INTRODUCTION

Carmen Luke

Readers of this anthology might believe that because its title bears the terms "feminisms" and "pedagogy," that the issues addressed here are exclusively about gender and teaching. This is not the case. Feminist theory and research have expanded exponentially in recent years both in diversity of inquiry and theorizing. That work, it seems to me, has made it abundantly clear that gender identity and relations cannot be apprehended or theorized on their own abstracted terms. That is, sex, gender, or femininity needs to be studied and theorized in its constitutive relationship to other sociocultural significations, economic and political histories, hierarchies, and discourses.

I use the term feminisms, therefore, to signify a collective orientation, albeit diverse theoretical positions, among this group of authors exploring issues of pedagogy. In that regard, each of the essays here provides only a partial take on aspects of identity politics in relation to parts of the pedagogical project of everyday life. Similarly, 'pedagogy' cannot be conceived of as an isolated intersubjective event since it too is fundamentally defined by and a product of a network of historical, political, sociocultural, and knowledge relations. Let me begin, then, with an anecdote to illustrate how concepts and meanings, in this case of pedagogy, are products of historically and culturally situated social formations.

On a visit in the summer of 1994 to the Institute of Pedagogics at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia, I was invited by Valerija Vendramin and Eva Bahovic to give seminars on feminist pedagogy. In the many informal and formal discussions that followed my presentations, I was certainly prepared for debate about my own assumptions, those underlying feminisms, and feminist pedagogical models more generally. However, what I had not anticipated was a reluctance, among academic staff and students at the institute, to use the term pedagogy, par-

ticularly its use to name any distintinctly Slovenian, post-independence educational model. We came to that particular intellectual and cultural encounter from very different sociohistorical political contexts. Our conceptual assumptions and visions of political practice—whether through feminisms or models of education—were grounded in radically different experiences. For Slovenian academic educators, the term "pedagogy" was tied to two historical educational models, both of which remain affiliated with ideologically rigid mechanistic transmission models of education. The first was modeled on nineteenth-century Prussian didacticism under Austro-Hungarian rule and the second under Tito's communism. Generations of Slovenians have been subject to *pedagoski*—a centralized national curriculum and pedagogy of indoctrination, via nineteenth-century Prussian and twentieth-century communist models, which many Slovenian educators and intellectuals in Slovenia wanted to change in the public mind and all educational theory and practice. One way to achieve this transformation, they believe, is to rename education, to refuse reference to the term "pedagogy" in public and scholarly educational discourse in order to begin theorizing and implementing educational practice, to articulate a new vocabulary untainted by the traces of a colonial and authoritarian educational system.

But this particular aversion to the term should not suggest that what we in the West have called pedagogy—at the levels of institutional education in schools and universities, and of mass education through media and popular culture—are not hotly debated and central to visions of "the new order." For instance, a then-recent billboard ad in the city center of Ljubljana, featured close-up shots of five female posteriors clad only in a g-string thong. As a sign of "new times," it generated academic and public debates about the political and moral ramifications of such public pedagogies—lessons in mass-media advertising, consumption, and the objectification of women. Dealing with these new issues of representation in newly emergent, hybrid, and local discourses of capitalism clearly raised many questions and contradictory solutions about reeducating the public.

Wary of terms such as pedagogy or critical pedagogy, the phrase of choice among my Slovenenian colleagues was "democratic education." This, they argued, characterized new ways of thinking about education in a post-independence age. While we struggled over meaning, so to speak, of terms such as culture, feminism, and pedagogy, we had lengthy debates over the implications of calling any educational practice "democratic." In my view, liberal democratic education has always managed to construct itself as egalitarian, inclusive, and as

valuing and rewarding individual ability within what many feminist and educational scholars consider a rigged and discriminatory meritocracy. Throughout this and the last century, democratic principles enshrined in the meritocratic ethos of competitive schooling, selective curriculum, and standardized testing, have managed to maintain and legitimate themselves through the mechanism of credentialing, rigid class, gender, and race divisions. Arguably, in the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia, no other public institution has managed to do so as effectively. Under the liberal rhetoric of democratic participation, schools have long functioned as a selection and certification mechanism whereby the politics of exclusion and inclusion are institutionalized under the guise of equal access (to unequal competititon) and measurable merit based on individual potential and achievement.

The discourse of democratic schooling claims that individual difference of intellectual ability, processed through allegedly fair and equal access and participation in the competitive game of schooling, will "logically" produce unequal outcomes. How the cultural, gender, and class bias of curriculum texts and tests, pedagogy, and policy, work to tranform the discourses of equal access and equal participation into unequal material outcomes and the reproduction of class, gender, and race divisions is not part of the official promise and ethos of democratic education.

So, as an educator, I skirt the term 'democratic' as cautiously as my Slovenian colleagues skirt the term 'pedagogy'. For them, the term democracy promises genuinely new potential: both discursively and in the political agendas they now set themselves in establishing a new nation-state. After four decades of communist rule, preceded by Austro-Hungarian colonialism, democracy is a new, unknown entity and a conceptual and political possibility. As a "naming," it does not carry the same historical baggage as is the case in North American and other Anglo-liberal democracies. Our debates about feminism(s) shared similar but different concerns over meaning.

