1992). Men do not support women who speak too loudly (Lewis, 1992). Women's stories should not implicate men (Lewis, 1992; Manicom, 1992). Women should not presume to use the privileged language of men nor should they expect the respect, recognition, and authority which is given to men who tell stories (Lewis and Simon, 1986; Pagano, 1988; Manicom, 1992). The message of the culture for women and others, compliance, is attended with consequences of marginalization and exclusion and silencing (Lewis, 1992; Lewis and Simon, 1986; Ellsworth, 1992; Luke and Gore, 1992; Manicom, 1992).

Lewis and Simon (1986) encourage men to locate themselves differently in relation to women and to themselves. They see that men need to move from the voice of authority to a voice of questioning in seeking ways to take responsibility for the oppressive social forms that deny freedom and human possibility. Men must learn how to listen, to hear, to see, and to watch in becoming more fully aware (Lewis and Simon, 1986). Women who work to find ways in which to speak as women in women's different terms face a difficult task. The tasks of "the fathers [are] easier," says Luke (1992): "writing and speaking 'truth' from the singular location of insider, an insider with unifocal and monochromatic vision, are not great accomplishments" (p.49). Donating freedom from a position of privilege is not the same as understanding and risking and challenging the power of privilege and the privilege of power (Lewis and Simon, 1986).
Manicom (1992) identifies four kinds of silence that women choose for survival. "Silence," she says, "is the underbelly of sharing" (p.377). When women are excluded from particular educational contexts, as they are in the discourse of social studies to a large degree, theirs is the silence of "not being present." There is the silence of "being present but not heard"; what is said is diminished or not acknowledged, its language apparently indiscernible to those for whom it is intended. There is the silence of "preserving privilege" which comes from the fear of saying something which will given offence. There is also the silence of "feeling unsafe."

The most obvious problem is speaking with authority, in both senses of the expression. "Women who try to be more assertive face a double bind, for they are perceived as 'hostile' females rather than as 'forceful' men" (p.32, Maher as cited in Culley and Portuges, 1985). "Conflict may be open when feminist teachers run up against unsupportive or actively hostile men in positions of authority in the school" (Connell, 1985, p.139). For Tammy and Amanda-Leigh, the critical/feminist perspective in teaching creates "the double bind [for women] of needing to speak and to remain silent at the same time in order to guarantee some measure of survival" (Lewis, 1992, p.183). For Alison, trying to interrupt by speaking the dialect of patriarchy has invoked the sanctions and the awareness of the need for safety. For Ellen, the experience of sharing concerns about misogynistic attitudes with other women department members felt somehow subversive. She worried that there would be consequences. Ellen's is the silence of "feeling unsafe," knowing that what she has to say will make men look bad, lacking trust in the system and in the support of colleagues. "The threat of social sanctions defuses the vitality of storytelling" (Lewis, 1992, p.177), reducing the stories to mere whispers.

Telling our stories of violation and subordination in the presence of those whose advantages are highlighted and challenged by such sharing, or doing so in the presence of those who hold the discursive power to subvert the act of consciousness raising as a
feminist method, is for many women a contradictory outcome of their experiences (Lewis, p.177).

Those who are accepted into the discourse of schooling do so on clearly defined terms. Louise reflected on her acceptance, saying she had learned at a very early age to be nice. She is accepted because she speaks appropriately in the gentle tones of the mother. She has recently started reading Steinem's *Revolution from Within* and is reflecting on the ways in which her identity has been shaped in relationship to men. Joan learned at an early age to play, and play better, the boys' games. The rules of the game do not exclude her or marginalize her to the bleachers of teaching, as they do for many. She does not challenge the coach.

Martindale (1992) has noted this imposition of the identity of mother and playmate as a phenomenon of women's professionalization. The problems arise for those uncomfortable with the competition or the rules or the sideline roles they are required to play, or the coaches' vision. Anger is the underbelly of the niceness to which white middle-class women are socialized, to borrow from Manicom and to paraphrase Lerner (1986). The refusal of the identity as nice mothers, players, or cheerleaders invokes the sanctions of silencing and exclusion. The study suggests that women do not speak in the single "different voice" described by Gilligan; Faludi says that such a notion continues to reinforce the subordinate status of women where "sex differences can be used to rationalize oppression." The tensions in the voices which tell some of these stories reflect the contradictions of women's teaching for democratic citizenship in a society where the terms for participation are gendered. Their stories are the narratives from the sidelines of social studies teaching, in some cases depicting the foul play for women who are not on side, suited to the sport, or appropriately respectful in their tones. "Their stories of violation violate at each retelling" (Lewis, p.182).
DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY IN WOMEN'S TERMS

The narratives express different notions of leadership and citizenship within the educational community, in the language of women. Implicit in the negative encounters with those with "power over" are visions of a leadership style which does not negate or marginalize the experience of strong, knowledgeable women, but which incorporates, encourages, and values their personal, professional, and practical perspectives and standpoints in inclusive and more truly democratic visions of education. Some of the women make explicit statements about leadership. What is abundantly clear in the narrative collection is the complexity and diversity of ways in which these women conceive of and negotiate relationships of power and authority.

NARRATIVE THEMES

Two recurring themes emerge from the data as incidental findings, adding dimensions which suggest alternate or expanded models rather than an essentialist or stereotypical model for women in leadership. The themes do not occur in every narrative but are recurrent and significant as women’s responses to the contradictions of their multiple roles and perspectives in education.

Theme: Educational Leadership

Amanda-Leigh has a vision of educational reform which places value on all the process participants, including teachers and students, in the articulation of that vision. Her close friends are those in education whose alignment is similar, whom she respects for their values, their intelligence, and their commitment to teaching, whom she sees as "leaders" in the teaching field, and who recognize the extremely political nature of enacting a vision. "My friends are the strongest teachers in the school." She cites Fullan in discussing her personal meaning of educational change and her sense of her identity as an "agent of change." Hers is a vision very much grounded in her understanding of Fullan’s (1982) work on the meaning of educational
change. Fullan says that many educational changes are initiated by administrators for symbolic political or personal reasons, such as the need to appear innovative or to respond to community pressure or to gain more resources. These changes are not real educational change, however, and are not neutral in their benefits (p.22).

Fullan’s research on innovation and school effectiveness has shown that the principal is essential to the success of instructional reform but that most do not play roles as instructional leaders. Change is influenced by the character and climate of the school as an organization (see also Goodlad, 1984). The principal, peer relationships, and teacher orientations create the school’s character and climate for reform. Fullan’s research further shows that effective principals talk with teachers, help them get together, and are knowledgeable about what is happening. Ironically, he cautions principals undertaking change that commitment to change must allow for teachers to develop their own sense of meaning in relation to change.

Amanda-Leigh’s vision of leadership is constructed around her notion of conflict resolution through a dialectic process, the "talking with teachers" to which Fullan refers, which insists upon the critical perspective that those who actively participate within and understand the system have a right to be heard; the voices do not have to be in agreement. "My goal is to keep those lines of communication open. It’s okay to disagree with one another but you have to operate in a compatible, respectful framework to do that."

She expresses her frustration at working in an "inadequate system":

"Inadequate" is more than just the money or the physical structure of the school. It’s the bureaucracy associated [with it], particularly in BC and the way administration works with their teachers. I can’t stay in a system where I am dictated to -- that’s not me. I’m far more intelligent than that. I don’t mind being dictated to if you tell me why you’re doing it and I accept it. But I definitely have problems with the present structure of the system [as I know it].
People leave the system because they are disenfranchised, she said. Pollyanna, the idealist who chose not to work for External Affairs because of the ladder-oriented, bureaucratic, controlling nature of government as workplace, has had to come to terms with teaching’s stark reality:

It’s hard to work in a system that doesn’t believe in or facilitate individuality too much. You’re being forced to condone or accept things that you don’t like. If you’re looking for improvement in a system and those opportunities don’t exist, it makes it very very difficult. Even wanting a minimal change that will make the overall school function better, a simplistic thing like moving the morning announcements to a different time in the day so that the whole school operates a little better, when that becomes a battle, you wonder why you’re there.

For Amanda-Leigh, being an educator has the attendant mandate of commitment to an integrative process which validates her vision of herself as an agent of change and which trusts and respects the holistic ways she applies her personal, practical, and professional knowledge to both educational and social realities. "I get a lot of satisfaction from challenge and change and new things." From this standpoint, she had asked nothing more of the system than she gave to students within her classroom and gave to her colleagues as department coordinator.

In her position as a school administrator, Joan is able to enact the role of educational leader. This role is her particular strength: "I like to see change and to find ways to bring about change." She is supported by her principal in developing and encouraging staff participation in the implementation of projects such as the creation of a Humanities program or the computer technology program.

In contrast to the administrative role of educational leadership is the notion of leader-as-business-manager which has its roots in the technicist "excellence/efficiency" programs and materialist reforms of the 1980s. Amanda-Leigh is opposed to the more management orientation of present administrative structures. She would consider a career in administration if teachers were not politically separated from administrators:
I can't come into administration in BC under the present structure. I couldn't leave the [Teachers'] Association and work outside of it. Should we ever get back to a more cohesive approach and away from this middle management [idea] -- principals are no longer educational leaders, they're managers -- then, yes, I would really consider it. [It] is one of the reasons I went for the coordinator's position when it came open. But I won't go after an administrator's position or even train myself in that capacity at this point until they restructure the system. It is one of the most destructive forces working in [the BC education system] right now, the relationship between A.O.s (administrative officers) and teachers.

Louise added another dimension, articulating some women's discomfort with the "business" or rationalizing of education. She discussed the principal whose leadership style facilitated her growth in the teaching profession. In his leadership, Louise saw the natural style of a humanist, not governed by current mandates of the positivist realm to measure effectiveness:

That man was a really good man .... If he felt that you were a sound person and knew what you were doing, you did it. He didn't write reports by sitting in the class for three lessons within a week and writing down detail after detail. He was around the school all the time, noting what was going on. He really had a sixth sense. But now it's all so formalized, so bureaucratic. The principal gives you the sheet of what he's going to look for beforehand and you sit down and talk about it. Then he comes to see the lesson. It seems so artificial. I can do it all, but it just feels so artificial. I really liked those days when there was more trust between principal and teacher. It had to be mutual, but if it was mutual, it was great. How I really evolved in my teaching life was on a series of [agreements of] mutual trust.

