PURSUING RESPONSIBILITY: WRITING AND CITING POSTSTRUCTURAL QUALITATIVE INQUIRY, SOCIAL JUSTICE, AND CHRISTIANITY

by

SARAH CATHERINE BRIDGES-RHOADS

(Under the Direction of Mark D. Vagle)

ABSTRACT

This abstract aims to aid the reader in approaching this dissertation by expanding upon the content stated in its title (see Appendix A for a supplement to the title that complicates its function as a means of further preparing the reader for reading this dissertation). The reader is invited to join the researcher in her pursuit of responsibility related to two objects of knowledge, one named prior to the study and one named during the authoring of the dissertation text.

This poststructural qualitative study initially sought to explore ways to speak across perceived differences in the missions of those who identify strongly as Christian and the social justice missions of many teacher education programs. Further, the researcher sought to understand how Christianity serves as a prominent identity category for many preservice educators and how that aspect of identity is often not addressed by teacher educators who aim to create a culturally responsive atmosphere as part of their social justice mission. The researcher collected extensive data from thirteen interviews with seven participants and two focus groups with four participants. The participants were all pre-service elementary school teachers enrolled in teacher education programs who self-identify as Christian and who had participated in mission work outside of public schools.

As the study progressed, the trajectory of the work both shifted and diversified as methodological issues proliferated. This shift required the researcher to consider further data sources, such as physical responses of the body and response data from writing partners, and to explore methodological issues, like citational practices, ethics, and the representation of participants. As a result, this dissertation became both about the intersection of Christianity and social justice in teacher education, as originally intended, and about the persistent methodological issues that are produced in poststructural qualitative research. Consequently, this dissertation can be useful to both teacher educators with social justice missions who encounter Christian students in their programs, as well as qualitative researchers who are working at the boundaries of traditional methodologies and need models of what post qualitative research might look like.

INDEX WORDS: Poststructural, Qualitative inquiry, Christianity, Mission, Vocation, Social justice, Teacher education, Deconstruction, Writing

PURSUING RESPONSIBILITY: WRITING AND CITING POSTSTRUCTURAL QUALITATIVE INQUIRY, SOCIAL JUSTICE, AND CHRISTIANITY

by

SARAH CATHERINE BRIDGES-RHOADS

B.S.Ed., The University of Georgia, 2001

M.Ed., The University of Georgia, 2004

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2011

PURSUING RESPONSIBILITY: WRITING AND CITING POSTSTRUCTURAL QUALITATIVE INQUIRY, SOCIAL JUSTICE, AND CHRISTIANITY

by

SARAH CATHERINE BRIDGES-RHOADS

Major Professor:	Mark D. Vagle
Committee:	Amy Parks Judith Preissle

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2011

DEDICATION

For my mother and the Cap’n from whom I will continuously learn about love.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As always, words cannot adequately express the gratitude I feel for all the people who have encouraged me with great kindness, patience, and love during this process of thinking, writing, reading, listening, and talking that is so lovingly referred to as *dissertating*. I offer only a small beginning of thanks below.

To all of the women who have given time to talk with me and explore the love that guides their work and fills their hearts.

To Bill for listening to me try to think the world post-like, for being a wonderful father to Elena always and especially on long writing weekends, and for loving me even when I couldn't remember my own name (or yours).

To Elena for laughing with me often and for reminding me to be thankful for the wonderful in life.

To my mother for unconditional love and support.

To God for all that is always becoming.

To my LP for our Monday night walks and talks, for inspiring me with all your brilliant and creative thoughts and writing, and for teaching me how to be kind to myself even on the toughest days.

To Jessica for writing and thinking with me often, for helping me remember that I only have to begin somewhere, and for joining me in an exploration of how to mesh poststructuralness and motherhood.

To Missy for being open and for constantly encouraging me to be so too and for gyming with me even when we'd both rather be doing anything else.

To Mark for always being hospitable to my theoretical wanderings and wonderings, for modeling the wildness and excitement of philosophy, and for reminding me that I cannot and need not say everything in a dissertation.

To Amy for helping me find the practical in things.

To Jude for asking me the questions I don't know how to think.

To Candy for loving me like my mother.

To Matthew for always telling me how proud you are of me and for being a wonderful Papa to Elena.

To my sister for teaching me about being a mother, supporting me through the rough patches, and for listening.

To GannPops for the never-ending diaper changing, book reading, and bird watching with Elena and for encouraging her general silliness. Pops, your salary will be doubled when I graduate!

To Lindsey, Jenni, and Hannah for your never ceasing flexibility and energy.

To the Critical Reading Group for giving me a place to make theory and practice inseparable.

To DDD, COOLMOL, and Tracy for making Phdness fun and ridiculous.

To Dianne and Stephanie for keeping me in check.

To Betty for being a wonderful critical friend for many years and always building me up.

To Bettie for encouraging me to get smarter.

To Tesler for a dance video that never gets old and always keeps me laughing.

To my father for being a part of my life.

To Athens Moms Group and Full Bloom for keeping me and Elena social.

To everyone who has leant me a writing home for the long weekends.

To Holace and Grahm for taking care of me and Hilary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1

APÉRITIF/DIGESTIF

"We begin wherever we are—in the midst of a language, of a tradition, a heritage, of a complex and ultimately unfathomable web of intersecting, interweaving and conflicting beliefs and practices, an inescapable cacophony of voices and counter-voices, a crazy quilt that we will never succeed in unstitching or simply bringing into harmony."

Caputo, 2001, p. 301 in *Questioning God*

Introduction

I begin this section with a quote—a direct citation from one of the many works of theologian John Caputo. His friends call him *Jack*, a name not so dissimilar to the given name of Jacques Derrida (1967/1974), *Jackie*, the man whose assertion to begin "wherever we are; in a text where we already believe ourselves to be" (p. 162) is the quote to which Caputo referred in the above quotation. I am not sure why I wrote the citation from one Jack over another Jackie and I am not sure if it matters. In fact, it is with this question of *if it matters* that I find myself here, writing a story of a dissertation that I have come to believe can be nothing but "an inescapable cacophony of voices" (Caputo, 2001, p. 301), a '*wild profusion* of existing things' (Foucault, 1970, p. xv), that I must do my best *not* to tame if I am going to be mindful of the poststructural commitments I take up in the dissertation.[1] Nevertheless untangling and taming is the task of a dissertation—a text which must simultaneously say something that has not been said before and assure the readers (the dissertation committee) that the author is well prepared for a lifetime of inquiry situated within the research tradition that precedes her (i.e., has the

intelligence, knowledge, and self-discipline among other things) (Lovitts, 2008). This written text, after all, like any written text, finds its place within an "age-old discursive habit to create one author, who supposedly gave birth to the words on the page (as if they lay within, waiting to come out)" (Davies, 2000, p. 7). It is here, within this tradition, that I find myself writing three stories of a text in which I was charged to become a "writer-who-can-be-known" for "her words" (Davies, 2000, p. 7) in a dissertation filled with words that are laced with a "residue of ambiguity" (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p. 697).

To prepare the reader for the stories I will tell below, I begin by attributing some space to exploring a trouble with words and the burden of authorship that have necessitated this chapter as a companion to the ones that follow. As a part of this work, I also describe how writing functioned as a method of inquiry that enabled a pursuit of responsible research and relations in the face of numerous methodological stuck places. I follow with three stories, each of which proceeds from a methodological stuck place, an aporia, which has greatly impacted the work I have done in this study and the writing of this dissertation. In them, I describe how these sticking points acted as moments of beginning, where deconstruction happened, and I had to make a decision how to proceed responsibly in light of methodological and ethical uncertainties. Finally, I conclude with an elaboration of two beginnings that have resulted from the work in this study and the writing of this chapter. It is my hope like an apéritif, a cocktail typically served before a meal, this chapter will ignite the readers appetite for what is to come and like the digestif that is served after will aid the reader in digesting the unfamiliar.

Words and Authorship

Trouble with words is not something new that I bring to the table with this dissertation. What words can do (and cannot do) has long been up for grabs in qualitative research (See

Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a for discussion)[2] and such quandaries about language have been a focal point of poststructural educational scholars for many years (e.g., Davies, 2003; Lather, 1993; Mazzei & Youngblood, 2009). Derrida's (1967/1974) critique of logocentrism[3], for instance, threw into doubt the idea of full self-presence and self-consciousness and invited a rethinking of many of the foundational concepts that qualitative research hinges upon such as voice (Mazzei & Youngblood, 2009), validity (Koro-Ljungberg, 2010; Lather, 1993), data (St. Pierre, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c), and writing (Richardson, 1990, 1994; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005). As such, this dissertation finds its place within a long tradition of questioning how research that claims itself as qualitative can (and possibly should) be done since the language we use to collect our fieldnotes, transcribe our interviews, make sense of our data, and share our research with others is marked by the belief that words cannot do what they claim to do—represent an originary being (including participants, researchers, objects of knowledge). Situating this work and myself as author within this context that foregrounds uncertainty, thus, requires as Spivak (1974) has suggested, learning "to use and erase our language at the same time" (p. xviii). That is to say that problematic language is unavoidable because all language is incomplete (e.g., categories like participant, Christian, researcher), and yet it is necessary to use this problematic language in order to do the business of research. This necessity requires that I *think* language and *do* language as Spivak (1974) does, coming "to such unfamiliar conclusions that our very language is twisted and bent even as it guides us," performing writing as an act of contortion (p. xiv).

Who I can or should claim to be as an author, for example, must be highly contested since the words we use to narrate our*selves* as sufficiently coherent beings, can, as Derrida (1967/1974) said, be understood to say "more, less, or something other than what he [or she] would mean" (p. 158). When asked, for example, if he were an atheist, Derrida (1993) replied

that he could “pass” as one, explaining that he was unable to say “I am” because he lacked the authorial “I” to reconcile the many voices within him that gave one another no rest (pp. 154-155). Similarly, Michel Foucault (1980) suggested that we should perhaps dispense of the signature altogether, signing our works instead from the conversations we have been a part of since power (authorial or otherwise) is a "multiplicity of force relations" (Foucault, 1978, p. 92) that comes from everywhere and does not follow hierarchical notions. Moves such as these do not advocate for an abdication of authorial authority or claim that this understanding of the author is an improvement, a more enlightened viewpoint.[4] Instead, such moves invite a theoretical and epistemological shift toward examining how familiar concepts and categories function; not what they are.