But what this account illustrates so clearly, and what feminist and cultural studies scholars have long argued, is that meaning is never guaranteed, fixed, or unproblematically shared among social agents. Terms such as pedagogy, on first glance, might appear to mean more or less the same thing to most people involved in the educational enterprise. Yet because they are embedded in substantively diverse cultural and historical contexts and experiences, appeals to a common meaning become problematic, debatable, if not altogether impossible.

WHY PEDAGOGY?

My own life-long experiences of having been object and agent of pedagogical practices have led me to conceptualize pedagogy in very different ways than those commonly forwarded by educational theory. I have chosen pedagogy as the operant term for this volume for several reasons, all of which are tied to the fact that I engage in, construct knowledge and relations around, and am myself constructed by pedagogical encounters. But this choice is not based on the exclusivity of my own personal experience. Rather, the many personal and professional relationships I have formed in the process of becoming an educator and writer, have repeatedly taught me about shared educational experiences among women of all ages and from different cultural backgrounds, working in diverse disciplinary areas and countries. These shared experiences have revealed patterns of how we were taught to become girls, then women; how we learned to become academic women; how we learned to teach students and teach colleagues about ourselves as scholars and women. These have been long apprenticeships, often both difficult and rewarding. Yet they have profoundly influenced how we teach, what our research, theoretical, and methodological choices are, how we manage our institutional relationships, and how we negotiate our political agendas through diverse community activisms, scholarly networking, the university bureaucracy, and the building of professional and personal friendships with other academic women.

At the core of all this, is our labor as academic teachers, and "common" histories of having been objects of countless pedagogical regimes. These common histories do not imply identically shared experience but acknowledge that we have been formed in socially and culturally unique ways through the common experiences of schooling, growing up with television, learning from our mothers, "othermothers," childhood and professional peers, partners, and friends. It is this expanded sense of the term pedagogy that I have used to frame this volume. I wanted to put together a book that would reflect the many pedagogical dimensions of everyday life implicated in the constructions of gendered differences and identities.

Pedagogy in strict educational theoretical terms variously refers to the "art" or "science" of teaching, the processes and practices of imparting knowledge to learners and validating students' knowledge through evaluation and assessments. Within that definition, pedagogy refers to both intentional teaching and measurable learning, both of which are assumed to take place in formally named educational institutions. How-

ever, conventional definitions have generally failed to acknowledge the power/knowledge politics at the center of all pedagogical relations and practice:

> pedagogy refers to culture-specific ways of organising formal teaching and learning in institutional sites such as the school. In contemporary educational theory, pedagogy typically is divided into curriculum, instruction and evaluation: referring respectively to cultural knowledge and content, classroom interaction, and the evaluation of student performance. . . . Pedagogy entails a 'selective tradition' of practices and conventions . . . [and] insofar as such selections serve the interests of particular classes and social relations, decisions about . . . pedagogy are ultimately ideological and political (Luke & Luke, 1994, 566).

My own experiences as a girl in schools and a woman in university have taught me well both the selective tradition and the politics of selection. As girls in schools during the 1950s and 1960s, we didn't see ourselves in the curriculum other than in silly and stereotypical roles. Ten years at university completing three degrees also taught me quite clearly about which authors and what kinds of knowledges are ruled in and which are outside the canon of what Elizabeth Grosz (1988) calls "phallogocentrism." The gendered politics of classroom encounters—at school and university—have taught me and so many other women about the politics of voice and silence, even though we didn't always have terms or theory to talk about how pedagogy can function as a silencing device.

I have worked in the field of sociology of education for the past decade, and so my own academic and intellectual labor is centrally focused on questions of pedagogy and the sociology of knowledge. And, not insignificantly, the common experience of academic feminists—in fact, all academics—is that we all teach or at least have taught at some point in our careers. Yet for the most part, the politics of authority and knowledge which structure pedagogical relations and workplace culture of the academy have not received much theoretical or analytic attention in feminist theorising other than by feminist educators. Questions of curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation, and assessment have been addressed primarily by academic feminists in the discipline of education which, in my view, limits the theoretical scope and possibilities of rethinking pedagogical and knowledge relations from different disciplinary and subject positions.

Feminist practice in the academy takes many forms: women combat sexist, patriarchal, and phallocentric knowledges at many different

institutional levels and sites (Luke & Gore, 1992). Yet we all teach in one way or another: whether it is in the form of research training and supervision, writing for publication, or delivering lectures and conference papers. But how our labor is contextualized in the specificity of diverse institutional settings, the particularity of our student composition, and the disciplinary areas in which we work, profoundly influences how and what we select to teach, how we teach, and how we locate and construct ourselves in the subject position we occupy as the signifier 'teacher'.

I believe that our labor as teachers exerts critical influences on our institutional and personal identities, on scholarship, theoretical choices, and how we interpret and enact the pedagogical project of teaching to enable learning. And since what we teach we have ourselves learned, we are by no means, to use Gayatri Spivak's phrase, "outside in the teaching machine." We read books and journals, deliver conference papers, exchange and debate ideas, all in efforts to learn so that we can engage in the academic business of institutionalized scholarship: the (re)construction and (re)production of knowledge. The same process holds for teaching: we learn in order to teach and thereby are doubly located in the knowledge production and reproduction equation.