For Louise, administrators have not always been as supportive. She, however, has a fairly strong avoidance factor in her personality: avoid the unpleasant, avoid the confrontation, she said. Implicit in her statements is the preference for leadership which is underpinned by concepts of power with rather than power over and which is facilitated in a dialectical and respectful manner. The non-confrontational character of her personal style governed her response:

I learned early in life to just listen to somebody and go about and do what I believed in myself. I guess I'm not aggressive and I
don’t challenge. I would leave things, but I’m very strong in my own way. I remember a vice-principal who loved to rap my knuckles. I just learned not to confront him ever in person but to do it with notes, more indirectly, putting it on paper.

Effectiveness, for Louise, is grounded in trust and respect and is measurable only in terms of humanness.

Joan discussed two ways she had recognized, in her location as an female administrator, the influence of a gendered perspective. The first is an acknowledgement of the maternal dimension in her leadership. When Joan evaluates teachers, she does so through her identity as a mother: "My ultimate bottom-line is, would I want my son in this class? .... That’s something you can’t see other than from a mother’s point of view .... There’s something inherently protective that mothers tend to have." Being a mother can be helpful with discipline problems too:

I discipline some of the bigger boys differently than a man would. There’s nothing that makes them tell you what they’ve done wrong and promise to behave more than to tell them I’m disappointed in them. Boys have a strong affinity for their mothers or that mother figure and don’t like that person to be disappointed in them.

Less comfortable with the authoritarian style, she referred to women’s ways of handling discipline problems as more subversive.

The second aspect of her gendered location which has influenced her leadership style has been an increased sensitivity to gender issues within the school community. "I’m more conscious of girls that I’m dealing with and their insecurities. One of the saddest things I’ve come across so much lately ... is the abuse of girls in the home situation." She identified two groups of boys whose dominating attitudes make girls uncomfortable within the school community: the rugby boys and First Nations boys in their treatment of First Nations girls. She noted that racism does
not tend to be an issue in the school which has a 10% presence of aboriginal students. There are active attempts made to deal with these gender problems, but, she said,

... you're not going to change the attitudes of 16- and 17-year old boys who have proudly worked on these for the last 15 years and it has obviously not been stopped in their homes. In some cases, you also have to realize that what they act out covers a problem in their own lives. [Problems arise] if that's then supported by 4 or 5 other fellows who may have different reasons but who feel better about themselves by lording it over someone else and that may be because they've been so dominated or abused or the only thing where they've achieved success.

Involvement in this research process had given her cause to reflect on the gender dimensions of schooling. She was to go as a member of an external accreditation team responsible for the Humanities programs and would, she said, definitely assume a gender lens in her analysis of the departments. As an educational leader, she actively incorporates human dimensions in being open to and choosing to fuse, rather than dichotomize, the male/female components of leadership. Effectiveness, in Joan's terms, is also measured in terms of human dynamics.

**Theme: Mentorship**

Tammy's narrative described a further dimension to the vision of effective leadership. Her story begins to articulate the significance for women of leadership as mentorship. Often, the mentor has the capacity to invite another to explore career directions. Mentorship is not the arbitrary and capricious bestowal of favours upon those who are subordinate such as the senior Board member had bestowed upon the "little girl" who stood up for herself. For Tammy, mentorship has been the characteristic of her personal and professional relationship with Wanda Cassidy whom she first met in her role as education director for the Legal Services Society. Wanda is a social studies methods instructor at Simon Fraser University, a doctoral student working with the University of Chicago, and, as the only woman in social studies education
teaching at a BC university, an important role model for women who teach social studies. For Tammy, Wanda’s capacity to invite her to work in ways alternative and additional to teaching has made all the difference in her confidence and sense of self-worth as a teacher; the invitations were given in recognition of Tammy’s ability. Such invitations are extended by those who have power and can be powerful tools for advancement in both positive and negative ways; the very act of including one excludes others. Often, however, the criteria by which mentoring is extended to some and not to others are exclusive, elusive, and arbitrary. Women have known this phenomenon more frequently in its exclusive nature, where those with power offer it to those with similar interests and thus reinforce the status quo, a hegemonic structure which denies women both recognition and access to power. Old boys’ networks and boys’ clubs have long traditions of this kind of exclusion.

In contrast to Tammy’s story, Ellen’s story speaks in painful ways about how women can be alienated in a system that often does not measure leadership effectiveness in terms of the ability to mentor or facilitate human resource development in teaching. As one who has been profoundly vulnerable to administrative decision-making processes which have not seemed to place value on her contributions and capacities in teaching, Ellen has chosen the safety of acceptance and the practicality of moving laterally to other areas of interest. Her career plans have changed in light of her experience in BC schools. As there have been few role models for her of “women’s ways of teaching,” there has been no mentoring or active recognition of the importance in encouraging or developing her teaching strengths to offset the discouragements she has faced. Ellen values her collegial relationships but does not see these as mentoring. She described the nature of teaching as isolated. Like “ships in the night,” teachers go into their rooms and work in circumstances that mitigate against collaboration and development of collegial relationships.
As the least extroverted woman in the study, Ellen perhaps does not have as visible a presence in social studies or in school as the others in the study and has not been offered the invitations which have transformative and creative capacity for women's careers.

Mainly, I've gone it alone. I wish I had [had mentors.] Basically I was thrust into a teaching position, [expected to] shape up, and from then on it's been the same. I don't really think I've ever had anyone who's taken me under their wing .... This is how you should go to make the next stage. I've had to come to my own conclusions .... I think [the mentors] exist. One woman, our current science department head, was mentored. [The principal] encouraged her to go for department headship. The guy who was relinquishing the position said he wanted me to do it. I didn't see that as mentoring but as politics because he didn't want her to do it!

Under the circumstances, she has basically done things "under her own steam." She has valued the opportunity to participate in this project for the perspective it has given that "she is not alone." Such conversations amongst women had seemed subversive to her. The issues, she said, are important to address in more proactive ways. We must prioritize them, find ways to offer "protection" for women, and not get distracted by the many other things in our teaching lives. Her stories also speak of the importance for women of role models who are women speaking as women about teaching and leadership.

Issues of safety have emerged for Alison as she has tried to claim a place on the administrative ladder. Twice denied the invitation to advance to administration, she has since reconsidered her role in respect to the nature of the practical conditions of leadership. In our discussions, there was no mention of leaders who had mentored her career, though she spoke of valuing the mentoring or support of friends and colleagues in teaching. Her recent decision not to apply again for administrative advancement was reached in discussion of her career goals with her present principal.
Leadership is, for Alison, exclusive, removed from teachers' realities, unsafe, and often enacted in patronizing ways which do not recognize the voices or "different messages" of those whom it purports to lead. She has chosen to accept her "small" role of departmental leadership and social studies teaching. She reinforces the notion of laterality previously discussed: she has "carved out a niche for herself which may not be recognized in [the district] but obviously is nationally." She does not need the extra money, nor does she want the job's insecurity:

I want to stay where I am. They can hardly remove me from my job, unless I do something terrible. They’re not going to blacklist me in Ottawa. Working with the [National] Ministry, they phone me and ask me to do what I do again. It’s they who approach me. I’m in a fairly secure position. I can say what I like. It doesn’t matter that I tell the principal he’s not a king ruling a kingdom. I couldn’t say that if I were a vice-principal. Once I had figured that out, ... I decided that actually I was in a far better position and I would be much happier to stay where I want .... Human dynamics are very complicated. You ask the wrong question at the wrong time, you even show that you can think, even by asking the question .... [some] would find gentle ways to say things -- well, there’s a point at which I’m fed up with being patronized and so things do tend to seep out.

She can now critique the system in safety and she sees that as important, though she acknowledges the discomfort it can cause for the leaders.

Alison acknowledged that gender was an additional factor in her being refused promotion, but she believes that men who have "different messages" receive the same response. Women with strong messages may appear more threatening:

I think that my problems with the board certainly stem from a gender-based point of view, that [they perceive that] I am a strong woman and quite frankly scare most of them to death, although I am not threatening, and I don’t wish to emasculate, swallow, or castrate any of them. In many ways, I do have something to say that is different to their message but I know lots of men who have been caught in exactly the same way because they have a different message. So while I can say it’s because I’m a woman, I could also give you the names of men who have been refused promotion for the same reason. I think I have an extra [point against me] in
that I'm female, but I have more trouble sometimes with other females than with other men in getting my point of view across.

Her comments reflect her sense of herself as politically independent. She knows that those who define the models for leadership in her district do not give credit for independent thinking or outspokenness, extending their invitations for advancement instead to those who "don't rock the boat."

The power-to-invite dimension of mentorship is particularly significant for Louise who feels she has been "lucky" in her location as a teacher.

We've had good superintendents in our district who've always been supportive. I've never felt that there was any barrier in my way because I was female and that might be unique to my district. I was asked really early on and over and over again to consider administration: how did I see my career developing? I didn't [consider it] because my children came first. I didn't want to spend any of the summer with administrative tasks. I also didn't want to do education courses. I was more interested in the intellectual exploring. But I was given the opportunity.

Louise has turned down the invitations to become an administrator, not prepared to sacrifice her family's needs, her summer of farming, or her own need for a more harmonious existence, to the additional pressures of administering schools; as a humanist, too, she would find it hard to administer the sometimes "cruel" decisions which are required of an administrator. The support and mentorship of others such as the Berkeley professor and the humanistic men of social studies teaching who were all role models as well as friends have been important in Louise's growth as an educator. The invitations have, however, served to reinforce her sense of being recognized and of self-worth in a system which can undervalue the work of its teachers: "I've never had any barriers put in front of me."

Louise's vision of leadership reflects the value she places on caring and on connecting in the management of teachers as a human resource. Her story speaks of the personal and
professional growth which is possible where value is placed on supportiveness, collegiality, autonomy, trust, and respect. She, on reading this thesis in its developmental stages, has expressed the greatest concern for the loss that education suffers in not encouraging and supporting women like Ellen.

Joan offers the standpoint of one who has accepted the invitation into the ranks of administration. She was encouraged by her principal to apply before she felt she was personally ready to undertake that direction; she was busy playing basketball at the international level and didn’t see that she had the time.