It is through this work of examining the *hows* of those concepts and categories, which are so useful to think and act with, that possibilities for newness become available. Instead of doing away with old concepts, such as author, we ask these concepts to do different work (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005). Erica McWilliam (1997), for instance, described how academic writers must necessarily claim authority as authors, but those working in the “post” must work to produce a “different posturing of authority” (p. 219) with “*new* textual forms” (p. 220). As with any concept or category useful for making sense of the world, each different posturing and new form is always open for critique. In fact, it must be if one is “to fight the tendency for our categories to congeal” (Caputo, 1987, p. 236). Such a congealing, Koro-Ljungberg (2010) warned can lead to a sort of “methodological banking” (p. 606) that can enable researchers to evade responsibility for the ongoing decision making that takes place in qualitative research. Authors (and researchers), then, who work in the “post” (or the post-post) must ask the sorts of questions about their work that invite an ongoing critique of their research during the actual

process of conducting research. Koro-Ljungberg (2010) proposed, for example, that researchers ask how one knows when a qualitative study becomes complete and analysis is finished (p. 607). Similarly, in her text *Fields of Play: Constructing an Academic Life*, Laurel Richardson (1997) pursued the questions, "How do the specific circumstances in which we write affect what we write?" and "How does what we write affect who we become?" (p. 1). McWilliam (1997) asked, "What sort of textual performance is now appropriate?" (p. 224), and St. Pierre pondered (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005), "What else might writing do besides mean?" (pp. 971-972).

Not surprisingly, in committing to the type of deconstructive work[5] in which I am obligated to write within the limits of language, consistently and persistently doing and troubling along the way, I find myself *necessarily* asking questions such as those mentioned above.[6] Believing, for instance, as poststructural thought invites, that what can and cannot be said, done, written, or thought is shaped by the cultural stories available to us through language—stories which we shape in the same moment we are shaped by them[7]—I find myself needing to put writing at the front of this dissertation even though the storyline of linearity crumbles as I write. *Not* to do so feels uncomfortable.[8] If I am mindful of the theory that guides my life and work, I must trouble the writing of a *me* who conducted the research, of the participants I interviewed, of the literature I have read, of the theorists I have cited, and of the conversations of which I have been a part. *Not* to address the writing, it seems, for me, here in this space, is not to "bear the burden of interpretation" (Derrida, 1978, p. 209) that seems necessary if as Denzin and Lincoln (2005a) said, I accept that "writing itself is not an innocent practice" (p. x).

This burden of interpretation has haunted me throughout this study, "coming and coming back again" (Derrida, 1993/1994, p. 13), as I have found myself writing within and against what Derrida (1993a; 1993b; 1995; 2005) called the aporia of responsibility. It, like all aporias (an

impass as the Greek translation suggests) requires one to decide what is *just* in the face of the singular other at the very moment when one does not know how to proceed. That is to say, in the writing of this dissertation, the writing itself has become a marker of this paradox of responsibility—one which I hope would allow me to proceed in a study where ethical concerns and methodological conundrums abound. In this way, I take up the call of poststructural theories, which according to Richardson (1997), call upon authors to look at ethical responsibility in relation to writing. To do this, as Derrida (1989/1992) advised, one cannot be merely a "calculating machine" (p. 23) who aims to follow and conserve laws and rules. Instead, deconstruction is driven by and calls for "an openness towards the other" (Derrida, 1984, p. 124), which exceeds any attempted (and necessary) calculations, anticipations and so on, never proceeding, so he believed, "without love" (Derrida, 1992b, p. 83).

Writing as an Ethical Project

This work follows in the footsteps of others who have found the troubling of writing as an ethical project where responsibility to the other can be placed at the forefront (Davies, 2000; Derrida, 1989/1992; Gannon, 2005, 2006; Holbrook, 2010; Lather & Smithies, 1997; Richardson, 1997).[9] Derrida (1989/1992) said that by troubling "the norms and the etiquette of academic writing" one can hope to "exhibit their finality, what they are protecting and excluding" (p. 85). Teri Holbrook (2010), for instance, asked educational researchers to spend more time examining the possible effects of a failure to consider what she described as the "oppressive" ways that writing can be used for "sorting, rating, and labeling" children with disabilities, qualitative researchers, and others who are encouraged or discouraged to write in multiple contexts (p. 172). As a method of encouraging such questioning, she resisted the production of what Lather (2000) called a "comfort text" that conforms to "usual ways of sense

making" (p. 285). Instead, Holbrook (2010) created a multi-genre text, which included various photos of artwork and multiple types of prose. Similarly, Susanne Gannon (2005) produced what she called an "imaginative act of fiction writing" (p. 622) in which she deconstructed the oft-cited binary between literature and science that she worried limited the possible (and possibly loving) ways for readers and author to encounter the other in research. Gannon invited readers to imagine with her an *other* who defied categorization as perhaps a sister, friend, or even the woman she could become in an unimagined but never impossible future. Drawing upon Cixous (1994), who Gannon said took up writing as a practice of love, writing became a space for Gannon to engage with the limitations and effects of writing the other.

Writing as a method of inquiry. In the writing of this dissertation, I have found myself, like these researchers before me, inviting writing to become a space where I could, as St. Pierre (2005) said, "produce different knowledge and produce knowledge differently" than traditional approaches might allow (p. 175). To do the ethical work that writing can invite, I have taken up writing not only as a method of inquiry but also one of data collection and analysis (Richardson, 1994; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) in which the writing of myself and others, necessarily involves unique interpretations that are not based not in already established rules, laws, or norms that serve as sole indicators of responsibility (Derrida, 1989/1992). It also includes a constant mindfulness and attentiveness to the unforeseeable in research and the impossibility of language to fully represent any subject (i.e. participants, key informants, committee members, family members, other readers). These characteristics produce research as a space of uncertainty where questions abound with no easy answers. Yet still, as Derrida (1995a; 1995b) suggested, one must continue to make decisions, to act—here and now—all the while questioning those decisions as they are made. In this way, I have made writing my space of action, a taking up of the urgent

call of deconstruction, which is justice, if such a thing exists (Derrida, 1989/1992, p. 15). The text becomes another part of the research *field* where fieldwork continues on and data proliferates (St. Pierre, 1997a; 1997b; 1997c). As such, questions about writing become questions about qualitative research itself. Richardson (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005, p. 966) proposed just these kinds of questions: "How can I make my writing matter? How can I write to help speed into this world a democratic project of social justice?" (p. 967)

Richardson (1990, 1993, 1997) also advised the writing of "writing stories" which situate one's writing within other contexts in one's life such as disciplinary constraints, familial ties, and personal histories. She believed that this work of persistently and urgently looking at oneself and others and the discourses that have shaped thinking offers authors the opportunity to ask new questions about the potential consequences of our writings and make a situated and ethical decision about how to proceed. In other words, these stories invite the researcher to attend to how she is produced through writing and how that writing contributes to the production of others, exploring how language operates as a powerful constitutive force, actively producing people and things.[10] Richardson (1997) described, for instance, how the story line of academic writing often complicates the ease of reflexive and ethical work aimed at what and who writing produces since academics are often told to suppress the "I" and accept the "all-knowing, all-powerful voice of the academy" (p. 2).

This type of situating seemed particularly important for the writing of a dissertation, which not only must be organized according to a timeline, but also acts as training instrument—a text which in part must stand to tell someone about the author as a researcher and demonstrate its ethics and validity (Kamler & Thomson, 2008). McWilliam (1997) recalled being told that the common five chapter format that follows the predictable and linear "theory-method-findings"

plan would act as a driver's license allowing her insider status in academia. Building upon this metaphor, she noted that, like the license, the thesis was as boring to read but without the advantage of being as short. Unlike the thesis, the license actually had someone "in the picture," leading her to question who actually gets framed in the doctoral text (p. 223). But like me, she had to write *a* dissertation to complete her doctorate but also because like me, she believed that she had important work to do. The project then becomes, like Holbrook (2010) described, to "incite treason while performing the practice [I] seek to interrogate" (p. 177).[11]

***Nomadic inquiry and the leap into the unknown*.** This dissertation functions, in part, as a writing story of a researcher trying to *do* research as the research *does* her and others within the very field that the dissertation produces. In turn, this chapter functions as a writing story of a writing story. However, these stories are not written by an all knowing, self-reflective researcher and they are not linear, carefully sequenced, or necessarily bounded on the page. Instead, this field of writing is marked by what Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) called striated and smooth spaces which exist simultaneously in an overlapping mixture.[12] The former is a fixed, sedentary space, where actions are predetermined and carefully planned. The latter is a nomadic space that is not marked by departure or arrival but is instead "infinite, open, and unlimited in every direction" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, pp. 475-476), in a constant state of becoming. St. Pierre (1997a, 1997c) explored research as "nomadic inquiry" (1997c) and writing as "nomadic writing" (1997a) where a researcher can try to "settle" in these smooth spaces (St. Pierre, 1997c, p. 369) and let thought "multiply and recombine" (St. Pierre, 1997a, p. 412). A nomadic researcher works to endlessly deterritorialize the stirated spaces that have been previously ordered or shut down, "gnaw[ing] a smooth space to extend her territory" (St. Pierre,

1997c, p. 370) and watching as the field grows and "erupts in some strange, new place" (St. Pierre, 1997a, p. 412).

This type of work is a move toward an ethics of the unknown that interrupts the telling of simple stories and instead necessitates a text with multiple, overlapping, and often contradictory layers that refuse being centered or hierachized. As Helene Cixous (1993) said:

> The thing that is both known and unknown, the most unknown and the best unknown, this is what we are looking for when we write. We go towards the best known thing, where knowing and not knowing touch, where we hope we will know what is unknown. Where we hope we will not be afraid of understanding the incomprehensible, facing the invisible, hearing the inaudible, thinking the unthinkable, which is of course: thinking. Thinking is trying to think the unthinkable: thinking the thinkable is not worth the effort (p. 38).

This is the work of getting "lost" that Lather (1997) described—work which solicits interruptions amongst participants, researcher, readers, and other data in order to "open up present frames of knowing to the possibilities of thinking differently" (p. 288). In this way, writing "has nothing to do with signifying" but with "surveying, mapping, even realms that are yet to come" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 4-5). The text that is produced does not "imitate the world" (p. 5) but is oriented "toward an experimentation in contact with the real" that is always "susceptible to constant modification" (p. 12).

Below you will find the three stories mentioned above that are markers of this nomadic journey. I arranged them in a way that I hope will allow a reader to get a sense of the scope of the research—even as the scope of the research continues to become. As mentioned above, each story proceeds from a methodological stuck place, an aporia, which has impacted the work I

have done in this study and the writing of this dissertation. I call these aporias of responsibility, following Koro-Ljungberg's (2010) call to turn validity toward ethics, taken in the Derridian sense of responsibility being always unfinished (see the validity section of Appendix A; see also Appendix B; Apéritifs /Digestifs, Uninvited Guests 17 and 57 for further consideration of validity). Burbules (2000) described aporia as a "crisis of choice, of action and identity, and not only of belief" (p. 17), affecting the researcher on multiple levels at once. He continued on to say that researchers may find themselves with "too many choices, or no choices," asking questions such as "What do I do?" "What do I say?" or "What's wrong with me?" (p. 17). In these sticking points the researcher must decide how proceed responsibly when there is no clear answer.