Academic labor requires that we select and develop curriculum, teach it, and assess student learning. We not only teach the scholarly word in print, but we teach with and about the world which scholarly work attempts to theorize. We interpret through instruction the course readings and related materials and, finally, appeal to certain criteria to assess what we determined as learning outcomes. Selection, interpretation, and evaluation of knowledge are the core relations of exchange between teacher and student, and these are fundamentally embedded in intersubjective—but institutionally constrained—relations of authority, desire, power, and control.

For feminists, these relations often entail substantial moral and ethical dilemmas because "feminist pedagogy" has long claimed that it refuses traditional authority and power in teacher-student relations and, instead, claims to construct pedagogical encounters characterized by cooperation, sharing, nurturing, giving voice to the silenced (e.g., Culley & Portuges, 1985; Grumet, 1988; Pagano, 1990). The feminist classroom, as Jennifer Gore (1993, 88) puts it, is marked by "the rhetoric of freedom, not control." In these alleged spaces of freedom, teacher authority is often disavowed and the sexual politics of institutionally authorized feminine authority and power are generally not debated or questioned (Gallop, 1994; Gallop, Hirsch, & Miller, 1990; Luke, in press, 1996; Matthews, 1994).

For feminist academic educators across the disciplines, these are issues of considerable theoretical and practical significance in relation to the still important feminist agenda of a politics of transformation. For all of us, regardless of our diverse subject positions, identities, historical trajectories, or disciplinary locations, pedagogy is fundamental to our everyday work in academia, much as it has been a central feature of all our lives in the shaping of our knowledge and identities.

Teaching/learning encounters begin in infancy, and range from learning letters and numbers from "Sesame Street," concepts of home and family from the 1980s "Roseanne" or "Family Ties," 1970s "Brady Bunch," or 1950s "Father Knows Best," concepts of femininity from *Seventeen* or *Glamour*. They include "things my mother taught me," culturally different protocols we learned at our friends' homes, and years of lessons in what counts as knowledge derived from decades of schooling and, for many, college or university education. Informal pedagogies begin with toilet training, the instructional toys parents buy for their children, parental lessons about hot stoves, crossing the street, or how to ride a bike and tie one's shoes.

What girls learn about femininity and sexuality from their mothers, other girls, and magazines, boys learn from other boys in the playground and locker-room. Lessons in manhood, as David Morgan (chapter 4) explains, are constructed in ways significantly different from how girls learn and relate over issues of identity, sexuality, and gender relations. Morgan writes of growing up male in England in the late 1940s and early 1950s. In that particular historical and cultural context, he recalls how boyhood and consequently manhood was constructed through models of male heroes in popular culture, and through male bonding in the "rhetoric of [sexual] experience." Having taught at university for over three decades, his enounter with feminisms in the 1980s has led him to reconceptualize his own boyhood and adolescent experiences of learning to become a masculine subject. Morgan's chapter speaks to the pedagogical project of reconstructing one's theoretical position on the basis of new learnings (feminisms) which led to a reconceptualization and, importantly, "rewriting" of parts of his own historical trajectory into discourses of masculinity.

PUBLIC PEDAGOGIES OF EVERYDAY LIFE

Learning and teaching, in my estimation, *are* the very intersubjective core relations of everyday life. They exist beyond the classroom, are always gendered and intercultural. I have taught and been taught in

many different kinds of educational institutions on several continents. As a girl, I was taught in Sunday school, Saturday-afternoon German-language school, English in a special school for immigrant kids, and so on. My domestic education entailed relatively formal lessons from my German mother and grandmother (sewing, gardening, and cooking "German"), my Canadian girlfriends' mothers (cooking "Canadian"), and my Chinese-American mother-in-law (cooking "Chinese"). I have learned from and have been taught by popular culture, peers, parents, and teachers, as a girl and as a woman. It is this broader (cross)cultural and social dimension of pedagogical practices—of teaching and learning the "doing" of gender—which shaped the focus of this book. That is to say, it is about the teaching and learning of feminine identities as they are variously constructed in potentially transgressive as well as normative models in a variety of public discourses, and as they are variously taken up by women.

Pedagogical regimes of subject formation begin in infancy. Before an infant is even born, most Western working-class and middle-class women consult not only other women, but pregnancy, birthing, and infant care books and magazines, teaching themselves about the ABCs of early childcare (Phoenix, Woollett, & Lloyd, 1993). Most parents attempt to teach young children the fundamentals of literacy, even if that literacy comes in the form of alphabet fridge magnets or playdough letters. In Western culture, parents induct the young into the sociocultural order and teach them culturally relevant moral lessons from folk and (often gruesome) fairytales in storybooks. Parents who can afford it, buy developmentally appropriate instructional toys in order to enhance their children's motor-skill, perceptual, and cognitive development.

As I show in my own chapter on children's popular culture as public pedagogies, computer games teach, and so do comic books, magazines, billboards, television, Barbie's Malibu Fun House, Voltron, Transformers, or the "multicultural" Power Rangers. Theories of play historically have been premised on the assumption that hands-on experience with manipulable objects are the basis for all learning. Yet psychological descriptions of play and pedagogy have tended to treat the sites, practices, and objects of play as individuated and nonideological. Children's toys and popular culture market not only desires and consumer behaviors, but cultural discourses, meanings, and values. Miniature tea-sets, little ironing boards and stoves, kiddie make-up sets, baby dolls, little cribs, and mini-strollers were the foundations of girls' play, learning, and "doing" femininity among the girls I grew up with and, as research continues to demonstrate, this discourse has changed little (Kline, 1994; Willis, 1992).