When she first applied for vice-principalships, the positions were given to men. "It was ... an old boys’ thing," she said. Despite a district policy requiring applicants to have graduate degrees in progress or completed, one position went to a man with no graduate degree or any intention of pursuing one. He was the principal’s golfing buddy. Her qualifications exceeded traditional administrative profiles; she more than fit the criteria for acceptance on her own terms into the masculine world of administration. Her third application was successful; ironically both principals who had chosen to invite others now consult her in matters of computer application problems.

As an administrator, she sees herself as "playing with the boys" on a level playing field, though she acknowledges that other women’s experience is not the same:

I’m comfortable, but then I’ve always been comfortable in male company -- it doesn’t bother me, having been the only female secondary administrator in the district for four years .... I think that comes from learning at an extremely early age how you dealt with the boys from having to deal with my brother and his friends .... and also finding that there are very powerful ways of getting your own way with them .... they’ve always accepted that I’m one of them and I can do whatever.
The idea that women may be dominated or threatened by men never occurs to her. Accepted on her own terms, she has never been baited or excluded or not invited. Her terms are written in the language of a woman gifted in academic, athletic, musical, professional, practical, and interpersonal skills, terms that are in very essential ways unchallengeable credentials for exemplary instructional leadership.

As in her teaching, her leadership style is an eclectic negotiative process of reflecting upon and acquiring skills "that work." She debated the role of gender versus personality in her particular style, not wanting to split the model into the masculine/feminine dichotomy:

I think a better way of looking at it is that it doesn't matter whether it's male or female. What you take are the best attributes of those people whom you admire in roles of leadership and adapt and suit those that can fit you. Then you create your own style. It doesn't matter whether you are male or female. You have to have some female role models to fill [out the style]. You can take attributes of a male role model that you feel make that person a successful leader and you can adapt those attributes to suit you. That's the key: you don't copy that style. You develop your own style by selecting and adapting.

Her principal has been her primary mentor and role model in leadership, particularly in areas of staff development. His vision of school as a "people place" and as a family where all members are treated with respect governs hiring and personnel practices. She has learned by modelling strategies that have worked successfully for him in drawing out the strengths of the people that he's hired. Both work to maintain good collegial relations which are viewed as very important. "The other thing is that I can go in there at any time and shut the door. That's the key, you shut the door. The conversation is kept private. I can disagree with him and it's never held against me."

Joan laughingly said, with respect to the research I was conducting, that her narrative must seem like she's "from another planet." The comment reflected the way in which her
experience of schooling and teaching is not typical of the experience of most, either men or women. I reassured her that she was fine, that she fitted in perfectly. She provided a model of just how exceptional women have to be in order to be accepted without question into male-dominated areas. She has also described a model of a fluid, dynamic, and collaborative leadership style from which the answer to Currie’s (1992) question, "Who shall educate the educators?" might be derived.

**Conclusion: Negotiating Identities as Women in Social Studies and Leadership**

The complexity of the six women’s negotiations of the terrain of social studies becomes increasingly problematic within the stories as they move beyond the more personal and private worlds of their classrooms, within which they construct respect and authority in their own terms, and into the more political and public realms of schools and the broader professional settings where respect and authority are less likely to be theirs to construct and more likely to be contested. Within classrooms, they are relatively autonomous in creating and enacting their own identities and realities, though even these are structurally constrained and negotiated with students who have social and cultural understandings about women, teachers, social studies content, processes of learning, and dynamics of power. Their experiences speak of skill and resourcefulness in these kinds of classroom negotiations.

Beyond classrooms, however, the personal negotiations take a more profoundly political direction. There are too many stories of painful negotiations to ignore the difficulties women face in striving for their own identities as educated and critically informed citizens whose work, taken seriously, necessitates thinking critically about the study of human action in the social world as it socially constructs the acceptable terms for women’s actions in masculine language. Women’s work in social studies teaching is fraught with contradictions, as this study has shown. The stories told here claim the space to reflect upon why so few women choose to teach social
studies and why so few teach the senior courses which require the most authority for knowledge. Their stories illuminate the tentativeness and partiality of traditional knowledge and understanding about curriculum, pedagogy, and leadership in social studies and teaching. The stories pose questions which challenge others to think and teach critically about the content of the partriarchal curricula, the old stories or master narratives of education and of social studies. The old stories impose constraints in contradictory and systematic ways to deny some the democratic rights of equity, social justice, and freedom as persons to express themselves in their own language, to be heard and acknowledged, to be different, to care, to feel strongly and still be strong and knowledgeable, and to live without fear. The women’s stories invite readers to a dialogue of re-negotiation in which the master narratives which have described models of curriculum, teaching, and leadership are reconstructed -- transformed -- as new stories more inclusive of the diversity of human experience.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

THEMES OF THE STUDY

This study of six women's experience of teaching and leadership in social studies does not find that a single model or story is appropriate. "Models can only be restrictive and reductive because they cannot predict and thus cannot take into account the complexity of contingent and material realities" (Lewis, 1992, p.189). Neither do these stories illuminate a monolithic discourse of feminism; rather, the stories explore multiple feminisms (Kenway and Modra, 1992) as these are described in the women's reflections of their identities as women, as teachers, and as leaders in social studies. They explore the complex dimensions and possibilities within personal and teaching narratives for constructing new meanings and knowledges about teaching. Each story has something important to say and to teach us about the possibilities of narrative for exploring in more diverse and fully human ways the lives of teachers as social actors.

Within the women's personal stories, we can find the grounding of the social vision that each has negotiated. Amanda-Leigh grew up in a family where the children were taught explicitly political ideologies of liberal democratic citizenship and were given the opportunities to practice these. Tammy, a child of the fractious sixties and seventies, grew up to challenge the conventional thinking of her traditional French Canadian heritage, adapting the cultural skills of lively debate to the critique of social and educational conventions which limit or constrain fully empowered and equitable participation by all. Joan knew no gender or social boundaries in her personal story of growing up to be the best she could be in sports, academics, and music. In her family, her giftedness and growth as a person were encouraged, not constrained. Ellen grew up with the constraints of an education removed from the centre and with the cultural separation of emotion and reason. Few caring women figure as strong models in her stories of educational and
personal growth. Yet, she struggles to find her own maps for the journey to participating as a woman in a world powerfully defined in men’s terms. Her stories are the most tentative and difficult explorations of women’s vulnerability in the unequal gender dynamics of educational communities. Alison’s childhood models of strong knowledgeable women are both integrated and resisted in her adult life. Her mother’s caring in the community limited her capacity to care for her own children. In constructing her own identity, education and the tradition of teacher as scholar, not nurturer, have been the keys by which Alison understands personal, professional, and social empowerment. By contrast, for Louise, her identity is an integration of women’s nurturing and intellectual capacities. Caring and the love of learning which have enabled her to face the many demands of her life are reflected in the personal and political understandings she models in her teaching.

The six women tell diverse stories of social studies pedagogy as education for democratic and environmental citizenship, for social critique and transformation, for intellectual and individual growth, for community participation, and for human understanding and possibilities. Some styles more closely resemble the models of feminist pedagogy than others. That is, themes of caring and connection are more fully realized in some women’s teaching and curriculum negotiations than in others. They span a continuum from quite traditional approaches to ones which challenge students to engage in a critical approach to the social and educational status quo. No one story is told in this study as better than another; all are viewed as different, valid, and significant stories of social studies teaching. Yet, all stand as powerful stories about the processes and ideologies which underpin teaching for social transformation and social justice. Within each story is a political and social vision of the classroom as a community and as a reflection of the possibilities for community in which individual differences are recognized and valued. Democratic harmony is constructed as possibility by complex and dialectic processes of
negotiating relations of power in classrooms which reflect particular personal, practical, and political understandings of those social relations.

Their curriculum negotiations incorporate these same understandings. The women do not talk of conveying curriculum but of creating and enacting it in relatively autonomous ways. They adapt the content, skills, attitudes, and processes of social studies in integrative, reflective, and holistic ways which suggest their different ways of knowing and being located as women geographers in social studies and the social world, a kind of praxis. Their teaching stories often speak implicitly of the girl-friendly curriculum approaches which are made explicit in the literature of science and math teaching.

The freedom which characterizes their curriculum transformations of social studies is more constrained in Geography 12; their negotiations, more complex. Standardized assessment is a structural constraint. Formally measuring student progress, teaching and testing under the competitive agenda of success for some, failure for others, and assessing quantitatively education's productivity and effectiveness are difficult processes for five of these women; such processes collide with their personal and educational narratives of teacher and student autonomy in constructing knowledge and authentically assessing that knowledge in terms of the many diverse stories which are classroom and curriculum realities. Individual resistance to the structurally constraining nature of teaching for standardized assessment takes the form of self-reflexive dialogue. Teaching for critical thinking, they think critically about who they are teaching and what they are teaching for. All of the women respond to the challenge by negotiating for optimal student success within the constraints of teaching and assessment conventions; in this critical and dialectical way, they conform to the curriculum and assessment expectations. These stories suggest, however, other ways of understanding and respecting human diversity in learning. They expose some educators' real discomfort with the metaphors which
cast education in the technical terms of business and which seek ultimately to impose rational methods upon the rich, authentic possibilities for human learning.

These women also participate actively within broader educational contexts. They construct identities as leaders within schools, departments, and other professional contexts. In this way, they live out notions of participatory citizenship within educational communities beyond their own classrooms. They are again guided in the processes of negotiating these contexts by the personal, practical, and political understandings which underpinned their classroom negotiations of curriculum and pedagogy.

What characterizes their stories, however, is the increased complexity and contradictory nature of their negotiations for some of the women, as they encounter gendered social and structural constraints in relations of power. Three identity constructions seem to be socially acceptable for women and women teachers; those who work as mothers, as playmates, or as cheerleaders under the expert guidance of men are more likely to be accepted in their growth as teachers and leaders (Weiler, 1988; Manicom, 1992; Wilson, 1993). In living out these roles, women are more likely to succeed in social studies teaching and leadership. This, of course, is problematic; women as intellectuals, for example, who think critically about their identities and locatedness as teachers and leaders, seek respect for the authority of their different types of knowledge but do not always speak in the deferential tones or from the appropriate place that these roles require.