The first aporia involves an entry from my dissertation log, a document I used to collect and analyze data throughout the study. In it, I explore an aporia that I call *Citing God*, which involves my difficulty in with the subject/object binary as it specifically relates the researcher/participant and its complication by ways of citations of God. The second involves an excerpt from a chapter in the dissertation that I use to explore the difficulties I have had with *Citing Theorists.* In particular, I describe the impossibility of claiming responsible citational practices in the face of what felt like the interminable blurring of theorists with other data. Finally, the third, *Citing Selves* relates to the decision not to treat individual participants as my locus of analysis but instead to write characters as spaces where thoughts could happen and from which data collection and analysis could proceed.

All three of these stories overlap. They also contradict each other as I wrote through multiple beginning points for the study and tried to make sense of moments where I did not know how to proceed. These were my attempts to put the writing of the dissertation at the

forefront, a move that Davies (2009) said can allow one to grapple with the "almost irresistible" desire to try to present the real. It is also a move that invites the imagination to take "free reign" as the author works from the "body's deep surfaces as places to be read," working within and against the "weight of familiar language uses and patterns" (p. 199). As such, I have watched the linearity of both planned research process and a linear text unravel and deconstruct as I have written. This chapter, in the process, has become a space to address an object of knowledge that I did not set out to address—the production of the qualitative researcher and qualitative research when writing is used as a method of inquiry.

Aporias

Aporia One: Citing God

I begin with an excerpt from my dissertation log, a place where I wrote often throughout the dissertation:

> *Holy shit, my mom was one of those women. I almost wrote girls but stopped myself even though my mom was the same age as they are when she wrote the letters I just read. She actually wrote "PTL," Praise the Lord I assume, after multiple words and sentences she wrote. It was in all caps. And on the outside of her letters it said things like "glory" and "Jesus" and things like that. I just kept thinking, oh my, she was one of them. I don't even know what I mean by that. I sure do separate them from me even though I thank God every night for Elena and for my family. Maybe it is because my God is someone different. It is like I don't know who my God is but he isn't Jesus. Or maybe he is. But he isn't necessarily a he and doesn't necessarily need a capital letter.* (dissertation log, 2-9-10)

In June of 2009, when I was part-way through writing the dissertation proposal for this study, my much beloved mother passed away unexpectedly, and in September of that same year I gave birth to a daughter named Elena Fischer Rhoads, the Fischer after my mother's maiden name. I wrote the above excerpt a few months after Elena's birth when I had already begun collecting interview data upon receiving IRB approval in January, 2010. My aunt, sister, and I had been cleaning out some of my mother's things and we had come across a collection of letters that she had written throughout her lifetime to her parents and sister that I imagine found their way back into my mother's hands when her parents had passed a few years earlier. The letters began in her younger days when she would update the family on her adventures at the horse camp where she spent many weeks as a child and teenager. They continued on into her early marriage to her first husband, my father, in which she often described the trials and joys of raising her first daughter, my sister, in a city too far from her family. A sprinkling of letters reached the years of my early childhood where she had moved back to her home state, but the letters I referred to above were written in her early twenties when she was just at the age of the preservice teacher participants I interviewed in this study that I claimed aimed at examining the production of the subject—the preservice teacher—in relation to mission work.

I wrote the above entry in my dissertation log, a computer document that became a space to write through the numerous data I collected and analyzed in writing[13] throughout the study. The writing I did in this log undertook a variety of forms. More often than not, I would sit down to a blank page with a stack of books, articles, interview data, or any other assortment of documents I either felt compelled to read or had scheduled specific time to read, and I would just write.[14] Sometimes, though, I would find myself running to the computer to think through a discomfort or realization I had during a conversation with another, reading a text, or listening to

an interview transcript. That was presumably the case here since I began the entry with "Holy shit," a phrase that I have come to notice has popped up quite often in moments of great discomfort (and ironically has often incited even more discomfort given the topic of dissertation study).[15]. At this point in the study, I had already interviewed four participants[16] while I was still trying to finish up my dissertation proposal, I found myself thinking often about the preservice teachers I interviewed about the short-term mission trips they took as part of their missions to glorify a Christian God and to love others.[17] I also found myself thinking often about what it meant to claim to be a Christian since all of my participants had made that claim. Not surprisingly then, as I reread this excerpt from my log, I feared that I might be connecting my mother's professed Christianity with that of my participants. And I wasn't sure what I meant to imply by that.

I hoped the poststructural theories I had chosen to use in my work (or they had chosen me, I am not sure) would somehow protect me from falling into the trap of writing off *others* or *ideologies* as members of a monolithic problematic group who might somehow subvert movements toward a more socially just society.[18] I had often seen an inclination to disregard the preservice teachers with whom I worked, who, like the interview participants in my study and the vast majority of preservice teachers in the United States were white, middle-class, mono-lingual, and female.[19] And despite the fact that I had already delved into my dissertation study, I was unsure of how or if this category of *Christian* mattered. More importantly, I was uncertain how or if it mattered in relation to the work toward social justice that I believed was important in teacher education, even if I was unsure that social justice is possible. [20] At any rate, here I was, expressing some sort of shock and discomfort that my mother's citation of God somehow made her one of some unidentified *them* as if it were a distasteful fixed position far different from

where *I* was. I did not like it. It felt not only wrong but unjust. But confusingly, in almost the same moment that I seemed to be to distancing myself from that category, whatever it entailed, I also questioned my certainty about that refusal. I questioned the boundaries between me and them, myself and my mother, myself and participants, and perhaps all of us and God.

My training in poststructural scholarship taught me that new possibilities for thought might arise in examining the discursive practices that felt the closest to the *me,* the ones, for instance that I must actively work (even if I do not realize it) to engage in as I narrate myself as a coherent *I* despite the constantly shifting power relations which I produce and am produced by.[21] I might begin by locating those ways of thinking, being, and acting that felt particularly familiar, a bit too comfortable, or unnoticeably common—the ones which made me *feel* like Sarah, some unitary, finished being who was not in process as poststructural theories suggested.[22] In other words, I might invite suspicion of my own citations, the ones I repeated so often that I forgot to remember that I could repeat them differently.[23] I appeared to be doing that sort of work in the excerpt as I questioned my own practices of praying to a God I was unsure existed. The writing felt too dangerous though. While at the moment this excerpt rested safely in my dissertation log, a place I had designated for letting thoughts happens and imaginations run wild, I had no idea what part of that log would come out in later writing, the writing that would make it to the actual pages of the dissertation.[24] Who would I claim to be in those pages and who would I claim others to be? What effects might such claims invite?

The *I*. Like the vast majority of people in the United States, and especially in the South, I grew up in religious households loving a Christian God whom I believed had a purpose and a plan for my life.[25] Not surprisingly then, as a teacher educator, who has worked with preservice elementary teachers throughout my doctoral program and prior to it as an elementary school

teacher, I have often suspected that my students experienced, but perhaps did not recognize, the same familiarities and comforts afforded to me having grown up in a country where identifying oneself as a lover of God, and especially a Christian God, was often not only readily accepted but quite necessary if one was to be considered good, just, and morally sound.[26] I would often find that the preservice teachers with whom I worked signed their emails to me with "God Bless!" or "In His name," and openly talked with me about how they spent their summers and spring breaks traveling the world to undertake what are often described as short-term mission trips done in the name of Jesus. Furthermore, not only did I often hear them speak of being *called* to take these trips, they often mentioned teaching as their *calling* as well. This was a term I had used as well to describe my own work in teacher education which focused in helping preservice teachers find ways to enact a more equitable and just society.

Although I often felt unsure about defining who or what was *calling* me to act, for these Christian students, I assumed *calling* referred to a divine one from Jesus Christ, one that was often not written about in the literature I read in teacher education that focused on preparing teachers for work in public education.[27] Perhaps similarly, I imagined public education as a mission field, in a sense, a space, for social transformation that was necessarily marked by numerous missions required by accreditation boards and individual schools. But this sort of field felt far different from the fields I knew my students were entering on their mission trips.[28] Although I believed like most educators I know, that the field of education or the act of educating is never neutral given that education, by definition, implies change in a certain direction, I feared that the direction these preservice teachers desired was not in the service of *all* children, particularly ones whose behavior fell under the multiple descriptions of sin that circulated in different Christian circles.[29] These same preservice teachers (and in some instances

teacher educators) who often cited Jesus Christ in their email signatures were the very ones who claimed that homosexuality was not a social justice issue despite the mounds of research that examines the horrific experiences of bullying and marginalization that many openly gay, lesbian, or transgender children encounter, sometimes in the name of Christian beliefs and practices.[30] In this way, I could see how citations of Jesus Christ might invite suspicion that Christianity might not mesh with social justice aims, but I still was not so sure who this *one of them* was that I had written about in my dissertation log and I was not sure I wanted to or *could* know.[31] I desperately sought another description of that world than what Noddings (2008) described as the common belief amongst conservatives that liberal agendas are attacking religious efforts. I didn't want to be taken up as one more line of assault on Christian preservice teachers.

Derrida (1994) said that "constantly to suspect" (p. 18) is part of what gives deconstruction its movement and opens possibilities for justice to arise. Yet, suspicion seemed like such a tricky concept and I found myself experimenting with what this suspicion might be directed toward. It did not make sense to direct it at the subjects, the preservice teachers themselves, whose motives and intentions—whose missions—would be said to direct their actions in other epistemological and ontological paradigms. In poststructural thought, a subject was made to *mean* through language just as she made and remade the language that produced her.[32] Also, directing it at the *mission* or even the *name of Christ* in which the mission work was enacted seemed counter to the description of the world I was using to help make sense of this dissertation work. In this description, names were merely nutshells that always failed to tie down the nut, the thing itself, they claimed to protect and shelter.[33] Furthermore, doubting the goodness of who or what issued the *calling* my preservice students claimed to answer seemed impossible. The nature of God the Father, Jesus the Son, or the Holy Spirit, if such a being

existed in trinity, or at all, would always exceed any definition provided.[34] And thinking suspicion in relation to Christianity was also impossible. I had learned from the work of theologian, John Caputo, religion, and Christianity as a religion, was far too contradictory and multiplicitous to tie down.[35]

I had to determine how to deal in descriptions of the world that were counter to those that I was learning about from the poststructural theories I was reading, and I was unsure of how to use these theories and be suspicious of them at the same time as was necessitated. Was I failing to be suspicious of the theories that informed my thinking even if these theories were not claiming to have access to the real but were just offering other descriptions of the world? Like my earlier realization that I was perpetuating categories of *us* and *them* in my writing, it felt wrong to presume myself (and others), for example, to be unfinished and in process. On top of that, I heard the familiar critiques in my head asking me what post work would get me if it will not provide me with a clear answer, if it will not tell me what to do. Yet, I knew that poststruturalism advocates action or as Foucault said, "everything is dangerous," so danger is not an excuse for inaction. I could not guarantee what this work would get me, but I knew I had to begin. I had to propose something to my committee, even if I did not exactly know what. I had to believe that it is in these moments that make us most uncomfortable that the truly fruitful work can happen. And I had to believe that other descriptions of the world might produce different effects, and I would have to do my best to pursue the responsible scholarship that would allow me to be accountable to the descriptions I produced—even as I believed such responsibility to be always unfinished.