The social relationships generated around children's popular culture are centered on teaching and learning skills and values, and larger sociocultural and political lessons about class, gender, ethnicity, social power, family, good vs. evil. So, for instance, playing "house" or Barbie enables gender-specific social relations among girls and, of course, between individual girls and their toy objects. Boys' toys enable similar gender-specific relations among boys, and it is through these early gendered commodity discourses of play that kids are taught and actively learn about social power and relations, gender and race-identity formation. However, this is not to say that all children acquiesce to the play strategies and social relations implicitly prescribed by gendered toy commodities (see chapter 5). There is no simple and unmediated correspondence between, for instance, the lessons of children's popular culture, girls' or women's magazines, or even the more explicitly didactic lessons of schooling, and the formation of subjectivities and social identities. As most of the authors in part II argue, contrary to traditional social theory, culture industries do not produce a seamless hegemonic discourse which construct identically "duped" and experientially impoverished social subjects. Yet it would be equally naive to suggest that popular cultural texts and practices, or mass schooling, enable a boundless deferral to difference in the politics of meaning, reading positions, and identity formation.

The lessons of life are always simultaneously hegemonic, contradictory, and enabling of difference and diversity. But such tensions and contradictions can be particularly complex for children from dual-culture households who can experience diverse and often ideologically conflicting sources of formal and informal pedagogies that often add both a special burden and a unique complexion to identity formation (Luke, 1995; Reddy, 1994). As young parents, we made endless searches in toystores and bookstores for culturally inclusive books or toys which would teach our child about interracial families and cultural diversity. Much as my parents went to inordinate lengths to teach me about my cultural heritage, and to counterteach against the anti-Semitism and anti-German sentiment which was somewhat rampant in small-town Canada in the early 1950s, I too as a parent in an interracial family ended up having to learn how to teach my own child about bicultural identity, and to counterteach so much of the racism and sexism that came home from school and peers.

As a six-year-old immigrant girl, I spent hours in front of the television at my friend's house trying to learn English pronunciation and for years during my childhood, my parents sat me down almost weekly to learn and practice reading and writing German. In addition to lan-

guage and literacy instruction at home, I was sent to Sunday school and Saturday-afternoon German school. Many of the Asian and European migrant kids I grew up with had to endure the same kinds of extra schooling we all hated. But what became more difficult as we grew older, was coming to terms with the tensions and contradictions between the cultural lessons of home and those we learned at school, from peers and popular culture about gender relations, career aspirations, and feminine identity. The lessons in *Seventeen* magazine were a lot more important than the lessons on femininity I was taught by my mother, the church group, or the girls' guidance teacher at school. Then, as today, girls studied teen magazines intently, wanting to learn everything we could about boys, dating, sexuality, how to be a young woman, how to cope with parents, and so forth. And, as Kerry Carrington and Anna Bennett argue in chapter 6, much of what has been condemned by first-wave feminist analyses as politically suspect and hegemonic constructs of normative femininity in such magazines, can in fact provide positive counter-discourses to traditional concepts of femininity.

Cultural clash and dissonance, cultural difference and cultural diversity is a lived reality for millions of bicultural children and adults. It was the texture of everyday experience for me and for the kids I grew up with in the many neighbourhoods where migrants invariably start out from (cf. Tizard & Phoenix, 1993). My generation was a product of postwar modernist schooling, the first to grow up with television and mass-media culture, yet a generation marked in large part by our generation of parents who themselves grew up before World War II in a radically different cultural sphere. Moreover, many of that generation were dislocated and relocated as a consequence of World War II, just as many of the previous generation drifted to the "new world" as a consequence of World War I. In fact, what is now widely conceptualized as the 'postmodern subject'—one constituted by multiple discourses and local sites, and continually reshaped through travel along and across life trajectories and cultural zones—is a condition of subjectivity not that uncommon to entire generations of mobilized groups following high modernist events such as industrialization, "hot" and "cold" wars, or the breakup of empires. Growing up mobile, crossing boundaries, straddling cultures, learning the "old" and the "new," profoundly shape a lived sense of gendered bicultural identity, ways of knowing multiplicity, diversity, difference, and a provisional sense of place. And it is this struggle for place, identity, and, indeed, survival—this learning to make the self in relation to the overlapping, sometimes congruent and often contradictory discourses that variously combine to constrain and

enable subject positions and identities—that is the very substance of everyday life for most people in what are now called postmodern conditions.

Relations of learning and teaching, then, are endemic to all social relations, and are a particularly crucial dimension of parent-child relations. The authors in this volume argue that pedagogy is fundamental to all public/private life and all communicative exchanges, from the nursery to the playground, classroom to the courtroom. Social agency in the world is about learning from and reacting to multiple information sources, cues and symbol systems. In chapter 2, for instance, Elisabeth Porter develops an analysis of women's friendships. She makes the case that learning about others' desires, life narratives, needs, and goals is a prerequisite of identification with a concrete other in order that one may reciprocate with appropriate care, respect, and responsibility in the building and maintenance of women's friendships. We learn from others and we teach others about ourselves, our viewpoints, and our understandings. This volume, then, is an attempt to explicate the experiential and representational texture and political parameters of some of those everyday sites where gender identities and relations are taught and learned.

THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Most collections like this begin with an idea. That idea quickly turns into an intellectual and social project as one maps the initial idea onto existing and related areas of debate and inquiry, and then goes about contacting scholars in efforts to secure contributions. The intellectual debate over a project that ensues with potential contributors also produces social relationships which form a writing community of sorts. In the three-year course of this project, I have formed fax, e-mail, phone, and writing relationships with people I have never met. That in itself is a dimension of sociality and intellectual work which both requires and generates certain kinds of pedagogical skills as well as a politics of identity claims and positionings. Let me elaborate on this.

My case for a volume such as this had to be argued in order to convince potential contributors of the merit of taking the concept of pedagogy out of its traditional semantic field and connect it more directly to issues of identity. Papers had to be edited and arguments provided to justify those edits; in many ways, that kind of textual work is similar to the teaching function inherent in marking student papers. Through this negotiation over knowledge, I have learned much about

the lives of the women in this volume. Many who started out committed to this project three years ago have had to drop out, mostly for work-related and a variety of personal and health-related reasons. Moves to a new job and all the institutional and social pressures that accompany taking on a new position—particularly in the case of academic women who are also single mothers—also took its toll. Events such as the birth of a child, or serious illnesses, call for a very different kind of social and writing engagement between editor and author(s) alongside the usual business of editorial work. Repeatedly, the dimensions of these relationships illustrated Elisabeth Porter's argument in her essay on women's friendships.

This volume consists of thirteen essays organized into three parts. Part I addresses questions of identity formation, part II focuses on the public pedagogies of popular culture, and part III examines pedagogical agendas and politics in academic and legal discourse. I thought it conceptually and politically important to begin the book with the politics of identity formation, and believe that chapter 1 makes a powerful contribution to debates about the complexity of gender and cultural intersections that impact on women of color. In "Learning Identities and Differences," Patricia Dudgeon, Darlene Oxenham, and Glenis Grogan talk about the identity politics of being Aboriginal women.

All three women come from diverse personal, disciplinary, and community backgrounds, but all claim a strong sense of self as Aboriginal women, and a shared commitment to advance the academic achievements of their people. Much has been written in Australia about Aboriginal identity—importantly, the reclaiming of lost identities. The three women here speak of a particular inflection of that struggle for identity: being Aboriginal, female, high-achieving, and working in academia. In this country where indigenous rights, standards of health care and housing, education and employment rates are far behind those achieved in many communities in developing countries, being Aboriginal, female, and in academic leadership positions, is a powerful accomplishment. One of the many difficult issues to come to terms with, they claim, is dealing with racisms from the white community and with their sense of difference wihin their own communities. Their stories tell parts of each woman's life experience. This approach—the telling of stories to each other—reflects the Aboriginal tradition of story telling which defines individuals' sense of place and belonging. From these stories emerge in sharp relief the impact their experiences have had upon the development of the philosophy of the Centre for Aboriginal Studies at Curtin University, where Darlene Oxenham and Glenis Grogan are centre coordinators and Pat Dudgeon is the head of the centre. Unlike the

history of African-American Studies Centers, universities, and colleges in the United States, Aboriginal academic centers of study are relatively new in Australia. In that regard, the institutional positions the women occupy are testimony to their political and pedagogical commitments, tenacity and perserverance of purpose in a society and institutional context which has only recently let go of European, pastoral, and missionary models of Aboriginal welfare and education.

In the second chapter, "Women and Friendships: Pedagogies of Care and Relationality," Elisabeth Porter analyzes the moral dimension of women's friendships. She argues that women's friendships are characterized by learning about others' desires, life narratives, needs, and goals. Learning about others is a prerequisite for identification with a concrete other in order to reciprocate with appropriate care, respect, and responsibility. What differentiates women's friendships from men's disconnected sense of self and other, are shared intimacies, mutual supportiveness that emerge from concrete everyday lives, and a concerned partiality for and responsiveness to particular others, relations, and contexts. This orientation to particular others, not to an abstract generalized other, underpins women's relational caring. The social and ethical differences between women and men's orientation to self and other, Porter argues, are the consequences of pedagogic differences in early gender socialization and identity formation which are taught from birth and reinforced by social structures. Importantly, Porter argues for a feminist concept of friendship which is built on a dialogics of caring relationality and requires strong ideas and practices of the self: self-trust, self-love, and self-respect.

In "Motherhood as Pedagogy: Developmental Psychology and the Accounts of Mothers of Young Children," Anne Woollett and Ann Phoenix examine developmental psychology textbooks and use transcripts from interviews with mothers to identify constructs of motherhood and childrearing pedagogies. Their analysis supports Porter's argument about the early socialization of relationality among girls, and ties in with my own chapter in part II on the textual construction of childhood and parenting. But because undergraduate developmental psychology texts are not popular cultural texts per se, I thought it conceputally appropriate to include Woollett and Phoenix's essay in this first part of the book on identities and differences. Their transcripts demonstrate that mothers actively teach their children about sex-appropriate gender behaviors, values, and identities. These women identified more with their daughters than sons, and saw their relationships with their daughters in relational terms. Woollett and Phoenix show that developmental psychology constructs parenting as mothering, and

idealized mothering is based on assumptions of white middle-class and heterosexual nuclear families. Class or cultural differences are ignored in these texts other than when "problem" families and mothering are discussed in terms of deviation and deficit.