Learning that one can speak in a voice of one's own is not easy for women; there are few models in education of women whose stories are not told as sidebar narratives. There are, however, stories of those who choose to reject or re-negotiate the identities socially constructed as appropriate for women. These are the women subject to sanctions, such as gender jokes, intimidation, transfers, and punishing timetables. In social studies teaching, women's rejection
of these roles is grounded paradoxically in each one’s particular political understanding of her place and role as a citizen in a system which endorses empowering notions of the rights of the individual, of educated and democratic citizenship, of community participation, and of social justice. These, it would seem, apply conditionally to women.

Some of the women who have resisted the socially constructed and constraining terms for women’s participation encounter and deal with anger. They struggle to maintain a sense of agency and personal autonomy. They develop strategies of resistance such as silence, repressed anger, and lateral movement to other routes for development and recognition of their abilities. They seek the political support of unions for grievances but struggle with the preference for less combative negotiations between equals and with the uncomfortable personal costs of such actions. They protest against the repressive gender regimes which can characterize some teaching landscapes. They speak subversively about the status quo which subverts their own capacities to speak openly and authoritatively. They struggle with their niceness in circumstances not nice. They eschew the competitive, the combative, the powerful, the isolating, and the hierarchical relations of power which contextually locate them as marginal and as less than those whose story is told at the centre of the educational text. Their stories of teaching as senior subject specialists also contest the singular feminist pedagogical story which can serve to stereotype women as nurturing and as therefore natural teachers of young children. Such strategies challenge the social and professional stories which subordinate women and which deny women’s intellectual and professional identities.

In visions of leadership in social studies and teaching which are comfortable for women, the women of the study articulate stories of collaboration, negotiation, lateral relations in the form of collegiality, and respect for different knowledges. Particularly significant in some of these women’s stories are the themes of instructional leadership and mentorship in facilitating their
creative, professional, and intellectual growth. As teachers who seek democratic, equitable, relational, and empowering places for their work, these women place value on leadership which encourages the authority of women's personal, political, and practical knowledges and which constructs educational stories in terms of diversity and human possibilities. Women's work benefits from the recognition and support of mentors or instructional leaders who offer them respect and opportunities to negotiate their own terms for identities and authority as leaders and teachers of social studies. Women, the study indicates, work successfully and comfortably in contexts where power is enacted transformationally, that is, laterally, rather than transactionally, that is, hierarchically.

Research about women's leadership supports these findings. Schools with women administrators have a greater focus on instruction, communication, achievement, student performance, individual differences, and staff morale. Women are more inclined to be instructional leaders and have greater knowledge of the practice of teaching, emphasizing both achievement and affective goals for learning. Women are more likely than men to empower others and work collaboratively to achieve group goals (Sadker, Sadker, and Klein, 1991; Shakeshaft, 1986; MacLeod, 1988). "Women exhibit a more democratic, participatory style of leadership than men, a style that encourages inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness in schools" (Shakeshaft, 1986, p.503).

CONSTRUCTING WOMEN'S 'CITIZENSHIP' WITHIN EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITIES

The women of this study do not explicitly articulate their understandings of citizenship, nor were my interview inquiries framed specifically to address their stories of teaching social studies for its citizenship goals. But I would make the case that, within the stories they tell, there is a re-definition of citizenship which, in viewing schools as social models, is more inclusive of
the ways women participate in society. The conceptual networks and landscapes of organization which constitute the geography of teaching are, in Greene’s (1986) view, only schemata for understanding cultural life.

The stories these women tell begin to unveil the gendered nature of current models of citizenship within the educational community. These models separate public and political (universal) concerns from the private and personal (feminine) social concerns of women, articulating culture and law in androcentric terms which subordinate and exclude the particulars of women’s lives (Luke, 1992). Citizenship models inscribe the individual’s relationship to the state; they offer "conceptions of male individualism, power, and public speech disguised in the rhetoric of universalized self- and social empowerment" (p.33). Teachers of citizenship education are encouraged to empower students with the critical skills for political and public citizenship by valuing their experience and voice. Yet, such models theoretically and practically deny the privileging of some experience and voices and "the gendered structural divisions upon which liberal capitalism and its knowledge industries are based" (p.37). The traditional concept of citizenship, suggests Noddings (1992b), views a citizen as "a person of recognized public rank" entitled to the privileges of a freeman; but a citizen, she says, is also a member of a community with duties more positive and voluntary than those prescribed by abstract law.

Each woman in the study engages a triangle of personal, practical, and political understanding as lenses through which she constructs the meaning and the form of her life and her work as a teacher. Each skillfully negotiates constraints. Some are more constrained than others, but all are driven by political agendas for social and educational change. Their stories of experiences both of and as authority are integrally linked to their political conceptions of women’s citizenship and leadership in educational communities as personal, practical, participatory, relational, community-based, and grounded in the particulars of the everyday life
of schools. In these women's stories can be heard contradictions which reveal a system much in need of re-formed and re-visioned leadership and citizenship models.

For Amanda-Leigh and Tammy, personal and political commitments to the particulars of critical/feminist and democratic pedagogy collide with harshly-imposed gender role expectations of compliance. Despite their passionate adherence in pedagogical and personal ways to the liberal tenets of the critical discourse and democratic notions of citizenship, their locations as women illuminate the cultural realities of unequal power relations within schools. "More will have to be done to clarify the importance of everyday realities," as Greene (1986, p.497) says. Alison, the scholar, and Ellen might well consider what Greene (1986) says about images of the educated person and citizen being male images, that is, identities not constructed for women. By interrupting the patriarchal "business-as-usual" with women's everyday realities and by resisting or refusing subordination, women risk the anger of men which, in its real consequences for them, contradicts the very foundations of the educational vision of empowerment.

Critical citizenship has gender implications, (Gore, 1992), offering as critique of critical and feminist pedagogies their lack of attention to the contexts for empowerment: "They need to provide better guidance for the actions of the teachers they hope to empower or they hope will empower students" (p.68). Concerned about the contradictions of empowerment or liberatory pedagogies, Gore sees as dangerous the failure to address the regulatory context or institutional location of the struggle:

When much of the empowerment rhetoric pertains to practices which could or should take place within ... schools, we must ask how much freedom there can be within the institutional contexts and pedagogical exigencies of teaching? More attention to contexts would help shift the problem of empowerment from dualisms of power/powerlessness, and dominant/subordinate, that is, from purely oppositional stances, to a problem of multiplicity and contradiction. It may be helpful to think of social actors negotiating actions within particular contexts. I hasten to add here
that I am not advocating a notion of context as simply a pseudonym/synonym for the present or the immediate. Rather, I would argue that context must be conceived as filled with social actors whose personal and group histories position them as subjects immersed in social patterns. Thus contexts for the work of empowerment need to be defined historically and politically with acknowledgment of the unique struggles that characterize the exercise of power at the micro levels (p.61).

Teaching, for Gore, "remains embedded within a history of moral and cultural regulation" (p.68); the study indicates that these regulations and social patterns operate in particularly restrictive ways for women.

Greene (1988) looks at the situatedness in which notions of freedom are enacted, where freedom is defined as the power to act and the power to choose; women's agency and choice are narrowed and constrained by the nature of women's experience. The rhetoric of male autonomy and self-determination is abstract, hierarchical, and exclusive. The language of authority is often contractual and conventional, apparently objective, and detached from the affective, the private, and the concrete particularities of the everyday lives of women. Women do not stand up and demand their rights as autonomous citizens in the public sphere. It would be difficult, suggests Greene, for a single mother, for example, to assert her natural rights and God-given liberties if she could not engage dialectically with the determining forces around her; her life is constricted and confined by the needs of others and by lack of support. Women, socialized in "niceness," protected in their upbringing from darkness, ambiguity, and complexity, are not well prepared for the dangerous actualities of claiming the freedom and rights inherent in traditional notions of citizenship.

Freedom cannot be conceived apart from a matrix of social, economic, cultural, and psychological conditions. It is within the matrix that selves take shape or are created through choice of action in the changing situations of life. The degree and quality of whatever freedom is achieved are functions of the perspectives available, and of the reflectiveness on the choices made (p.80).
Tammy, Amanda-Leigh, and Alison did stand up for their rights. Niceness gave way to the need to push back when determining forces could not be negotiated or engaged dialectically. But one must ask, at what cost? How much better for the community of schools would it have been if they had been recognized as citizens with important contributions to make? How much more would schooling gain by encouraging, rather than discouraging, the equal participation of Ellen? How might the processes of schooling be improved by placing greater value on the models of citizenship which Joan and Louise embody in their teaching and leadership?

Currie (1992) views women’s identities as social and historical preconstructions in the Western liberal tradition. The normative dualisms of male and female, reason and emotion, culture and nature, doing and being, universal and particular, have created a system of gendered social organization. The "revalorization of 'feminine' ways of knowing" with its emphasis on women’s intuition, emotional commitment, maternal qualities, and personal experience has served to further distance women from public/political discourse and to obscure the real differences in power relations (p.344). The "hero of philosophical moral and political discourse" is sustained and re/produced through women’s work or services:

... through personal service (the work of maids, cooks, personal secretaries), sexual service (including provision for his genital sexual needs and bearing of his children, but also including "being nice," "being attractive for him," and so forth), and also ego service (encouragement, support, praise, attention) (p.345).

These categories relegate women to the service of men in the socially constructed and marginalizing roles of mother, playmate, and cheerleader which were previously discussed in this thesis. Louise, the mother, and Joan, the playmate, have constructed identities which conform to what is socially defined as acceptable for women and which afford them privilege. But these roles constrain women’s freedom to construct different identities and stories which claim authority for their intellect, politicization, passion, voice, and equal participation, for example.
One wonders what the consequence might be if Joan or Louise chose other identities, thus challenging the status quo and confronting the inequities? Both acknowledge that they have learned the rules of the game.

Vickers (1987) comments further upon women's work in the service of men by linking women's natural capacity to physically reproduce the species and to nurture children, translated as social nurturance, to the roots of patriarchy and nationalism: women's roles are inscribed as a patriarchal technology which creates and reinforces a culture's loyalties, identities, rights and responsibilities, inclusions and exclusions, but these national and ethnic groups identities and loyalties, or citizenship expectations, are male-defined. "Women are rarely viewed as culture makers but as conduits for the identities of others" (p.485).