The participants. As mentioned earlier, I had already begun collecting interview data as a part of what I termed at the time my pilot study, but which later became considered a part of

the first round of interviews.[36] As a starting point, I asked the elementary and middle grades preservice teachers who agreed to be a part of my study about their practices of attending mission trips.[37] I said in my IRB application that my intention was to deconstruct (to open up and see how it is functioning) the discourse of the mission work in elementary and middle grades education by focusing on how participants--teacher candidates--were inventing, reproducing, or resisting certain teaching identities related to Christian mission work. To do this I designed an interview protocol that invited participants to talk with me about their trips, even showing pictures from their trip if they liked. I had a protocol, but I found that I rarely referred to it and instead asked questions based on the conversation.[38] Although I found these interviews intriguing, exciting, and thought provoking, I was unsure if the thoughts being provoked during this data collection/analysis process were exactly the kinds I was hoping for. In fact, I feared that they were quite the opposite, if such things as clean opposites exist. As I interviewed, transcribed those and read through them again and again, listened to them more times than I could count, wrote about and through them, and talked with others about them, I heard/read what seemed like a drilling and mining for knowledge. I caught myself asking (in thought, speech, and writing) the sorts of questions that St. Pierre (St. Pierre & Richardson, 2005) mentioned as not necessarily aligning with the sort of project poststructural thought can invite: "Who are they?" and "What do they mean?" (p. 971).

These questions felt not only uncomfortable but not fruitful considering that my task was not to represent these women as fixed subjects but to explore how subjects were written in certain spaces at the same time that the space was continuously rewritten. These questions became even stickier as I fixated on parts of the transcripts that explicitly nodded to God's potential influence (or interference) in all of this. I read over and over again a prayer given by a

participant during our focus group in which she asked God to intervene in the conversation and shape it for His glory. I excerpt it here with great discomfort (and after considerable conversation with writing partners and others but I do so to highlight the ways in which my participants' spirituality was inextricably linked with their daily existences and practices of self, as well as to demonstrate how agency is tangled in conversations about and with God.

> "I pray God that you would truly be the center of this conversation, Lord, as we discuss all of these things, Lord, we come before you and submit before you. . . I pray that you would bring clarity to our speech as we discuss all of these big huge ideas, Lord. I pray that you would simplify it so that it is understandable and hmmm easy to communicate." (personal communication)

Who was I to decide what was God's doing and what was theirs? I desperately sought a way to think these women not as objects of knowledge but as lines of flight (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987) that would carry me away and disturb the tranquility of fixed meaning.

The blur: Who is a participant? At the same time I became fixated on determining the words of participants and their meanings, I became just as fixated on what *I* was *meaning* in the process. In other words, as I wondered who they were (each as individuals and a group), I wondered the same about myself. In my writing, I poured over the moments during interviews (and subsequent interactions with those interviews and the various associated texts) where I felt certain that I was either completely like each individual or completely different. I wrote about feeling chills during moments of interviews when I heard participants talk about the certainty of God's plan or the comfort of God's love for us. I even left one interview convinced that the participant was glowing with the deep love of Christ.[39] I also wrote of times when I felt nauseated by what I was hearing participants make connections between living in poverty and

lacking in love.[40] I talked with my writing partner, Hilary, about these moments often during our weekly data collection/analysis talks at a local restaurant (See Bridges-Rhoads & Hughes, 2010 for further discussion) and fretted over those conversations as well. Below is an excerpt after one of those discussions (Dissertation log, August, 17, 2010).

> Hilary asked how do I do it, how do I not put my shit on them [meaning how do I try to remain open during interviews even when I feel nauseated]. And I said because it is about the contradictions, it is the fact that I get chills, physical chills when I hear them and I am right with them, almost in tears thinking about how this narrative works for me. How it means something.

And then, in the days that followed, I would pour over what I meant by "this narrative" that worked for me or my statement of being "right with them." It was as if I could not *not* want an untroubled subject/object binary between myself and participants.

Selection criteria. The weight of the subject/object binary fell heavier upon me as I realized at some point during the study (not sure when) that depending on how I looked at it or who I asked, I could be said to fit all of my own sample selection criteria. First, I had participated in a religiously oriented mission trip in the past seven years that was initiated in the state where the study took place, Georgia. Though the trip I took was not affiliated with any *religion* in the more orthodox sense of the word, I knew that identifying somet*hing* or some*one* as religious was hotly contested. I had read much of John Caputo's work, for instance, who claimed (following the lead of Derrida) that perhaps *religion* might be recast as a search for the "possibility of the impossible" (Caputo & Raschke, 2002). In my case, I had embarked on such a search when another teacher and I traveled to various parts of Mexico in order to search for ways to do the seemingly impossible but necessary work of teaching across linguistic and cultural differences. I

was not sure that I wanted to use the term *religion* though in that sense, especially since like many others in education (e.g., Boston, 2005; Cooper & Randell, 2008; Lewy & Betty, 2007; Noddings, 2008; Palmer, 2003; Passe & Willox, 2009, Whitcomb, Borko, & Liston, 2008a; 2008b), I worried about the ever blurring boundaries of church and state.

Second, I was not sure if I had expressed a religious affiliation to my professors and peers in various capacities as was the requirement for interview participants. I grew up as a Christian, am currently affiliated with many churches and religious organizations for various purposes, and have been throughout my life. Depending on whom I asked, I am not sure what the answer would be. Finally, although I was not a junior or senior with major in either early childhood education or middle grades education, I had been one in that same position when I was in college. Furthermore, although I currently taught and supervised preservice teachers as a part of my graduate assistantship work, this work often felt like student teaching, and I often thought myself as a preservice teacher educator who was not yet a teacher.

Folding. The excerpt from my dissertation log that I placed at the beginning of this story finds its place here, in this interminable blurring of participants and me—the blurring that has left me wondering if I could ever tell the difference between the researcher and the researched as phrases like *one of them* crumbled before my very eyes. In three articles published the same year, St. Pierre (1997a, 1997b, 1997c) wrote of a similar problem in her work with the older women in her study who she said "had taught her how to be a woman" despite her having moved away from the community where they lived (and she was raised) and having been "reconstituted in other discourses and practices" (St. Pierre, 1997b, p. 178). She (1997a) wrote of the conflation of the subject-object binary, for instance, by saying the following:

> . . . I interviewed women I had known all my life, women whose language was my own, women whose practices of the self were my own. I could not contain myself with them; I escaped; I traced their words, their gestures, their bodies. I was them (p. 411).

St. Pierre had used Deleuze's (1986/1988) image of the fold to help her make sense of this conflation, but I had not read nearly enough Deleuze—thinking with Deleuze's images did not come easy. I resisted the *fold*, and tried to turn back to Derrida (1989/1992) or Foucault (1978, 1982) to try and help me think my way through my predicament so that I could proceed (into another space requiring more thinking, planning, and calculating). But I had no luck.

Thus, as I wrote, and thought, and acted, I returned often to read St. Pierre (1997a, 1997b, 1997c) to try and find some way of thinking differently. St. Pierre (1997c) said that images such as the fold enable a researcher to explore dualisms in research, such as the theory/practice binary which never seemed to hold as one struggled to enact ones theories in practice or strain the theory to name the practice (See also Deleuze & Foucault, 1977/1972). These images enabled spaces for the folding of theory into practice by way of inviting connections or alternative pathways that might not have been imagined without the image. She had also said that Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) welcomed the taking up of these images and the use of them other contexts. Yet, I feared that if I began to re-read and explore these images at such a late moment in the study, I might get too excited about what Deleuze (1986/1988) or Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) had to say and try to retheorize every bit of my dissertation in relation to it. Thus, I tried to only dabble in their texts when I could resist no further. I even caught myself claiming to want to reread parts of Deleuze's (1986/1988) text, which happened to be entitled *Foucault*, to think more about Foucault. I knew that this was just a ploy for me to get another glimpse of how his figuration, the fold, worked in practice as he employed it to write the text. Thus, with great

resistance, I resided myself to try to stick to St. Pierre's discussions of *the fold,* and in a way to try to think with St. Pierre's figuration of the fold.

Incidentally, doing so also meant harassing my writing partner, Jessica, into "explaining" the fold to me on the phone, over email, and through her comments as she read earlier drafts of this text. Through these interactions and my continued interactions with St. Pierre's texts, I have begun to see how the fold might help me explore this space where these images of an *I,* a mother, a God, an individual participant, or this group called *Christians,* or even a mission were all continuously folding into one another—indistinguishable in many ways. From what I am gathering from conversations with my writing partner, reading St. Pierre (1997c), and trying not to read too much Deleuze (1986/1988), the fold does not have a simple exteriority and interiority, each with a neat surface and depth extending below. Instead, what appears to be the interior is actually a *fold* of the exterior. What is thought to be deep down inside a person's core, for instance, is but a fold of what appears to be on the surface. In fact, the fold is what we call our subjectivity or how we make sense of ourselves. It is the way in which we make ourselves into certain kinds of persons by folding that which is outside inside—by folding with other folds. In different spaces and times, in different cultures, possible subjectivities are produced, but the lines between these are not closed. The boundaries are always shifting as new folds become available—as we begin to think ourselves in relation to the ideas, materials, and even the concepts of time that are folding onto one another.

If I saw myself, as St. Pierre (1997c) had, working within a fold that was producing my subjectivity, my sense of self, then in that fold I could think myself differently. I could think a subjectivity with no easy boundaries which separated me from others. Instead, this sense of self was already doubling over, folding into other places, people, and things and distinguishing one

from the other was often impossible. In this sense, who I was, or even who I claimed as participants in the study became questionable as I recognized how I was made in the same folds as my mother, as my participants, as multiple other *thems* I could name.

This doubling and redoubling reminded me of how Davies (2000) wrote of how she drew often upon her own experiences of both writing and living as an important part of her research practices. She referenced the writings of Hélène Cixous (e.g. Cixous & Calle-Gruber, 1997), who she said drew upon the details of her own subjectivity in order to "find the detailed ways both to understand the complex detail of subjection and to creatively move beyond some aspects of it" (Davies, 2000, p. 10). Davies (2000) saw this work as autobiographical not in the sense of producing an account of a particular life, but instead, by examining how one takes up "the tangled threads of life" to understand the "constituted power of discourse both as I find myself constituted and as I, in turn, constitute the world in my reading and writing of it" (p. 10). Like the fold, Davies (2000) seemed to be suggesting that in these tangled threads of life, these folds, we are double over into one another, so intertwined in that we can begin to think our*selves* as others.