Mothers' pedagogical functions, the authors claim, tend to be concretely based on, for instance, the children's ages, the number of children, and the contexts of women's everyday lives. Women's home pedagogies of childrearing and the construction of their identities do not follow the decontextualized lessons of "good" mothering promoted in developmental texts. Rather, the identity politics and power struggles within mother-child relations are mixed: women feel both good and ambivalent about motherhood; the alleged middle-class ethos of reciprocity, mutuality, and ("elaborated code") reasoning is riddled with mother-child conflict and tensions, battles of will, and power struggles. The image of ideal motherhood in developmental psychology theory, then, is an inadequate and unrealistic image of women-as-mothers. The perpetuation of this model to undergraduate students, many of whom will work in the public sector as social workers, counsellors or teachers, is politically naive and dangerous in an age when more and more women claim social identities which this discourse condemns: "working mothers," "young mothers," "single mothers," "lesbian mothers."

The last chapter in this part, "Learning to be a Man: Dilemmas and Contradictions of Masculine Experience" by David Morgan, examines the construction of masculinity. Given the relative paucity of scholarship by men on the construction of masculinities, I thought it important to include a contribution on pedagogic regimes that shape masculine identity formation. Morgan's essay, therefore, provides an historically interesting, class- and cultural-specific account of early lessons in masculinity, particularly lessons in male bonding over issues of sexuality. What Morgan describes are practices that are significantly different from girls' learnings and relations over issues of identity, sexuality, and gender relations. The relationships among boys that Morgan describes are often confrontational and hierarchical. Bullying is one such early boyhood experience through which boys learn "how to take it," and learn to be a man.

Morgan writes of growing up male in England in the 1940s. In that particular historical and cultural context, he recalls how boyhood and consequently manhood were constructed through models of male heroes in popular culture, and through male bonding in the "rhetoric of [sexual] experience" which, he argues, interects with what is commonly claimed as the dominant mode of masculinity—"the rhetoric of rea-

son." Morgan counters the argument that divisions identified between women and men, femininities and masculinities, are usually mapped onto splits between emotion and reason. He claims that this differentiation "also maps out differences among men or styles of masculinity." Reason and experience combine in different ways to form masculine knowledge and identities, and are used in different ways by men within systems of patriarchal dominance. Masculinine identity formation, then, is not a unified experience among men and is never wholly experienced and constructed on one side of the experience/reason dualism.

How popular culture functions as public pedagogies is taken up in part II. This section begins with an excerpt from Susan Bordo's important book *Unbearable Weight* (1993), nominated for a Pulitzer Prize and selected by the *New York Times* as one of the "Notable Books of 1993." In "Hunger as Ideology," Bordo examines the politics of the gendered discourse of food in media representations. Food ads targeted at men often equate eating with sexual appetites, whereas women are positioned in a much more restrained, but no less eroticized, relation to food. The sexualization of desire and gratification, coded onto women's and men's relationships with food, is particularly evident in dessert, candy, and snack food ads. Food ads, however, do more than push to sell products: they teach consumer, gender, and cultural behaviors and values. Bordo points out that women's historical relationship to food has been to prepare and serve food to men and children, often foregoing her own portions in places and times where food was scarce. For women, the preparation and serving of food is the socio-cultural conduit through which she expresses her care, love, and devotion to kin through the giving of (oral) sustenance at the price of self-denial. Representations of gender in food ads are often ambivalent and contradictory, but mostly hegemonic. Women claim to "crave," "obsess," or "dive into" those scrumptuous deserts, yet compared to men's voracious appetites and the generous portions they consume in food ads, women eat restrained and then only "tiny scoops" and "bite-size pieces." Busy career women (and, more recently, men) prepare and serve quick meals for the family, but a woman's "self-feeding" is almost always a solitary, "private, secretive, and illicit" affair in isolation behind closed doors.

The lesson for women is straightforward. In public she denies her hunger but in private, she obsesses, indulges, and fills herself with tiny bonbons, a few potato chips, or phallic ice cream bars. Bordo argues that the representation of women in Western media food ads "offer a virtual blueprint for disordered relations to food and hunger," and functions as a Foucauldian social discipline "that trains female bodies in the knowledge of their limits and possibilities." These texts and

imageries do teach powerful lessons about what and how women should eat, how they should feel about food, and what foods they should be publicly seen with. The huge financial resources invested in the Madison Avenue vision of sex-food-gender, the billion-dollar diet industry, and the statistical evidence of women's many eating disorders, are testimony to the power of these images from which women do learn how to discipline their hunger, bodies, and identities.