Noddings (1992a) points to the hypocrisy and sophism of schooling which pretends to endorse critical thinking and freedom of thought as primary virtues, while excluding the stories of others and denying participants in the school community the opportunity to exercise and acquire these skills. The contradictions for women whose token equal access is granted by the liberal/democratic principles of equity and freedom which undergird education and the workplace are discussed by Luke (1992):

The liberal state can grant legal and equal opportunities of access to the public sphere without providing for women the conditions for equal participation. This move, in turn, denies them equal access to the power (and rewards) with which to articulate and legislate change in their diverse interests (p.36).

Women participate as citizens by voting, working for wages, serving on city councils, teaching, typing the nation's memos, wiping its tables, making its beds, scrubbing its toilets. Their work is too often confined to extension of domestic labour. In secondary social studies, women teach the young ones; men do not value or contest ownership of junior courses. The asymmetrical nature of women's social and educational participation is further illuminated in Luke's analysis
of what constitute "substantive political problems" significant enough to gain men's support: "We have yet to see men organize to lobby for the right to housework, to childrearing, and to bring their wages in line with women" (p.36).

The social construction of women's identities as different, therefore deficient, and as dependent creates divisions that need to be overcome, says Spender (1982). She suggests that Woolf's (1938, as cited in Spender) analysis of schooling as "men's education" is as valid today as ever. Woolf advised women in subversiveness. Women should stay outside of men's education, she said, as it did not develop in the young an abhorrence of war or an understanding of cooperation; rather, men's education interpreted difference as threat and conquest as solution.

Schools and other educational institutions can practise on a small scale what nations can practise on a large scale, where competition, not cooperation, is the order of the day, where winning rather than a fair share is most valued, where difference is seen as deficiency. It is still men's education, and the same weaknesses, limitations, and exploitations are still valued. Virginia Woolf argued that if this was the 'civilisation' that men had created, women should be 'disloyal' (Spender, 1982, pp. 138-9).

The central paradox for women teachers whose personal and intellectual identities are located in social studies is found in the overly simplistic view of democratization in which the universal or master narratives of power deny practices of privilege and devalue the particular contributions and knowledge of women.

Critique and action, deployed at the classroom level without critique of the metanarratives that theoretically and practically sustain the structures and discourses of schooling in the liberal state, may miss the point altogether. Equal opportunity to speak in the classroom, like equal representation in imagery and language in curricular text, will do little to challenge the outer limits of the epistemological horizon where the masculinist logic of the universal subject and its naming of the other is firmly inscribed (Luke, 1992, p.37).
Those whose "heightened sense of the politics of power in the work of teaching and learning" would seek to "interrupt, interrogate, struggle with, or manage that power" strive for transformed conceptions of citizenship which include the diversity and experience of others (Briskin and Coulter, 1992, p.254). Claiming authority for voice, intellect, passion, and imagination, and claiming equality as citizens within educational communities are actions which, for women and others denied equal access to the public discourse of education, challenge the liberal masters' text from the margins (Luke, 1992, p.45). The dominance of the masculinist subject in the discourse of democratic and critical education "renders [the] emancipatory agenda for 'gender' theoretically and practically ineffective" (Luke, as cited in Kenway and Modra, 1992, p.138).

This project makes the case for putting gender on the social studies agenda and for deconstructing patriarchy’s narratives of democratic citizenship in both social studies and education. The case is made collectively and dialectically, forging alliances across others’ differences; such cases must be inclusive and well-documented. The case is made when the sidebar narratives are woven into the mainstream of social studies and educational thought. This, according to Noddings (1992a), would mean re-thinking social studies and the models of citizenship we currently teach to include the private world of women’s culture and caring. With a re-visioned social studies as the heart, "New curricula should reflect the fundamental interests of private life as well as those of public life, and public life itself should be deeply influenced by the articulation of private life" (p.240). The standards of women’s culture, suggests Noddings (1992b), can also guide us in educationally planning for a more caring community and a safer world.

Casey and Apple (1989) make a further case for attending to women’s stories of teaching when they look at trends in recent years towards technicism and the intensification of teachers’ work, often viewed as "women’s work":

With the working conditions of a predominantly female teaching force a subject of intense political debate at the present time, and with conservative policy proposals recommending more control over teachers, we must accept the challenge to publicize the past and present effects of such agendas on women teachers' lives. As the discourse of woman as teacher shows, finding ways for women teachers to have a voice can be part of the struggle to alter the conditions of gendered labour (p.83).

**FEMINIST RESEARCH AS PRAXIS**

Feminist research for me has been a personal, practical, professional, and political process in which I have negotiated and re-negotiated my understandings of women’s teaching and leadership in social studies, of my personal story, values, and ideologies, and of the politicized praxis-oriented feminist research agenda. Collaborative research is, of necessity, a complex and constant process of negotiating the theory, the data, the subjects’ responses to meaning, advisors’ critique, my own standpoints, and the very personal sense of integrity and responsibility in telling other women’s stories. Nor can one make the feminist case without reference to the dominant story. Lewis (1992) says that men do not have to be present for "women carry the parameters of patriarchic meaning-making as a frame from within which we struggle to articulate our own interests" (p.174). Feminist collaborative research takes longer for its need to attend to so many stories.

Those who discuss feminist pedagogy know that "the dynamics of power and empowerment are intricately intertwined" (Briskin and Coulter, 1992, p.259). As students in classrooms are empowered by negotiating, not avoiding, the power dynamics, so too are women who are given the opportunity to negotiate in the unequal power relations of institutional, academic, and social structures. Transforming the social relations of power within this thesis so that it was safe for an individual to speak meant conceptualizing safety and empowerment in
women's collective, as well as individual, terms. This collection of women's stories consciously incorporates notions and processes of collective empowerment and safety.

Alcoff (1992) says of the problem of speaking for others that "a speaker's location is epistemically salient" (p.7). She identifies the dilemma of the presence of the voice of the one who speaks for others as a "crisis of representation": Is it the speaker's responsibility to speak out against oppression, or to follow the lead of those spoken for in uncritical ways, or to "move over and get out of the way," either by keeping silent or by deconstructing [bracketing] one's own discourse? Is it sufficient to replace "I" with "we," or to adopt the passive voice, thereby erasing agency, responsibility, and accountability? Neither can "the positionality or location of the speaker and discursive context ... be ignored" (p.12):

How what is said gets heard depends on who says it, and who says it will affect the style and language in which it is stated, which will in turn affect its perceived significance (for specific hearers) (p.13).

To the extent that the discourse of schooling has a politicized context, does a voice not neutral have legitimate claim to be heard? Once uttered, can meaning and truth be controlled? Does one retreat from truth-telling and meaning-making, thereby "[undercutting] the possibility of political effectivity" (p.17)?

Even a complete retreat from speech is of course not neutral since it allows the continued dominance of current discourses and acts by omission to reinforce their dominance (p.20).

Alcoff argues for dialogue, reconceptualized "as an event, which includes speaker, words, hearers, location, language, and so on" (p.26), wherein listening is valued as much as speaking.

April, 1993: And can you hear my voice? I have struggled with its place in this study. As I coordinate a conversation between six women, two advisors, and the theorists in whose work my study is grounded, I am conscious that my own voice has gained strength and confidence. I have chosen the questions which generated the data, thereby omitting other inquiries and other
answers. I have selected the theory as well as the data to support the argument. I have presented the stories, attentive to the integrity which underlies friendships, and protected the narrators. I have struggled to be fair, trustworthy, and attentive to the dialogue. I have a stake in making the careful and well-documented case in collective terms. I have chosen to speak for others who speak for me. I have chosen the tensionality and tonality of the story. I have reflected on the consequences and possibilities of choosing to interrupt the game. I acknowledge the passion which drives my experience of research and teaching, which seeks to define a new game more generous and inclusive of difference, and which no doubt, can be heard in my voice as the storyteller.

Ellsworth (1992) identifies the feminist poststructuralist perspective: "Any women’s politicized voice will be partial, multiple, and contradictory" (p.103). A speaker, she says, must acknowledge the "multiplicity of authentic voices in her/himself."

April, 1993: I speak as a woman, a mother, a graduate student, a practicing teacher of social studies, a friend, and a feminist. All of these voices have political implications. There are rules for each voice. There is a critical tension where no one of my voices can be heard without the others being there. I am choosing to talk, refusing the safety of silence, negotiating from the position of collective narrative and careful documentation because the rules for and dynamics of democratic participation don’t define my or others’ experience of it.

Ellsworth’s argument that critical pedagogy has failed to address "issues of trust, risk, and the operations of fear and desire around such issues of identity and politics in the classroom" (p.105) must be extended to systemic issues for critical educators who live in socially constructed positions of subordination. As in Ellsworth’s classroom, we need, within academia and within teaching,
... to see the task not as one of building democratic dialogue between free and equal individuals, but of building a coalition among the multiple, drifting, intersecting, and sometimes contradictory groups carrying unequal weights of legitimacy within the culture (p.109).

The sidebar narratives, mine and others, need safe space in which to be heard, not as discordant, but as different and valid.

May, 1993: I have had three opportunities to observe "audience effect" and will have several more. The first was in making public the project questions at a Gender Equity conference jointly sponsored by the university and a local school board. The women who attended my session represented teaching and the academy. No administrators or school board representatives chose to attend. The stories I had to tell would not have structural impact. In leaving a half hour for discussion, I was interested in evaluating the effect of the presentation. Two young women new to social studies teaching seemed most enlivened with the opportunity to share their experiences and to ask further questions. I wondered at the empowering effect they seemed to have gained from merely knowing, at that time, that the questions were being asked, stories shared, understandings explored.

In two academic contexts, I had an opportunity to share and receive feedback on the work I had been doing. The first was a meeting of an academic social studies group. Early in the meaning-making stages of this study, I shared my draft of chapter 3, the stories of the women's personal lives. My analysis at that stage was tentative, but I had thought their life stories would be interesting as "something different" in social studies research and might generate questions about how this would relate to their teaching stories. I was stuck for answers at times. My answers and grasp of the concepts felt a lot like the tentative use of language one might expect from a woman graduate student whose project is unfinished and who is speaking to a room of venerable men in social studies education. There was nothing tentative about the response of
the one who represented the politics and practice of social studies teaching who said he was outraged and offended by their life stories. I have offered to give a workshop at the social studies teachers' conference in the fall. My language is no longer tentative. Part of me hopes only women will attend; that will be safe. Part of me knows that others must hear and participate in the dialogue, but that could be painful. I walk the difficult path between the authority and energy of my knowing, the fear of the backlash for knowing what I know, and the safety of silence and deferential tones.