Movement in thought. Thinking with the image of the fold—whether it be St. Pierre's fold, Jessica's fold, Davies's fold, Deleuze's (1986/1988), my fold, or some folding of all of these—I began to see my role as a researcher differently. As I came to see myself as possibly being *one of them*, whoever or whatever that was, my research questions began to have new meaning. For my dissertation proposal, I had written three new questions that I thought would be broad enough to allow me to embark on a wide exploration but narrow enough so that I at least remembered I was to have some direction. They were as follows: How is the subject—preservice teachers—produced within the contexts of mission work?, How are the discourses of

social justice and Christianity (God) deployed within these productions?, and What resistances or tensions, if any, are available for confronting these productions? I was able to look at these words like preservice teacher, social justice, Christianity, God, mission, as folding into one another. As such, the resistances and tensions were fluid and ever changing as certain ways of making sense of oneself folded.

I also began to see the necessity for exploring the ongoing sense I was making of what felt indistinguishable. In other words, I wanted to do the work of attending to details of my own subjectification in order to make sense of the discourses through which I and others were produced as we produced them. The endnotes, which I call *Uninvited Guests* (see Appendix A for description) became spaces where I could do this work. In them, for instance, I pondered the ideas attributed to multiple others and explored how these interacted in multiple moments in time. These were spaces where decisions of how to think oneself and others and keep open these boundaries between us and them became possible. In these spaces, I believe responsibility to myself, my mother, the participants, the reader, and God was made and remade.

Aporia Two: Citing Theorists

I begin this writing story with a partial excerpt from Chapter Three of this dissertation entitled *Appetizers*:

***Freire*:**

Must we start out so combative? Tisk, tisk. I must say that I was hoping we'd all think of this conversation as a dialogue of sorts, where we all come to the table ready to rethink this object of knowledge, love, that you have so kindly brought forth. As you have noted, we all have some things to say about love, and of course, like all words we use to describe ourselves, our worlds, and others, it should be rethought in a space where we can stimulate one another to

think and re-think the former's thoughts and re-word the world I don't want to speak for you Derrida, but if I am not mistaken, no one here is claiming to have received a mandate from God to save the other, with the undiscussed truth in hand to be inserted into another's head.

Derrida:

Yes, thank you for the intervention, Freire. I find my work is often taken up in ways I had not intended. Nevertheless, I do believe that we can all claim to be here under a pretence of openness to the other, even if you and I have very different ideas about this truth you speak of . At any rate, if I may offer a little precautionary advice on the matter before we proceed though—language does have a way of allowing us, how can I say this, to say "more, less, or something other than what [we] would mean."

Freire:

Derrida, if I may intervene again. I must beg you to explain what you are trying to do with all this talk of language? Scare her into saying nothing? With these precautions, should we not proceed then? Should we just call off the conversation all together? Of course it is important to recognize that language is never neutral, but we cannot fail to realize that it is through language that we make sense of the world. And it is through a focus on language that we can come to know our place in the world and our true humanity. I am sure we can return to this point in a bit. First, though, let's get back to Responsibility's concerns. Before you speak again, I'd like to thank you, Responsibility, for your hospitality. I am glad that you have invited us here to help you think. I am sure there are many others who you could have invited to converse with you today about love. I remember you telling me on the telephone, for instance, that you have found that many of your undergraduate students often talk of love along with references to a Christian God, which you often see referred to, for instance, in email signatures

which state "With love in Christ" or "Jesus is love" and so on. You have invited us here today, instead of, for example, Jesus, so I hope that in time you will share with us your reasons for bringing us here instead of others.

As stated above the above is a partial excerpt from the second chapter of this dissertation, a chapter entitled Appetizers, signaling its place in series of conversations that find their place in body of this dissertation. I use the term *partial* in relation to this excerpt because although I cut and pasted from the chapter in which it finds its home, I did not include the excerpt in its entirety. I did not include the tiny numbers that mark the endnotes, or the *Uninvited Guests* as I have come to call them (see Appendix A for description), protruding from the text. Of course, even if I had, the poststructural theories I take up in this dissertation would invite me to question the word *entirety,* and *partial* for that matter, since both sit in a binary relation haunted by the privilege of presence over absence that Derrida (1967/1974; 1994) has repeatedly critiqued.[41] Nevertheless, in choosing to refer to this excerpt as *partial* and inserting it here as such, I aim to highlight an ongoing problem that has marked the writing of this dissertation, citational authority. The problem has not been in understanding the necessity of citing the scholars, studies, and words of others. I know full well that without further information, one can only assume that the words above were written by a person called *Derrida* and a person called *Freire* while a third person called *Responsibility* presumably was present. And to claim such a thing in writing, with it not being the case, would be considered by most if not all scholars, quite irresponsible (which is not what I am claiming, by the way) (see Chambliss, Bong, Greene, Kauffman, Loyens, & Van Meter, 2010 for a definition of plagiarism that includes not only direct copying of words but also excessive paraphrasing and borrowing of authors' ideas without acknowledgment).

For one, it would leave too much guess work, although in the context of this study which I have already named as being interested in education, poststructural theories, and social justice teacher education among other things, the figures might not be difficult to guess. Jacques Derrida, for instance, I already cited in the first page of this chapter. Paulo Freire, as well, has found his way into the pages as one I have heavily relied upon in my work as a teacher educator. Both are widely cited and are featured in books about their work in relation to education (Biesta & Egea-Kuehne, 2001; Darder, 2002; Trifonas & Peters, 2004). Responsibility, on the other hand, might not be so easy to identify. Although I have mentioned *responsibility* numerous times in this chapter, I have not capitalized it as a proper noun (unless it found its way to the front of a sentence). Instead I have talked about it as a thing—a desirable but impossible thing—but not as a person who might exist in the material world or who at one time lived and breathed as Jacques Derrida and Paulo Freire both had (May they rest in peace). How could one be certain *whom* I was writing about without further citation? Furthermore, how could one tell the difference between my work and the work of Jacques Derrida, Paulo Freire, or someone called Responsibility if I did not signal to another work? And how could one determine my role as *author* of a text in which this non-citation existed or for that matter, determine the genre of the text? Without proper citation, perhaps a reader could assume that this actually was a transcript of an interview not so unlike the numerous others Freire and Derrida have participated in [see the edited text *(Inter)views: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Rhetoric and Literacy* (Olsen & Gale, 1991) for interviews with Freire and Derrida]. Or perhaps one might assume it was part of one of Freire's *talking books* in which he and other scholars talk in writing about various social and educational issues (e.g., Shor & Freire, 1987).

Yet, here in this chapter, I have provided an excerpt, naked of all citations, for reasons that are persistently changing and unfinished. Before I go into more detail about the reasons for inserting the partial excerpt above, I feel I must tell a tale of an earlier draft of the conversation from which the above came—a conversation that went by a different name when it acted as my comprehensive exam, *Guess who's coming to dinner?: A fictional conversation with Jacques Derrida and Paulo Freire about love*. Taking space in a dissertation for writing about the comprehensive exams is probably not often done, especially when exams are designed in three parts (methodology, theory, and content literature) that neatly roll into the dissertation proposal and again the dissertation as the first three chapters. However, it is the writing of this tale that I believe will allow me to explore the work of writing in a particular way, subverting the linearity of typical doctoral work but honoring the research process as I have conducted it.

Comprehensive exam. The first draft of the above conversation was written as part of the work I undertook during my two part comprehensive exams, a fictional conversation between myself, Jacques Derrida, and Paulo Freire and an exploration of Michel Foucault's genealogical approach. Unsure of exactly what my object of knowledge would be for my future dissertation work or how I would even think the task of having an object of knowledge, I embarked on these two projects in order to explore a construct, *love,* which I had identified as what Foucault (1981) called a crack or tremor in the structures that produced my world. In my work with elementary preservice teachers, for instance, I was often struck by how nauseated I would feel when my students talked of loving little children, especially when talking about their reasons for wanting to become teachers. Similar to JoBeth Allen and Jill Hermann-Wilmarth (2004), I doubted their intentions and sensed a resistance to the culturally responsive and critical pedagogies I hoped they would enact with their future students.[42] Although these practices often called upon teacher

educators to not locate such resistance within the teachers themselves and instead in larger social structure, ideologies, and hegemonic relations, like Allen and Hermann-Wilmarth's described in the quote below, I too had difficulty being responsive to the actual students in front of me:

> We blame what we often generalize as their race and class privilege, socially conservative or outright bigoted family values. We question their naiveté born, we assume, of sheltered inexperience. We bemoan their unexamined Whiteness; their proud monolingualism; their sorority priorities; their 'love of little children' that seems to apply mostly to clean, White, well-dressed children and only in the most patronizing way to 'those poor little Black/Mexican/trailer-park kids.' Most of all we rail against their resistance to multicultural teacher education. If we hear that 'shoving it down our throats' line one more time, we might just do it. (p. 217)

And like Allen and Hermann-Wilmarth (2004) and others (Conklin, 2008; Holbrook, Moore, & Zoss, 2010; Hughes, 2010; Jones, 2009; Jones & Enriquez, 2009), this recognition of blame became a call to question my own practices as a teacher educator, especially as they related to my own commitments to teach students to work toward a more socially just society.

Although like Allen and Hermann-Wilmarth (2004) I found the works of scholars such as Paulo Freire (1970, 1998) and bell hooks (1994) useful in helping me frame my practice as a teacher educator and inviting me to question, along with students, how we were culturally constructed as privileged in many ways including race and class among other identity markers, I often took up other invitations as well. And more often than not, these other invitations complicated the work I was doing. The works by Derrida (2001) and Edgoose (2001), for example, invited me to question if such a thing as social justice could exist in its entirety as a telos, an end (or the origin, the center, for that matter) to work toward. As Caputo (1997)

encouraged, I wanted to think of justice as just another nutshell, a transcendental signified that like other names used to designate the center (i.e., essence, existence, substance, subject, consciousness, God, man and so on (Derrida, 1978, p. 279-280) was already unraveling without assistance.[43] Furthermore, Foucault (1978, 1982) conceptions of power that I came across in my readings of Davies (2003), McWilliam (1999), and Parks (2009), among numerous others, threw into doubt these categories of oppressor/oppressed that conceptions of social justice often relied upon.[44]

Nevertheless, social justice was this thing I could not *not* want. It was something I loved, something that called me to act—a part of the vocative order that as Caputo (1997) described or the messianic structure of the undeconstructable "to come" that Derrida insisted upon. Yet, I still wanted to know, for sure, what these preservice teachers really *meant* when they said they loved children so that I could, at least in part, make sure that I did not fall into what I could not *not* think of as a naïve space where recognition of one's cultural privileges were denied. Thinking through this felt especially important considering the widely discussed educational and social inequities that plagued U.S. schools (see Apéritifs /Digestifs, Uninvited Guest 31) and the oft cited belief that the cultural mismatch between teachers and students is an important contributing factor (see Apéritifs /Digestifs, Uninvited Guest 31).