Kerry Carrington and Anna Bennett also analyze textual imageries of femininity in "'Girls' Mags' and the Pedagogical Formation of the Girl," which provides an important counter-argument to scholarly critiques of sexist ideology in girls' magazines. Unlike the hegemonic gendered imagery in the more specialized discourse of food ads examined by Bordo, Carrington and Bennett argue that girls' magazines provide both hegemonic and "productive" images of femininity, and that there is no simple correspondence between textual form and content, and "the pedagogical formation of adolescent femininity." A close textual analysis of the four most popular Australian teen magazines (*Girlfriend, Dolly, Cleo, Cosmopolitan*) reveal that much of the imagery and textual content is in fact positive, productive, and enabling. They argue that there is not just a patriarchal plot, not just a hegemonic "culture of femininity," nor just a single stupifying discourse of "romantic individualism" at work in these magazines. Instead, girls are provided with a range of instructions, devices, and techniques for transgressing normative constructs of femininity. Ads and editorial texts provide lessons on how to manage menstruation, address common concerns about tampons, provide guidelines for safe sex and information on HIV, AIDS, and sexually transmitted disease, nutrition and health, contraception, eating disorders, lesbian and gay relationships, dating, make-up and make-over strategies with which to reinvent, remake, and "play" with sexual identity. Question and answer sections address a remarkably broad range of issues of pressing concern to teenage girls which many parents or school counselors probably do not deal with.

These magazines comprise one form of what Foucault called "governmentality" for the formation of feminine identity. However, these texts are no more than a cultural resource in the bricolage of everyday life in which we all make and remake ourselves *in relation* to a range of other discourses which are sometimes commensurate and hegemonic, other times contradictory and transgressive, but never static. Millions of girls today and in the past have learned how "to do femininity" from these magazines, and yet waves of generations did not grow up identically stupified and duped into *Stepford Wives* bliss. In Carrington and

Bennett's view, these magazines "are transgressive texts which expose femininity as a prop, a put-on, a make-up and make-over."

In my own chapter, "Childhood and Parenting: Constructs of Race and Gender in Children's Popular Culture and Childcare Magazines," I look at how race and gender are written into constructs of childhood, parenthood, motherhood in children's popular culture and parenting magazines. In contrast to the "productive" and "transgressive" constructs of femininity found by Carrington and Bennett in adolescent teen magazines, constructs of gender in children's popular culture and childcare magazines are decidedly reproductive of traditional gender divisions. The big money-spinning toy, videogame, and mass-media hits remain anchored in gender stereotypes, and parental self-help texts such as parenting magazines, do little to alter traditional perceptions of mothering or the family.

A content analysis of visual imagery in Australian, American, and British parenting magazines found that parents and children of color are virtually absent, as are gay and lesbian parents, and men in active parenting roles. Men function as professional experts, celebrity endorsements, or as cartoon features. Mothering, as Woollett and Phoenix also note in their essay, is represented as an isolated, indoor, and somewhat lonely activity centered solely on the care of an infant. The visual and textual representation of women in these magazines suggests that she has sole responsibility for the social and moral development of the young which, in turn, positions her as prime target for the kind "mother-blaming" perpetuated in developmental psychology and media pop-psychology discourse. The commodification of childhood, evident in the huge success of national and international retail toystore chains, is a central part of the instructional discourse of childcare magazines. "Good mothering" is based on assumptions of heterosexual and affluent nuclear families and on a woman's product expertise necessary for addressing children's innumerable developmental requirements which the commodity discourse claims to enhance and cater for. The commodification and marketing of childhood has segmented childhood into increasingly finer developmental stages, and mothers are continually exhorted to assume the moral and pedagogical responsibility of being knowledgeable of these developmental and corresponding commodity differences in order to make the right product choice. Thus, the articulation of finer-grained developmental categories, distinctions, and stages has become a way of constructing niche markets. Parenting, then, is a seductive but disciplining discourse embedded in fantasies of idealized normative femininity, exclusively white, middle-class, and heterosexual.

Susan Willis, in "Play for Profit," also looks at childhood as market with a focus on the commodification and changing public space of play. She argues that children's imaginative play is social and cultural practice through which gender stereotypes are variously combined, reproduced, and transgressed. Children's play, unfettered by high-tech gadgetry, is fluid and malleable, drawing on and combining multiple story-plots, characters, social relations, rules, and strategies. The play of children's commercial culture, however, is contained within a controlled environment of menued choices, much like schooling contains children in a site of negotiated but nonetheless disciplinary regimes and within similarly "menued"—categorized and boundaried—knowledges. Amusement parks such as Disney World provide another site for what may appear like a cultural domain for children's play, imagination, and amusement. Yet here too experience is programmed, ordered, and orderly, tightly "meshed with the economics of consumption as a value system." The trend in the last decade towards the commercialization of children's play zones, in Willis' view, aids and abets the encroachment of capitalist logic into one of the last "free" spaces of children's play. Pay-by-the-hour play areas in shopping malls, the identical colorful and plastic play zones at McDonald's (free play if you eat), and "Discovery Zone" in the United States are regimented and supervised spaces of play which promote a uniformity of "pretend" and play possibilities. Discovery Zone is a high-tech space replicating a Nintendo-like game format. Structured activities confine kids to specific experiences (sliding through tubing or into ball vats, scaling mountains), and to specific utterances. Much like fast-food chains only enable menued dialogue between customer and attendant ("small fries, large coke . . . ," etc.), so do places like Discovery Zone limit dialogue to shouts of "Let's do that again" or "Hey, follow me." Creative play, social interaction, complex discourse structures, and intercultural play experiences are increasingly limited.