Feminist research is also about reflexivity and about empowering those involved in the research process. How have the researcher and the researched been affected or transformed by the project?

Certainly, the sense of isolation which Ellen has felt has been overcome in knowing others’ stories; she has a sense of supportive community. She has been excited by the stories of women’s teaching, having no models like these, and would like to have the opportunity to collaborate more directly with women like these, to try doing things as they do. She is currently facing yet another timetable-dictated shift in her teaching assignment, this time almost wholly into English where they need someone for five additional blocks. Despite her request to teach Science full time, her flexibility as a teacher makes it expedient once again to disconnect her from her preferred courses. The tyranny of the timetable and its operators can still be felt as punishment rather than reward for teachers whose diversity and expertise are not confined to a single subject identity. The research cannot empower or transform her in her response to this year’s situation, but she speaks now of seeking a transfer next year.

Alison has not been transformed by the research process but is better informed, she said. In an ideal world, women could be respected and accepted for ourselves. She has recognized her own anger in what she terms the "arrogant" tone to her voice. She is angry and will continue
to do something about it in her own independent way. Interestingly, however, after this conversation, Alison phoned to discuss the possibility of a collective statement to the Ministry of Education and the Teachers’ Federation about the importance of addressing women’s concerns in social studies in their selection procedures for the formation of a curriculum revision committee. These stories, she felt, were important to share in political ways. She and Ellen both made the case for telling men’s stories of difference as well, though feminists would suggest they can make their own case!

Louise has been on leave from teaching this year. She realizes now that she has been exhausted with the increasing demands placed upon classroom teachers and has spent the year examining creative ways of returning to teach in blocks of time that allow her to pursue other dimensions and directions in her life. She and her principal are still ironing out the details, though she is encouraging the district to offer more flexible timetables for other teachers who risk losing themselves in their work. In participating in the study, she has seen the importance of defining one’s self and one’s work "from the centre." Involvement in this study and her year’s leave of absence have given her the chance to reflect seriously on her work and upon the real importance of having women as role models for students and for other women in social studies.

Joan’s recent disappointment in not being shortlisted for a principalship in her district, despite tremendous recommendations from her principal, was shortlived. Instead, she was appointed to joint positions as district principal and as coordinator of technology. The study, along with the review of her own and others’ experiences, has made her more sensitive to the difficulties which girls and women face. In observing classes in her present school, she pays greater attention to the gender dynamics. In one or two instances, she has been aware of "male" classrooms as places where girls are not comfortable. She was also more critically aware of the problems for women in social studies in her role as a member of an external accreditation team.
Two young women with new and innovative ideas and successful practices in social studies teaching were openly intimidated by two older men whose practices were quite traditional and didactic. The women were viewed as "rocking the boat." Yet gender equity was not perceived as a problem in the school, where most of the teachers were men. The words of the external team’s report, she said, were carefully chosen. It recommended the need to move towards gender balance and to provide gender role models in the school. Gender issues require tremendous diplomacy; they are easily dismissed as the causes of women who have "axes to grind," said Joan.

Joan and I discussed feminism as she had come to understand it. She had initially resisted the term, she said, because of her discomfort and unpleasant associations with lesbian feminism in women’s competitive sport. She thinks now, however, that she relates to the principles of feminism differently, particularly as she looks at the differential experiences of women and men in teaching and administration.

Amanda-Leigh, in reflecting upon her involvement in this project, said that she is even clearer about what she stands for and believes in as a teacher of social studies. The stories of this study are about women, she said, with strong personalities; all are survivors, but at what cost? What does the system lose in terms of human energy and potential for growth when it subjects those who are passionately committed to their work to the minimalizing and emotionally draining circumstances depicted in her own and other stories? Nobody should have to go through what she or Ellen or Alison or Tammy have been through, she said. In their stories, the message of "don’t rock the boat" overrides the key understanding of teachers’ work, that of the importance to committed teachers of personal integrity, pride, and professionalism. There is anger and discouragement in her voice. I know her best of all, and I rather think she will find the transformative capacity in her anger to make a real difference some day.
Tammy has developed a more detached and bemused perspective on what she does. She does not take the gender dynamics of her teaching situation so seriously or so personally any more, consciously incorporating more of a sense of humour in how things go; they don't, many of them, know how they offend. She is also more aware of the difficulties and inequities the younger women on her staff are facing; she is "not so much an island" any more, realizing she has to be more protective of them. What, she wonders, will the teaching lives of these women be like? She can see how easily they could be like hers. The inequities are still there and change is surprisingly slow. Tammy has never had any difficulty with the principles of feminism as these reflect women's politicized understandings of social and educational life.

May, 1993: And me? How have I been transformed by the research process? I'm a lot like Tammy: in claiming the time and place for documentation and reflection and in moving from tentativeness to authority in what I know, I find I am no longer so inclined to be angry. I don't take the master stories so personally any more. I am careful to try to catch that reactivity, the oh-so-quick responses to perceived and real slights, which can be used to undermine the case. And these new responses seem to transcend other facets of my life. I take the time now to listen attentively to what others are saying, reflect on my own understandings, consider the implications and the consequences, and negotiate the meaning. As a graduate student, I have had the benefits of role models and mentors who were absent when I was teaching and of encouragement in the academy to create meaning with passion. I have moved from tentativeness to confidence in negotiating and telling important educational stories in personal, gendered, holistic, and integrative ways. I am amazed that, once conceived, the project took on its own natural life and was nurtured, shaped, and formed to independence in exactly nine months! Yes, feminist collaborative research as praxis takes longer but it is such important work for women who engage in teaching as social and personal praxis and who face the
disjunctives of thinking critically and thus politically about teaching, as they teach for political and critical thinking in social studies and the social world. So much along the way was discovery that I realize I could not have wholly designed the study in advance; I had to allow for the tentative and open-ended nature of critical feminist inquiry. The research process has been as much a personal process of transformation as ones of academic and professional mastery.

June, 1993: I had once joked about giving a social studies workshop on women's experience entitled "Is it just me, or -- ?" But the question, framed tentatively, partially, deferentially, imperfectly, is really rhetorical. I know the answer. What I have liked best about this research process is that there is a sense of community where there wasn't much of one before. All of the women in this study have encouraged the completion of this project, but I find now that I am encouraging and supporting them in some way. I have found myself saying things like: Louise, it's all right to step back from teaching -- your story provides a model for others. Joan, teaching needs your way of seeing things. Yes, Alison, use my story in making your case. Amanda-Leigh, don't give up -- you're on the right track and your vision of education holds the promise of better things. You do good and important work, Tammy, and there's real strength in being able to support others. Ellen, we miss you in social studies. And my sense of this community is that there are others -- student teachers with whom I worked this year and young women teachers who came to me, knowing the work I was doing -- who need to know that they are welcome and valued, that they are on the right path and part of a community. It's been hard and serious work, yet in its collaborative and integrative nature, it has been fun and personally meaningful. Everyone wants to come to see the defence. We have talked of getting together for a real conversation.
IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Women’s underrepresentation in social studies teaching is not specifically addressed within the scope of this project, though the study has real implications for issues of women’s equal participation. Further research needs to be conducted in the field to discern whether curricular, pedagogical, and structural barriers and hiring practices mitigate against women’s teaching and leadership in social studies. Similarly, the decision-making of female pre-service and in-service teachers with social science majors, including those who choose to teach in other fields, would yield valuable information in the matter of women’s absence and underrepresentation in social studies. Additional studies of the ways in which women make or are limited in making course and career choices in social studies teaching and leadership would provide more definitive information about the ghettoization of women in junior social studies teaching and their invisibility in leadership roles. Studies of students’ understandings of the gendered nature of social studies teaching and curriculum are also important.

The women’s pedagogical, curricular, and leadership narratives provide valuable insights into critical, collaborative, democratic, and learner-focused approaches to teaching which have implications for current educational reform initiatives. In social studies, more attention must be paid to developing curriculum inclusive of other stories. Women’s social and political understandings are presently located as the token representations of sidebar narratives to the present master text of social studies. The call for inclusion remains unheeded.

Recognizing women’s pedagogies as particular and valid in social studies critically exposes the single voice of the manifest curriculum and its traditional teaching approaches. Better representation of women teachers in social studies would reflect the multivoicedness that is our social reality and would provide students with a balance of perspectives, an understanding of social balance. Girls are already disadvantaged by the conventions of schooling; the gender
gap affects girls’ interests, attainment, self-esteem, and career choices (Sadker and Sadker, 1986; American Association of University Women, 1992; A Capella, 1991; Martin, 1982, 1985; Gaskell, McLaren, and Novogrodsky, 1989). In light of research showing students’ lack of interest in social studies and of the role of the social studies teacher in creating positive attitudes and learning environments (Fraser, 1981; Haladyna et al, 1982; Schug et al, 1984; Shaughnessy, Haladyna, 1985), Stanworth’s (1983) research that showed girls were more responsive to women’s teaching and Fouts’ (1990) finding that girls are more positive about social studies when they have women teachers bears some serious consideration.

[It] may be the unique perspectives, values, and insights the female teachers brought to the social studies classes because they are female. That is to say, either consciously or not, these teachers may have injected into the curriculum values, content, and perspectives that are of more interest and relevance to young women than the curriculum provided by the men teachers. They may have employed feminist pedagogy (Maher, 1987), or teaching methodologies to create a learning environment that appeals to females. Consequently, the females felt more involved in the class, closer affiliation with their classmates, and more support and concern from the female teacher than the male teacher. It may also be that for the first time some of these young women were exposed to a female role model who is vitally interested and involved in social education (p.420).