As a doctoral student who was expected to become knowledgeable in the philosophical frameworks that inform qualitative inquiry as well as develop expertise in at least one approach to qualitative design (The Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies Graduate Certificate Brochure, 2010), I had designed a program of study which centered around the poststructural work whose scholar's words seemed to sing to me. As with any other discourse, the accepted ways of thinking, speaking, and acting necessarily excluded other possible ways of thinking (Foucault,

1978/1990). Since my poststructural readings did not invite such questioning about the certain *meanings* of such things as love, intentions of individual persons, or the identities of teachers as was often discussed in teacher education, I had to think new questions. I found myself trying to discipline myself away from what I often felt was a deviance of fixation on meaning and presence and try to "digest" poststructural theories so that I could use them (Sondergaard, 2002, p. 1) or get them "lodged…in my very bones" (St. Pierre, 1997a, p. 410). Such a digestion and lodging would also require me to wrestle with the simultaneous desire for and impossibility of presence, which according to Derrida (1989/1992) cannot be destroyed. As a result, I had to contend with my love of this thing called *social justice*, even as I recognized that when thought with my other love, *poststructuralism*, it could never be fully accomplished. Instead social justice, along with conceptual apparatus of poststructuralism would necessarily have to be under scrutiny.

Hence, I found myself in a stuck place where I could feel the desire for presence working on me. I felt, as mentioned above, a passion for, a commitment toward, and a love[45] of social justice; feeling drawn, for instance, to its promises for equitable schooling promoted by those in social justice teacher education, a reform movement which aimed to produce teachers who were culturally responsive and who had the knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified as necessary for making a more just society (Gay, 2000; Irvine, 2003, Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Nieto, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a; 2002b). In their review of literature related to culturally responsive teaching, for example, Villegas and Lucas (2002) identified characteristics that defined a culturally responsive teacher including an understanding of their own socially constructed identities and how these identities allow and prevent certain privileges and access in societies among others. I believed this goal was valid and I believed

myself right to pursue it. But similarly, as I said above, I experienced a harmony with the poststructural thought that invited me to question that which I loved in addition to the work these concepts could achieve, what they made visible or occluded, and who was given authority in its usage (Davies, 2000, p. 9). I believed that poststructural thought, "in its openness to meanings not yet thought of, and in its dedication to not getting stuck in old clichés and explanations (Davies, 2004, p. 9) was a way to do the work of constant questioning and it felt right to think with them. But, as also described above, I felt physically ill when I thought of how the preservice teachers with whom I worked often seemed resistant to any attempts to consider any notion of power in relation to knowledge. And I felt even more ill when I recognized my own tendency to focus on the presumed "deficits" that prevented critical work (See Conklin, 2008 for discussion). Yet I had to write something.

Writing and enacting a plan. In order to begin, I went on the hunt for theorists whom I thought might help me think love in relation to teacher education.[46] After deciding upon Paulo Freire and Jacques Derrida, I wrote a question for my comprehensive exams that I wanted to entertain:

> Love is cited as an important concept in the work of both Jacques Derrida and Paulo Freire. For Derrida (1989/1992), deconstruction cannot proceed without love (p. 83) and for Freire (1998), love fuels commitments to liberation (p. 41). In this question, I do not necessarily seek to compare and contrast these conceptions of love but rather use them to help me write through the limits and possibilities that these theories can place on my thinking. I ask, *How can thinking with Derrida and Freire create spaces for the possible problematization of love and education in ways which do not require me to dichotomize*

the two theorists' ideas? In short, *How can I begin to imagine ways to think these two scholars together as I wonder about love?*

With these questions in mind (or actually if I remember correctly, with a much less detailed version of these questions in mind), I simultaneously began collecting data for this exam question and the Foucauldian genealogical one. I set aside a few months to read widely for both exams and compiled a dictionary of quotes along the way, which was roughly 150 single spaced pages. I organized these quotes into concepts that I ran up against numerous times in my reading, such as praxis, undecidabilty, conscientization, undeconstructable, affirmative deconstruction.[47] While I compiled and organized this data, I wrote through my understandings of these concepts, relating them to the literature I read and the things I experienced in my life. In addition, I wrote the beginnings of numerous drafts that although they started with unacademic texts, like vignettes from my teaching, questioning about love, or quotations from either Freire or Derrida, I envisioned they would become the sort of texts that would be considered appropriate for most academic journals (in format at least). I envisioned I would enact the sort of writing I did in the introduction of this chapter (only much more polished and perhaps less repetitive!). For the most part, I knew what needed to be said, and I called upon different authors to help me say it, finishing my sentences on some occasions. Although this sort of writing often drove me crazy in the texts of others, leaving me to wonder what used to be surrounding this or that quote in another text somewhere else, I knew I was so steeped in my readings and rereading that I probably would not be able to stop my favorite quotes from finding their way to the page.

Nevertheless, despite my repeated attempts to produce a document from my data collection and analysis (I was up to Draft 18 at one point), I continuously found myself unable to produce. As one example, I began with a vignette of a conversation I had with a young

preservice teacher whom I talked with often in the locker room in the University's gym about many things but specifically her claims that God was calling her to help and love others in various ways, including teaching. Repeatedly, I would try to make this story be a jumping off point for what needed to become some sort of text about love informed by all of my readings on Freire and Derrida if I had any chance of passing my comprehensive exams. My problem was that I always reached a stuck point—a point of paralysis where I felt certain there was no way out. No due date, nor any threat I (or anyone else) could pose to just *get it done* seemed to have any bearing on my situation. At my breaking point, with too many beginnings, I called my committee chair, Mark, and told him I was lost and would most certainly never finish. He suggested I split my paper into two sides, placing Freire on one side and Derrida on the other and just see what happened. I opened a document, meaning to do so, and instead, I began to write something very different.

The unforeseeable. Instead of writing to an audience, carefully constructing a text that might actually be understood in the way I wanted (i.e., one that would provide my committee with a sense that I knew something about something), I began writing *to* Freire and Derrida hoping that perhaps either (or both) would speak back to me. I wrote for hours, stopping only occasionally to consult my dictionary, previous writing, or some of the texts I had read in order to think through an idea, pull in a specific quote or two, or insert additional characters who had been written about in one of my many earlier drafts. For example, I found myself wanting to tell Derrida and Freire about the story of the girl I had met in the locker room, so I returned to the vignette I had tried to reconstruct from memory. Interestingly, I found myself altering the written text from not only how I wrote it but also how I remembered it. In other words, a discussion that occurred between the girl and myself related to homelessness and love actually happened over a

sequence of conversations. Not having remembered the exact wording, I chose words that told a story that was based on what I remembered feeling and what I felt anew as I thought back on (and re-wrote) those conversations into one. Moves such as this confused me and despite my tendency to side with Foucault (1996) and claim that I have never written anything but fictions, I felt myself wanting and needing to *claim* this text as fiction (e.g., Banks, 2000; Frank, 2000; Gannon, 2005) or at least creative nonfiction (Caulley, 2008), although I did not necessarily know the difference.[48]

The discomfort continued as I returned to my dictionary to find appropriate places to cite. I knew that part of this exam process would necessarily include me proving that I at least had some knowledge of the conventions of academic writing, and I would have to produce a citational trail, an audit trail of sorts that would somehow verify the "rigor" of my work (Patton, 2002, p. 93), to prove that the data that informed my Freire and my Derrida's words were not just fabricated in my head. Of course, such conceptions of quality and validity were confusing since I was trying to make sense of how research might be done when not operating from a paradigm where I was trying to get "as close to possible to what is really going on" (Patton, 2002, p. 93). Instead, I wanted to view reality as a complex, ever-changing and often contradictory set of cultural practices and ideas (Peters & Burbules, 2004). Nevertheless, this was an exam, and I was working within academic rules and conventions that felt *right*. Thus, I combed through the text with my books, articles, writing, and dictionaries trying to not only directly cite when I used words in the same sequence as they had, but also trying to "get them right" so-to-speak—to make sure I was not totally off the mark.

Sometimes I would erase what I had written earlier, inserting a specific quote with quotation marks in those spaces where what my Derrida or Freire said could not possibly

contend with a beautifully written segment said long ago in another context. On other occasions, I would have either myself, Derrida, or Freire refer to a secondary source who would be referred to as a friend who not only knew their work but perhaps knew them particularly well, like Derrida's Caputo or Freire's Macedo. I would also erase statements that I felt were too feisty, perhaps, or were obviously framed in the qualifiers I often used when I spoke like "I mean" or "You know." Still, with all of this careful attention to detail and calculating of how both were taken up in scholarship elsewhere, I had trouble telling whose Derrida and Freire were on the page or if the question of authenticity even mattered. I had certainly not read everything either had produced and furthermore, I had read so many secondary sources that told me how to read and reread their texts, I often was not sure who had written what. Even more problematically, I was convinced that my tendency to *like* Derrida more than Freire, or as I said in the conversation, *love* Derrida more, was making the task of reading anything new, different, and loving in Freire impossible.

My discomforts were exacerbated when I talked over email with a professor who kindly cautioned me to be careful of how I was citing. She cited her own personal experience of having seen students suspended or expelled for citational issues and expressed a desire to help students understand the technical knowledge necessary to cite others' works without jeopardizing their own. She suggested I check back over the places I cited to ensure I did or did not need quotation marks and also that perhaps I add an endnote specifically addressing my citational practices. The conversation sent me on a rampage of double-checking, and I spent the two entire nights before my exams were due checking citations and trying to ensure that I was enacting responsible scholarship.

Ironically, or perhaps not so much, this sort of re-reading and calculating was precisely what Derrida was "talking" about as a part of responsible scholarship in the conversation I wrote. But for Derrida (1994), responsibility did not stop there. In fact, responsibility could never stop since making such a claim would necessarily close off the possibility of its occurrence. As Derrida (1995a; 1995b) said in this lengthy citation that did not make it to the conversation I wrote:

> Saying that a responsible decision must be taken on the basis of knowledge seems to define the condition of possibility of responsibility (one can't make a responsible decision without science or conscience, without knowing what one is doing, for what reasons, in view of what and under what conditions), at the same time as it defines the condition of impossibility of this same responsibility (if decision-making is relegated to a knowledge that it is content to follow or to develop, then it is no more a responsible decision, it is technical deployment of a cognitive apparatus, the simple mechanistic deployment of a theorem. (p. 24)

Responsibility, as this impossible possibility, was terrifying given that I could not be *off the hook* so-to-speak by doing my double-checking of citations. Instead, responsible citational practices were thrown into the realm of the unknown where any decision I made in relation to who to cite, when to cite, how to cite, or how not to cite would necessarily be made in the dark—without the comfort of rules and guidelines. Yet again, thinking with the poststructural theories that sung to me was making quite a mess. And despite the fact that I suspected the conversation had functioned in a way that was important for my thinking about research, the researcher, participants, and political and ethical relations, I was not quite so sure that I would volunteer to try this format out again, especially in my dissertation.