Willis notes that because public parks and playgrounds are becoming increasingly unsafe, the middle-class white flight to paid and supervised play areas leaves public spaces to the poor, often black, immigrant, and inner-city kids and their families. In the United States, massive cutbacks in spending on public infrastructure and social services have hit public education particularly hard. As a consequence, a private enterprise like Burger King "now runs ten high schools in the West and Mid-west." Commercial television already has made substantial inroads into curriculum and pedagogy of the U.S. public school system. Children's culture, their play and learning is undergoing radical change, and what this shift from free play to play for profit signals is

a shift to, in Willis' words, "technologically programmed definitions of play" which "fits the needs of managerial capitalism" (cf. Kenway, Bigum, & Fitzclarence, 1993).

The last chapter in this part, "Women in the Holocene: Ethnicity, Fantasy and the Film *The Joy Luck Club*," examines two cinematic texts as cultural pedagogy. Rey Chow's provocative analysis of the film *The Joy Luck Club* suggests a very different reading than the commentaries I have read or heard from viewers. She argues that the "ethnic film," a relatively new and burgeoning genre in Western cinema, is constructed in ways that white films and film-makers are not. The ethnic film has a double pedagogical functions in that it purportedly functions as a recovery of origins for ethnic groups, but serves also as cultural lessons for whites about others: their history, identity, social relationships, and experiences. Certainly the most recent collection of ethnic films focus precisely on those issues (e.g., *The Wedding Banquet; Like Water for Chocolate; Eat, Drink, Man, Woman; The Scent of Green Papayas*). Chow argues that these films function much like Foucault's "confessional," and "repressive hypothesis" by exposing to the normative gaze, and bringing "to light" the repressed histories and dark continent(s) of others. *The Joy Luck Club* reveals that otherness, the "secret" of Chinese identity and history, through the autobiographical narratives of the lives of four mothers—all from another time and place—through the eyes of their American daughters. However, the narrative and cinematic conventions used to symbolize "Chineseness" construct a pastiche of cultural stereotypes which, in turn, construct an "orientalist" reading.

In the second part of the chapter, Chow takes a different and unexpected turn by arguing that *The Joy Luck Club*, much like *Jurassic Park*, is part of the same moment of postmodern delegitimation of (traditional) knowledges, knowledge boundaries, and genres. By juxtaposing both films against Lyotard's notion of the delegitimation of knowledge, the science-fiction film and ethnic film fiction are ultimately legends of fantasy, fantasies of history with equal claims to narrative "truths" about our diversely constituted collective culture. Rather than reading *The Joy Luck Club* as subcultural, separate, and other, Chow reads it as functioning concurrently and at the same epistemological level as *Jurassic Park* in the postmodern partial and perspectival revisioning of knowledge about our multiple selves, ancestries, and origins. Ultimately, Chow argues, the scar on the neck of one of the mothers functions both as narrative hinge and metaphor which enables the narrative unfolding of mother-daughter continuities, and signifies woman as marked yet able to heal and recover (herself). But, importantly, the scar also signifies "the mark of a representational ambivalence and inexhaustibility—in

this case, the ambivalence and inexhaustibility of the so-called 'ethnic film,' which participates in our cultural politics not simply as the other, the alien, but also as us, as part of our ongoing fantasy production."

Part III consists of four essays which consider the pedagogical functions and consequences for women of pedagogic and legal discourses and practices. The first essay by Sandra Lee Bartky, "The Pedagogy of Shame," is a revised excerpt from her influential book *Femininity and Domination* (1990). Here she articulates what, I believe, many feminist educators have witnessed in their own classrooms. For many but certainly not all women, academic discourse and the gendered politics of classroom encounters, can be a profoundly humbling and threatening experience. Women's sense of intellectual inadequacy, Bartky argues, reveals itself in both bodily habitus and speech. Self-denigrating comments about their work, excessive qualifiers which preface their comments, and the use of tag questions characterize "women's language" in the classroom. Female students are often apologetic for their work, and often interact with teachers in physically diminutive ways, whether that is standing back from the group, heads lowered, eyes down, "chest hollowed and shoulders hunched." Silence, hiding, concealment, a subtle cringe and tentative speech, a sense of self as inadequate, defective, or diminished—these are the hallmarks of shame that many women students embody.

Bartky speculates that women's habitus may be a counter-pose to men's competitive, verbally and physically assertive self-representations. But given the male-defined tenor of many university classrooms, silence can be a safe space for women, particularly since women's assertiveness or disputations are not always affirmed as valued intellectual contributions. However, if we look at the research on girls and schooling, which Bartky does in the last half of her essay, the evidence is clear that women enter university with a life-time of socialization behind them in learning to take second place. Whether through classroom speech or pedagogy, teacher attention, verbal questioning, praise or explanation, boys get more and girls get less. Although girls' achievement levels across the curriculum, in Australia at least, slightly exceed those of boys, girls learn to learn in a different mode, one marked by restraint, silence and, for many, an enacted sense of inadequacy.

Efforts to reverse girls' and women's socialized learning styles have been the focus in recent years of feminist and "critical" pedagogy models which seek to empower girls and women, and other silenced culturally marginalized groups. A key pedagogical and political strategy of emancipatory pedagogy is to give voice to the diversity of student experiences through inclusive curricular content and classroom