More research which explores women’s teaching and curricular transformations and their effects on student learning and attitudes would be particularly significant. In light of the dominance of the traditional curriculum and pedagogy of social studies which speaks of politics, culture, law, history, geography, economics, and citizenship in androcentric terms and the less than positive research findings, it is conceivably a dysfunctional experience for boys and for girls. When there are very few women to articulate these dimensions of the social world in their own terms and to act as role models for girls, it is perhaps not surprising that women are uncomfortable with social studies curriculum and its traditional teaching methods, that women
are underrepresented in social studies and related fields in the social world, and that social studies reinforces gender role stereotypes. Viewed by students as the legitimate domain of men and men’s knowledge, the messages of social studies deny women major roles in public life (Kelly and Nihlen, 1982). The validity of women’s identities as teachers of social studies and as those qualified to speak about public life is measured by their presence and by their status as subject specialists, as department heads, and as administrators. This, in turn, suggests that hiring and promotional practices in social studies, schools, districts, and related professional contexts, such as Ministry committees, need further exploration for the public ways in which women are represented, misrepresented, and underrepresented.

Additional ethnographic studies of women’s personal, political, and social understandings and transformations of social studies curriculum at the junior and senior levels are also merited, in light of this study’s findings. Narrative insights into women’s ways of teaching add powerful dimensions to our understanding of the art of teaching social studies. The stories begin the task of providing role models of social studies teaching for inclusion, equity, and social transformation. Such stories are valuable for pre-service and in-service teacher education and discourse in social studies; they span the chasm which separates the public from the private world of social studies teaching and overcome the isolation for women with few role models in the field. These stories begin the building of a stronger, safer, more inclusive social studies community; they invite the membership of others. Many more stories need to be told if we are to enact Lewis and Simon’s (1986) previously-cited imperative to "create [the] space for lived differences that is not framed in oppositional terms" (p.216).
EPILOGUE

June 25, 1993: This thesis was celebrated on June 18. Four of the women who had participated in this study were able to attend. Tammy had picked Louise up at an early morning ferry from the Island. Though they hadn’t seen each other in years, they were having a great time catching up on each other’s news when I encountered them looking for the building. Alison and Amanda-Leigh were able to come as well. It was a sunny day and the room was warm. But there was a special other warmth which comes from a sense of common project and mutual support and encouragement that created tangible ripples of celebration within the context of defence.

One important aspect of the defence was a discussion prompted by Alan Sears’ (doctoral student and social studies methods instructor) comments on the importance of the messages of this project, including his own lack of awareness of women’s absence in his classes. Alan and I agreed to consider a co-presentation -- an alliance -- to create better understanding in the field of the meaning of inclusive curriculum and pedagogy in social studies. Valerie (Dr. Raoul, external examiner) suggested incorporating Dr. Deborah Tannen’s work, You Just Don’t Understand, on the different languages of men and women.

We all went for a champagne lunch afterwards. Valerie wanted to know which one was Louise; in fact, she had no trouble guessing. The two were off in a flash, deep in discussion of ecology and organic gardening. I overheard each of the women whose story I had told -- whose confidentiality I had so carefully protected -- introduce herself during the course of lunch: first, by her real name, and then by the pseudonym used in the study! Peter (Dr. Seixas, advisor) remarked on how interesting it was, "like getting to meet all the characters in a novel!" Jane (Dr. Gaskell, advisor) talked about how the study had been a catalyst for her own sense of the need to ensure more women participated in post-secondary social studies education; I wish her
luck in her new position as Associate Dean of Education in creating the forum for change within the academy.

And my son and his friend, both 16, attended the defence. They had some ideas for changing social studies teaching too. Though they didn't speak up at the time -- I wish now I'd thought of creating the space for their comments -- they had lots of ideas which were prompted by the discussion and lots to say over lunch.

In finishing this project, I have decided to try to find Miss Debrecen. During my own high school years, Janet Debrecen was the only woman who taught me social studies. She made all the difference; in that one year in grade 10, social studies came to mean so much more than simply taking notes off the board, answering questions from the board, listening to the droning of history, and memorizing facts which I never remembered adequately for tests. That was the year I was the top student in my junior high school. We studied Canadian geography that year, I remember. I was in her classroom when we heard the news of JFK's assassination. It was a memorable year for me. I need to thank her for her part in that and for her part in this project, as well.
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MALE AND FEMALE HEAD COUNT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS BY SECONDARY SCHOOL COURSE AND SUBJECT AREA

SOCIAL STUDIES -- PROVINCIAL DATA
Selected Courses and Data Derivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Program:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law 12</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography 12</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 12</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Civilization 12</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 10</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 9</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 8</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences Humaines 11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences Humaines 10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences Humaines 9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences Humaines 8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Junior/Senior Course Teaching Distributions in Social Studies in BC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women teaching regular program social studies:</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women teaching junior (SS8, 9, 10) social studies:</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women teaching senior (SS11, electives) social studies:</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men teaching regular program social studies:</td>
<td>2963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men teaching junior (SS8, 9, 10) social studies:</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men teaching senior (SS11, electives) social studies:</td>
<td>1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of regular program teachers:</td>
<td>3844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distributions By Percent of Total BC Secondary Social Studies Teachers:

Male: 67.1%
Female: 22.9%
(Of whom 69.9% are teaching junior courses)
Men teaching senior courses: 31.3%
Women teaching senior courses: 6.9%
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

THINKING CRITICALLY ABOUT SOCIAL STUDIES: WOMEN'S PERSPECTIVES

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete the following experience and qualifications information as completely and as accurately as possible. Some of the questions will be explored in further detail during our upcoming interviews. Please be assured that every effort will be made to ensure subject confidentiality during the research process and within the interpretation of results.

CONTACT INFORMATION

NAME, HOME ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER, SCHOOL, SCHOOL ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Marital status: 2 single, 1 divorced, 1 widowed, 2 married.
Ages: 30, 40, 42, 44, 52, 53.
Number of children: 1 x 1, 1 x 2, 1 x 3, 3 x 0.
Ages of children: 11; 12, 14; 28, 33, 35.
Also listed were interests and personal accomplishments, referred to as relevant in study.

ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Degrees: 5 x BA; 3 x BEd; 1 x MEd; 1 x MA; 1 x MRM.
Academic standings: All marked "superior" or "above average"

OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1 has been an administrator (vice-principal) for 7 years.
Other leadership roles:
5 x department heads
6 x school, district committees
6 x Ministry assessment/curriculum committees
2 x writing contracts
2 x curriculum development
2 x professional development workshop leaders
2 x accreditation
2 x PSA executive
2 x local teachers’ association representatives
1 x national geographic associations (2)
1 x district Pac Rim coordinator
1 x provincial assessment
1 x director, educational affiliations (2)

Provincial Specialists’ Association (PSA) memberships:
4 x SS; 1 x Environmental Educators’; 1 x Science.

Extracurricular Activities:
3 x coaching; 1 x refereeing; 4 x clubs; 2 x sponsor, school activities; 4 x school programs; 1 x Yearbook sponsor.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

115 years cumulative; averaged at nearly 20 years each.

Career interruptions: All. 3 x leaves of absence for travel, education or other reasons; 3 x maternity leaves; 4 x transferred to another country, province, district, department, or moved to full-time administration.

Teaching full-time social studies, September, 1992: 3 x yes; 3 x no. One leave of absence; one full time administration; one transferred to another department.

Years of social studies teaching experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History 12</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography 12</td>
<td>70 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law 12</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Civilization 12</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td>79 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 10</td>
<td>69 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 9</td>
<td>60 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 8</td>
<td>39 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other subjects taught: 6 x yes
3 x English; 4 x Sciences; 3 x Math; 1 x Home Ec; 3 x counselling; 1 x Phys Ed; 1 x Spanish; 1 x Outdoor Ed; 1 x Geology 12; 1 x Humanities; 1 x Sociology; 1 x Psychology.

Department head experience: 3 x currently department heads; 2 x previously department heads; 1 x No.

TEACHING PRACTICE

How often do you integrate social studies with other curriculum areas?
1 x always; 5 x usually.

How often do you coordinate projects and assignments with teacher-librarian?
1 x always; 4 x usually; 1 x sometimes.
How often do you coordinate units, projects, assignments with department colleagues or with district colleagues?

1 x always; 2 x usually; 3 x sometimes.

Check those activities which one might observe in any of your social studies classes. How much do you think students learn from each of these?

The data were summarized as a total in column 1. High values represent perceived high value for student learning. Respondents checked A Great Deal = 2; Some = 1; Not Much = 0. Columns 3, 4, and 5 represent the number of responses in each respective category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Small group discussions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Film or video</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Worksheets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Simulations, role play, cooperative games</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Library research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Field studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Giving notes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Computer programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Using textbook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other: (learning stations)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What limitations do you find with using any of these teaching strategies in any particular course?

Class size; limited software; individual student needs; time (3), especially with Geography 12; classroom dynamics; student variables; limitations of lecture, worksheets, notes; number of students for field studies; stress.

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very enjoyable, 2 is enjoyable, 3 is not sure, 4 is unenjoyable, and 5 is very unenjoyable, please rate these activities for students. Again, the data were summarized as a total in column 1. Low values, in this case, represent teachers’ perceptions of very enjoyable. Columns 3 to 7 represent the number of responses in each respective category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Working in small groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Doing worksheets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Taking part in games, drama, or role play</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Doing a research project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Using the library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Going on a field excursion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What importance do you place on each of the following for evaluating students’ achievement in social studies, where 1 is very important, 2 is important, and 3 is not important?

The data were summarized to a total in column 1 below. Here, low values represent teachers’ perceptions of high importance for evaluating students’ achievement. Columns 3 to 5 represent the number of responses in each respective category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-made tests</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2; 4; 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized tests</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0; 3; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial exams</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1; 3; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-teacher conferences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2; 3; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual research projects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5; 0; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group projects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2; 4; 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentations</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2; 3; (1); 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal records</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2; 3; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional judgement</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3; (1); 2; 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer evaluation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1; 3; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework assignments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1; 4; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0; 0; 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your social studies classes, what do you do to foster critical thinking?

- Develop self-esteem; incorporate a variety of points of view and resources (2); use current issues; use open-ended questions; emphasize process and reasoning; labs, tasks, problems.

How do you evaluate students’ critical thinking?

- Assess, not evaluate; look at support for their views; professional judgement; written and oral work (3).

Do you perceive students in your classes as having a more positive attitude to social studies than to other course? Clarify if necessary.

- Yes x 4; sometimes x 1; too many variables x 1. Positive, non-threatening classroom; they return after Grad; enrollment; depends on student interest and topic; students perceive Geography as easier.

Do you think that being a woman influences the way you teach social studies? Please explain.