The dissertation. Given my experience with my comprehensive exam, I (and hopefully my committee members) should not have been surprised that this dissertation has become something quite different than what I intended. It is not the series of academic articles I had envisioned that would be ready to fly out the door to a respectable journal after long hours of cleaning and polishing with considerable feedback. I had actually written one of those articles (not a clean, polished one though), which was to be presented at a conference in late 2010 that I ended up being unable to.[49] It did not feel right. In fact, it felt wrong—like some sort of horrific attempt to be open to and open up the category of *Christianity,* and more specifically *missionary,* that I had begun to do inquiry around based in my earlier work related to love.[50] It felt more like serving up my participants on a platter for judgment and dismissal. I did not think I was trying to protect the young women I interviewed, yet as I have said elsewhere (see Apéritifs /Digestifs, Uninvited Guest 30), I found a strange comfort in St. Pierre's (in Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) "reticence" to tell tale after tale of the women she studied and her suggestion that instead, readers "Go find [their] own. . . women and talk with them" (p. 971). Furthermore, the article was not doing the work I hoped it would. I wanted teacher educators to invite their Christian students *to the table* (Brady, 2008) and vice versa to not necessarily talk *about* religion as a fixed entity or religious persons as such, but to be open to the unforeseeable "to come" that was stirring about (Caputo, 1997) and to wonder. After having written it, I was feeling no less stuck than before, so I had to start again.

As described elsewhere (see Apéritifs /Digestifs, Uninvited Guest 30), I had plenty of starting vignettes, genres, and beginning quotes, as I had with my comprehensive exam questions. At one point, I even cut and pasted writing from my dissertation log to include in a document I entitled "Beginnings" (November, 2010). At some point, I came to a breaking point

when I felt that I had to "stop" this process of data collection/analysis[51] that had amassed an embarrassingly large number of pages of writing, not even including the hours I spent collecting/analyzing while riding my bicycle, sleeping (and not sleeping as I stayed awake and pondered), going to the bathroom, or eating dinner with friends (see Bridges-Rhoads & Hughes-Decatur, 2010 for discussion of other interesting spatial and temporal locations for data collection/analysis). I had spent months wandering as a nomad through writing and reading (St. Pierre, 1997a; 2003) doing the kind of "theoretical reading" that Kvale and Brinkman (2009) described where a researcher reads through interviews (and other data) "not follow[ing] any systematic method or combination of techniques" (p. 236)—that is, unless I counted my systematic writing and reading plan which involved me spending approximately eight hours a day with my dissertation log. I went away on a writing retreat with two of my writing partners Missy and Hilary,[52] and there, locked in a cabin surrounded by snow, I began to write a conversation between myself, John Caputo, and some character I called *P.* (participant) although I was not exactly sure *who* she was or *if* she was anyone at all.

Though I am not going to describe the process of writing that particular conversation here, nor the transformation from *P* and *Sarah* to two characters called *Love* and *Responsibility*, I do invite the reader to pop over now and read other descriptions if you so choose (see Apéritifs /Digestifs, Citing Selves) and Uninvited Guest 31; Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 4; Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 1). Instead, I will spend the next section describing my decision to just keep writing despite my hesitance. In other words, I felt the *urgency* that Derrida (1989/1992) has written of that marks work that gestures towards what is just, responsible, right, or good and calls upon one to act without knowing what is right. I do this by describing my return to the comprehensive exam as a means of exploring the thought

that happened in writing (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) and my subsequent decision to revise this exam and include it in this dissertation (see Dinner Conversations, Appetizers).

Writing and enacting a plan. I devoted some time to rereading the exam paper and doing some writing around how I thought the paper had functioned and was functioning. To explore unintended effects is a marker of much of poststructural work in that it involved a look at the ever shifting power relations that complicate neat demarcations of oppressed/oppressor and notions of clean intentions (e.g., Foucault, 1976). I wanted to examine what happened that I had not intended and what actions and thoughts these happenings made thinkable. For example, I remembered how in the process of writing I had inserted an unexpected character who had not made his way into any of the drafts of more traditional academic texts I had tried out before--Jesus. Through my readings about Freire and love, I had come across Stenberg's (2006) writing on liberation theology, a movement that combined critical pedagogy with Christianity. I had dismissed it rather hastily, feeling that the writing of injustices as structural sins was not useful for my purposes at the moment. Furthermore, entering religious territory seemed like a different project than one I had in mind.

Yet, this unintended act had consequences. Throughout the writing, my refusal to invite Jesus to the table for conversation, as my Freirian character would continuously remind me, struck me as important and one that became a central feature in the design of the dissertation work. I began to think love in relation to religious commitments and began to wonder how my own commitments to theorists and epistemological and ontological paradigms felt a bit *religious* in some ways, even if I was constantly attaching phrases like "if such things exist" to my thoughts and practices as a reminder that all claims, including the claim to *being* religious, at presence are suspect (See Caputo, 1997 for discussion). In his book (2001), *On Religion,* for

example, Caputo deconstructed orthodox notions of religion by referring to the question, "What do I love when I love my God?" He asserted that, although religion demands that we know the answer to this question, knowing is impossible since faith is also a condition of religious doctrines.

Building from this movement in thought, I began to explore possibilities for thinking myself and others as religious in multiple ways, although I recast the word religion as a doing, a searching for the "possibility of the impossible" (Caputo & Raschke, 2002) which can take the face of God, Justice, the Force or whatever one prays and hopes for (Caputo, 2001). Religion in this sense became religion without religion, a phrase Caputo borrowed from Derrida to mean that the religious experience of answering the call of our god, whatever it may be, is always already an experience of not knowing exactly what name it is we confer upon that god (despite that conventional religion taking the object of faith to be relatively determinate) or what we are when we answer. I asked, for instance, what might happen if I think myself as one who engages in religious practices? What were the potential effects of saying that I had religiously used critical pedagogies or poststructural theories in both my elementary and undergraduate teaching? What, then, might be thought of as my churches, guiding bodies, or spiritual leaders who would help guide me on my quest for the impossible? This work felt important. It felt necessary, especially when I thought about the pre-service teachers with whom I worked who often scoffed at reflection as if we were asking them to sit through a boring sermon. But as discussed elsewhere in the dissertation (e.g., Apéritifs /Digestifs, Citing God) the word religion did not necessarily feel like a fruitful space because it was overburdened with the meanings of others.

Nevertheless, I began to read widely to see how religion and more specifically, Christianity, was being discussed in education. I found a dearth of literature related to pre-service

teachers and religious beliefs in the secular literature (see White, 2009 for discussion). Also, I began to collect data to help me think more about what Noddings (2008) described as the problems of addressing religion in a critical way. Quickly, I found references citing a battle between critical, often liberal thought and conservative Christian thought that was worried to not only subvert efforts toward social justice but also shut down teacher education as a whole (Apple, 2006; Baurain, 2007; Kumashiro, 2009; Marsden, 1998; Stenberg, 2006). I began to sense the danger of my religious wonderings and distance myself from my wondering openly, using the word religion. But now, I could not think *love* without such a connection. And without love or religion, what would my dissertation possibly explore?

Unsure of how to proceed, I began to "listen" widely to conversations in coffee shops, to billboards, magazine editorials, television programs, to other teacher educators, and to the students I was supervising to hear what was being said (and not said) about this amalgam of interests which seemed to somehow intersect (love, social justice, vocation and missions, Christianity, poststructural theories, teacher education, critical pedagogies) and take on the role of a research question to be explored. Thinking the research question in this way was not something I had come across in any of the qualitative literature I had read. I even spent time with reference librarians trying to search for ways in which the research question was taken up producing no results that seemed relevant. Although I knew that according to Patton (2002), the type of question I could ask depended upon my paradigm, I knew in each paradigm there was still the assumption that a question must be asked. Consequently, I picked something as a starting point, which in part involved deciding to ask some pre-service teachers about their Christian mission work outside of public schools and inside.[53]

The unforeseeable. Interestingly, despite not having mentioned *love* in my IRB proposal or in my interview protocol,[54] as I began interviews about Christian mission work, *love* kept popping up. Participants discussed it so heavily in relation to their missions and mission work that I designed a focus group in which I started by saying, "Let's talk about love, ladies." Thus, as I began writing these new sets of conversations and revising the comprehensive exam, I was not surprised when Love became a central character in the conversations, replacing the *P* I wrote of earlier to become a space for thought informed by numerous data I had collected/analyzed, including interview data (see Apéritifs /Digestifs, Citing Selves, for further discussion). Additionally, other characters began to seem necessary as I began to invite to the table those whom I hoped might help me think about the certain *things* (although they were always slipping away) that made up my amalgam, which was becoming my research question. I invited Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault to help me think with poststructural theories, Paulo Freire to help me think critical pedagogies, John Caputo to help me think religion without religion, two pre-service teachers who openly described themselves as Christians (*Love* and *Impossible*) to help me think the pre-service teacher, and a teacher educator (*Responsibility*) who yearned for social justice although she was not so sure it was possible and might be better described as "to come."

As these characters interacted with one another, I became excited at the thoughts that happened in and through the writing. I was also excited about the possibilities that occurred for the exploration of my "research question" as I watched these characters bump into to one another, shift allegiances momentarily, and flounder with their commitments in the face of the others around the tables. Davies and Harré (2000) described how in conversations, subjects (my characters) were located as "observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced storylines" (p. 91). These locations, or positions, shift as multiple storylines interact

and overlap, opening up new positions with associated practices that must be learned. In her text *Frogs, snails, and feminist tales: Preschool children and gender*, for instance, Davies (2003) described how children must work to become known as fitting into the male/female binary. They must alter their dress, hairstyle, speech, feelings, etc., so that they can become identifiable (to both themselves and others) as either a boy or girl and *not* as the other (p. 2). This gender positioning is often taken to be part of the child's identity, yet it changes according to the context, including how power is exercised. The subject position of female, then, like other subject positions, is learned in different social contexts where certain ways of thinking, speaking, and acting are given the status of good and right while others are excluded as deviant. How one experiences social identities and categories such as race, class, gender, and so on are expressed and understood through these ever-shifting and contradictory categories. As a result, who one *is* is always open to question. And as such, I became quite excited to examine these multiples positionings.