- Yes x 2; no x 2; maybe x 1. Compassion; compromise; process; women’s history, law, issues; women in global context; different perspective; men are humanists; teaching style is a factor.
Do you think that students respond differently to women than to men as teachers? Please explain, relating it to social studies, if possible.

Yes x 1. Women's approach to teaching war, social and historical issues; students respond to teacher personality and as person (2); student response may be family-based (1), cultural (1), socially determined (1) eg: male aggression, previous school experiences; depends upon student; interest in students as individuals is key.

SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

How useful do you find curriculum guides in communicating social studies goals and objectives?

3 x very useful; 2 x somewhat useful

How often do you refer to the curriculum guides when preparing for social studies classes?

1 x never; 1 x at the beginning of the year; 3 x every month; 1 x almost every week.

In your understanding of the curriculum for social studies (omit electives here), how important are each of the following aspects? 2 is very important, 1 is moderately important, and 0 is not important at all.

The data were summarized to a total in column 1. High value represents teachers’ perceptions of high importance. One did not respond as her experience has been limited to Geography 12 in recent years. Columns 3 to 5 represent the number of responses in each respective category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Global Awareness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social and Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Canadian Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inquiry Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Media Literacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rights and Responsibilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attitude Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From your point of view, should some of these aspects of social studies have more or less emphasis in the curriculum for social studies 8 to 11?

More emphasis: 5 x Geography; 3 x Global Awareness; 1 x each of Law, Inquiry, Humanities, Community Participation; 1 x students should be exposed to all.
Less emphasis: Canadian Studies; History; Content, esp. Grade 8.

Please comment on any concerns you have with the current social studies (or senior elective) curriculum.
Lack of geography, grades 8 - 11 (2); too general nature of geography; weak background of students in geography; too much content; content emphasized over process; poor texts; history taught at expense of other area; lack of integration.

Please comment on any difficulties you have experienced in implementing the current social studies curriculum.
Amount of material in Geography 12 (2); changing course loads; some teachers lack "depth" of background; best ways of implementing new materials; class sizes; lack of resources (2); no support for field experiences.

Please rank the following broad goals of social studies, adding any that you feel may be missing. Use 1 to represent most important.
The data were summarized to a total in column 1. Low values represent teachers’ perceptions of most important goals.

17  To encourage inquiry and critical thinking
17  To facilitate understanding of global concerns
24  To prepare students for participation in society
24  To promote attitudes of tolerance and understanding
29  To facilitate positive and constructive social change
30  To transmit a nation’s cultural legacy
(1) Other: (1) To respect and understand the natural world

In your opinion, does being a women influence the way you teach the curriculum, that is, explain the world, its history, cultures, events, problems, politics, places, etc.? Please explain.
Yes x 2. Supplement curriculum, to tell "rest" of history; discuss issues as they pertain to women; include ordinary people; emphasize social history.
No x 1. In teaching, gender is a point of view which is included; "in teaching, gender ought not to be a factor."
Considering the question x 1. Not sure x 1.
Can you identify concerns that women in teaching may have with any aspect of social studies education?

4 identified concerns: Women in minority in leadership in social studies, therefore anomalous situations; omission from history; lack of access to teaching higher grades; poor support materials for studying women and history, women and law; problems with hiring and advancement of women in school system.
No x 1. No answer x 1.

Why do you think it is important for women to teach social studies?
4 x Role Models. Demonstrate competence. Demonstrate women can teach senior academic courses. Important for both boys and girls. Changing role models in society reflected in social studies. Gender equity. Important not to be limited by prejudice and societal expectations. Quality and type of information women bring to students. Possibly different teaching style which promotes different skills and attitudes. "Women have opportunity to foster growth, not control it."
APPENDIX III

SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

THINKING CRITICALLY ABOUT SOCIAL STUDIES: WOMEN'S PERSPECTIVES

RESEARCHER: MOIRA EKDAHL, GRADUATE STUDENT
SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
FACULTY OF EDUCATION, UBC

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS: In these two hours we will be together, I am interested in who you are as a person, as a woman, and as a teacher of particular subjects in particular contexts. Specifically, I am interested in concrete detail, example, your stories. The questionnaire gives a sense of who you are, how you teach -- I need to know how you view the world, what factors shape or have shaped your view of the world, and how that particular worldview translates to your teaching. You have read the purpose of the study and I am very happy that you have agreed to participate so willingly. All information is confidential and subject to your review and permission to incorporate in the study.

QUESTIONS

First, can we start with your childhood. What kind of a family did you grow up in? relations with parents? siblings? family interests? ideas, values? important friendships? activities? any other significant influences? the most significant aspects of your childhood that have influenced your way of viewing the world now? did you grow up in Canada? if not, what do you see as the biggest differences in cultural context?

Can we take a look at your schooling? What did you like best about being a student in elementary school? in secondary school? why? can you remember anything or anyone having a real impact on you as a student? an important friendship? involvement in activities? what subjects were your favourite? can you recall a particular teacher -- his or her characteristics -- who had an impact on you? what aspects of social studies were of interest to you? were there particular aspects which you found boring or irrelevant? what about high school in general was problematic for you?

Did you move directly from high school to university? What factors were involved in the decision or in delaying the decision? was the decision entirely your own? did you have any obstacles to overcome in going to or completing university? what about your decision to major in _______: who or what influenced you, or was this entirely your own decision? if you had this decision to make over again, would you make it the same way? can you describe some of the interesting aspects of being involved in the discipline while at university? did you finance your own education by working at the same time? what kinds of jobs did you hold down? what kinds of activities did you take part in, and how did you spend your "social" time while at university? what impact did your time at university have on your later life? have you returned to university? do you plan to?
I'd like to have a look at your **married and family life.** You are/were (married, divorced, separated, widowed) with/out children. What factors influenced your decision to get married at that stage in your life? were you working, finishing school, etc.? what about the decision to (not) have children? can you describe for me the adjustments you had to make in becoming a working mother? continue to make as a working mother? the difficulties? joys? sources of support? any major hurdles you’ve weathered as a married couple or as a family? how does your family spend the summer?

Can you tell me about **single life.** What kinds of activities are you involved in? what do you do for fun? how do you meet new people? who do you spend most of your time with, socially? what about single life do you like/not like? do you see lots of your family? what are your future plans?

I’d like to look at **teaching** next. Can you recall the process of arriving at the decision to enter teaching? was it your decision, or were there other influences? what about yourself did you feel most suited you to the profession? are there characteristics which sometimes made or make you feel not suited to the profession? an example of where this might be a problem? what was student teaching like? did you have a good relationship with sponsor teachers? what did you like or not like about them or their style? did they have an influence on your teaching? can you recall incidents where you decided teaching was not for you? any difficulties, problems, conflicts? what factors or incidents have convinced you teaching is a rewarding profession? what do you see as the personal benefits of teaching? was it difficult to resume teaching after leaving? can you think of any penalties for these interruptions? can you describe your style of teaching? an example, event, or incident where this is best displayed? your best lessons? your worst lessons? what about your first job: how were you hired? what were the students like? what about the area? the assignment? and subsequent jobs?

Can you tell me about your **personal interests.** How do you spend your summers? how will you spend next Christmas? is this the usual way? how do you manage a working day? a typical weekend during the school year? what of your friendships: who are your friends? what do you value in these relationships? are any of them friends through work? are there things you would like to do with your life that you are unable to?

I’d like to look at your view of **social studies.** You are a specialist in teaching Geography: when did you first develop an interest in this subject? what did you like about it? can you describe your feelings about aspects of the subject at that time? at other times? was your training to teach it adequate? are there aspects of the training that you would change? do you attend workshops and conferences? are there aspects of social studies as you now teach it that excite you? can you give me examples of lessons or units of study that you feel personally committed to teaching? do you sometimes feel you go beyond the curriculum to, say, emphasize some aspects more than others, or bring personal values or commitments to? other examples in social studies teaching? how about units or lessons you feel uncomfortable with? based on your questionnaire response, I can see that you feel strongly that social studies include ________: do you personally include these or emphasize these topics more than is recommended by the curriculum? why or why not?
With respect to the various teaching contexts within which you work -- and I mean by that your school, your district, committees, I have some further questions: What are the main characteristics of the school’s student population? can you describe any special relationships that you have developed with students, or any special role that you feel you’ve played in their lives? examples? do you have any particular working relationship that you value more than others? any particular friendships that you’ve developed with staff members? any particularly supportive relationships on staff? within district? how about anywhere there has been conflict in values, ideas, personality? how do you feel about these? what do you feel about the importance of collegial relationships? how about relationships with members of your department? is there anyone in particular who you feel has been especially helpful to your career advancement? in what ways? what role do administrators play for you? how about the department head? are there any examples that come to mind of feeling unsupported or not understood by others? how might a typical teaching day go for you? do you anticipate any differences next year? what personal qualities do you think make for good social studies teaching? how might these qualities differ from other subject areas, say, Math or English?

In the area of social studies curriculum, are you aware of consciously transforming the formal curriculum? can you give some examples of this transformation or extension, perhaps, or adding your own touches to lessons or units? what is unique about your interpretation of curriculum? do you feel at odds with the curriculum on occasion, or uncomfortable with its intent or emphasis? what are your favourite themes, units, or lessons? your least favourite? why? how do you adjust your teaching for these? are you aware of a particular notion of time or place that transcends your teaching? a particular political view or social perspective? what do you most want your students to understand about the world or about Canada from your teaching? what gift would you give students, if you could?

Finally, I would like to talk about women who teach social studies. You are, I am sure, as aware as I am of the relative absence of women in social studies teaching. Can you speculate what it is about social studies teaching that does not appeal to more women? are there, in your mind, other obstacles for women? if you had to create a set of characteristics of women who teach social studies, what do you think these would be? what do you think are the benefits of having gender balance in the teaching of social studies? do you believe it is as important, more important, or less important to have gender balance in social studies as it is in other subject areas? why do you think it is not noticed that women are missing? what unique perspectives do you think women might bring to the curriculum or the social studies classroom? why is it important for students to have women teachers as role models in social studies?
BIBLIOGRAPHY


```
```

```
(1992b) Report 2082: Male and Female Head Count of Public School Teachers and Administrative Officers By Secondary School Course and Subject Area Within School District. Victoria, BC.
```

```
```

```
```