The partial excerpt explored. It is beyond the scope of this story to provide multiple examples of explorations of these positioning. I provide many other in the endnotes throughout this dissertation. I do explore one here, which relates to the excerpt at the beginning of this story (which I have endnoted here to prevent those reading by computer from having to scroll back up through the text)[55] This excerpt took place at the start of a conversation in which Derrida, Freire, and Responsibility (a teacher educator) were chatting about love. Actually, Responsibility was talking about Love, a preservice teacher she had met a few weeks earlier in a coffee shop and had since conversed with on the phone a few times. Derrida and Freire were talking about love, having not yet met this character Love. I explore the effects of this misunderstanding in Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 1, but here, I pick up mid-conversation, where

Derrida, Freire, and Responsibility were trying to determine how they might proceed in this conversation about love/Love. They were trying to get a sense of one another as well. This was a process which involved each of them relying upon knowledge of the social and political categories each character might be aligned with. It also necessarily involved the characters producing one another as representatives of those categories in various ways. This positioning had important effects for the writing and possible meanings of characters and categories.

Derrida, for instance, was invited by others in the conversations to bear the weight of the common critiques against postmodern and poststructural work that McLaren (1986) said "threatens to cripple the very concept of the political in the human and the social sciences" (p. 392). Such was the case in the moments before the dialogue in the introductory excerpt of this section where Freire had intervened on behalf of Derrida, given that Responsibility had just expressed a frustration at Derrida's persistent attention to the contradictions within language. This intervention was interesting and unexpected considering that critical pedagogues (including those who rely heavily on Freire's works) often are heading up critiques of work such as Derrida's (see Ellsworth (1989) for an interesting discussion and a turning of the tables to critique the critiques). As Caputo (1997) wrote:

> It is not uncommon to portray Derrida as the devil himself, a street-corner anarchist, a relativist, or subjectivist, or nihilist, out to destroy traditions and institutions, our beliefs and values, to mock philosophy and truth itself, to undo everything the Englightenment has done—and to replace all this with wild nonsense and irresponsible play. (p. 36)[56]

Derrida is invited by Freire, in a sense, to highlight that his work came out of a concern for the other, or what Biesta (2001) called the "ethico-political horizon of deconstruction" (p. 33), and not as one who is out to undo the work the Enlightenment had done. Such a move by Derrida

functioned as an alignment with both Freire and Responsibility whom Freire had previously stated were all three interested in an openness toward the other.

Similarly, with his statement, ". . . if I am not mistaken, no one here is claiming to have received a mandate from God to save the other, with the undiscussed truth in hand to be inserted into another's head," Freire took up a position against his own critiques. These critiques often claim that Freire's talk of dialogue as requiring all involved to be willing and able to re-think and relearn is tainted by a positioning of a facilitator of the dialogue who must already know for sure the place of the oppressor. Freire and Macedo (1995) discussed the critiques of Gerald Graff, for instance, by stating:

> But Donaldo, I am surprised that someone like Gerald Graff, who I think considers himself an honest intellectual, would have difficulty identifying oppressive conditions and fall prey to a form of misguided relativism. I do not think it is difficult to identify the thirty-three million people in my country who are in constant danger of dying of hunger as belonging to the oppressed group. Even in the very rich United State, as my good friend Jonahan Kozol so succinctly shows in his book *Savage Inequalities*, it is not very difficult to identify oppressed people. (p. 386)

Macedo continued to say that who is or is not really oppressed is not the issue as much as the social and economic conditions that create such conditions. Freire, agreeing, continued on to say that it is the responsibility of educators to provide the critical tools to enable one to understand their worlds, which Freire understands as being a responsibility to the nature of human beings as curious individual. Furthermore, to do this means *not* to hide one's political position but also not to impose it on others.

Freire could have continued on to say all of these things here inviting quite a heap of responses from Derrida questioning the possibility of knowing the nature of man, among other things. Instead, as I wrote, I found myself cutting Freire off and instead having him invite Responsibility back into the conversation to thank her for her hospitality. Such a move to cut Freire off, so-to-speak, seemed necessary for both my sake as an author and for the comfort of the reader. Although I have said before that this text is intended to be a *discomfort* text which troubles clarity and easy separations between readers and writers (Lather, 1997), in writing the conversations, I often found myself quite concerned for the reader. As a writer, I found myself getting bored and lost when a character would trail on for what seemed like ages (as I have in this writing story!), and I often found myself stopping characters even though what they were saying might have seemed to flow from their mouths. These moves would, of course, alter the direction of the conversation, having some characters pop in earlier than expected preventing one character or another from saying what, at the time of cutting, seemed rather important. [57] Furthermore, when I interacted with actual readers, such as my writing partners, they would often suggest words that characters might say (e.g., suggest a quote from one of Derrida's texts) or make comments that would incite me to rethink what I had written. The writing (and citing) of theorists became quite a tricky task as I considered how my writing of them was making them become certain types of people on the page in front of me.

But at the same time, this work felt important. In this one excerpt alone I was able to explore my amalgam of interests in ways I had not in other writing. I was able to focus not on what these things, categories or persons were but what claims at knowledge produced, including other people. I could see how the words Freire was able to say (or not say) in the conversation necessarily affected who he became in that moment. And that Freire might be quite different

than a Freire who might pop up in other conversations (see *Dinner Conversations, Dessert* for instance). The conversations became a way to keep open these Freire's, Derrida's, this teacher educator and preservice teachers, and the membership categories to which they claimed allegiance (and other claimed it for them). Hence *who* they were and *how* to cite became impossible—yet another decision to add to my list as I wrote.

Movement in thought. As I continued on, I thought often about what Derrida (1999) advised about difficult decisions:

> Not knowing what to do does not mean that we have to rely on ignorance and to give up knowledge and consciousness. A decision, of course, must be prepared as far as possible by knowledge, by information, by infinite analysis. At some point, however, for a decision to be made you have to go beyond knowledge, to do something that you don't know, something which does not belong to, or is beyond, the sphere of knowledge. (p. 66)

With Derrida's words in mind, I knew that I needed space for these important calculations as they related to both the citing of characters and also the positioning of these characters in relation to one another. I knew, for instance, that I had to address my research questions, even though these questions had turned into an amalgam of intersecting ideas (love, social justice, vocation and missions, Christianity, poststructural theories, teacher education, critical pedagogies) that produced the subject position *preservice teacher* in various ways. While I felt like these conversations were the "answers" to my research questions, although they were partial and situated, I knew that these were also just more data to be collected and analyzed. The task of research became overwhelming and never-ending—one decision after another.

Thus, the endnotes that I wrote throughout the conversations became a space for an even more situated attention to my research questions. They became a way for me to explore not only the stuck places of who to cite and when to cite, but also a space for exploration of how these characters claims at knowledge positioned them (and other categories) in relation to one another. As such, the references I have inserted in the text are reference to specific moments in scholars' text that either I read to help me think a specific phrase or word or that I believe emphasizes or further explores the words of others. Similarly, I have referred to other data in this study, such as an article or interview transcript that has functioned in the same way. With a focus on these small spaces (or something not so small), I was also able to provide specific instances of movement in thought that would take the form of questioning for future work or implications in relation to teacher education. Additionally, though, I was able to explore this work in relation to the field of qualitative inquiry. As I attended to how timing, both in the conversations on the page and in my life and work as a researcher, altered what could be said and done, I watched the linearity of research crumble.

Aporia Three: Citing Selves

I begin this writing story with a lengthy excerpt from a text by Bronwyn Davies (2003) entitled, *Frogs and Snails and Feminist Tales: Preschool Children and Gender:*

> *". . . But what I cannot seem to avoid is constructing a character called George. Actions and the attribution of meaning to actions do not float free of subjects, though they are often attributed in a generalized way to 'others', or 'children', or 'people with power,' and so on. What I am attempting is to avoid that generalizing strategy, by constituting George as the locus of my analysis. At the same time, I am working to avoid the suggestion that George exists as a unitary, essential or fixed character who can be*

pinned down with my descriptions. I do not wish that George, with his butterfly cape, should be fixed in place with pins. I cannot decide who George is. "Who he is" is undecidable. This does not mean that he cannot come to life in my imagination or in yours (or his own), but rather, that we should not make the error of thinking that what he becomes in that imagined image is "the real George", or the essential George, any of whose further actions must be made consistent with that first imagined image. Just as George is undecidable, so are his actions. What we have to work with are readings of actions, and readings of our own readings. And it is possible to do this because George takes up his being in a world made up out of many of the same discourses as the world we live in.

The primary focus of poststructuralist analyses is on discourse, and on shifting patterns of discursive practices, rather than on the specificity of the individuals who take up those discourse and make them live. Nevertheless, and at the same time, by attending to all of what George says and does, and to the subtle, detailed particularity of it, my chances of coming to something new are opened up far more than if I attended to just a group called 'the boys' or 'the children'. To prefer these larger categories or labels over the naming of a particular subject would be to suggest that these categories are less constituted and constitutive than the category of an individual subject. George, boys, children, each of these is a discursive category, a way of making meaning used by me as a researcher, and by me as a member of the everyday world. As poststructuralist researcher, however, I am necessarily aware of the constitutive effects of taking up these categories as part of my analytic strategy, because in doing so, I join in the practices through which the thing I am trying to make sense of is made real (pp. 147-148).

The above excerpt is from a text written by Bronwyn Davies, an independent scholar based in Sydney, Australia, whose poststructural work in the fields of early childhood education and educational qualitative research have appealed to me for quite some time. Before I explore the aporia to which I attach the above excerpt, allow me to tell the tale of how I came to count Davies among one of *my people*—that is to say one of the educational scholars I like to think with (as I read and reread their texts). In the same moments that they claim an allegiance to poststructural theories, these scholars model and invite a questioning of what thoughts and practices such an allegiance can open up and close.[58] In other words, Davies became one of the people who helped me to try to figure out this character called poststructuralism, these characters called scholars, these characters called participants, and this character called Sarah—characters who, perhaps not so unlike Davies's character George, kept popping up and seemingly begging me to call them "real."

In my continuous learning to think with and produce the multiplicitous and heterogeneous body of thought dangerously called poststructuralism,[59] I have often struggled to find mentors who would not only talk the talk of the post but actively take on the doing of such work in ways that made sense to me and encouraged a challenging of it as a conceptual apparatus.[60] I lived in the high level theory, mostly of Derrida and Foucault, never seeming to give Deleuze enough time despite that others often told me I *had* to read his work for various reasons. I also read often those who were considered Derridian scholars, (e.g., Biesta, 2001; Caputo, 1997) or Foucauldian ones (e.g., Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982; Deleuze, 1998[61]). I also read those who used these theorists in qualitative inquiry (e.g., Lather & Smithies, 1997; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) and in teacher education (e.g., Britzman, 2000; McWilliam, 2003). Unsurprisingly, I found myself unsure of how to answer when asked early in my doctoral

career whose work I drew upon often within my field, which my intended degree told me was Elementary Education. As a field, elementary education almost seemed nonexistent, spanning multiple others (i.e., middle grades, early childhood, child development). The early childhood and middle grades work I read had scholars who sometimes used poststructural theories to work within and against conventional discourses which historically shaped those fields (see the edited texts Brown & Saltman, 2005 and Lee & Vagle, 2010 for some examples) but I was always on the lookout for someone who sung to me in a way that the works of Derrida and Foucault had. And by definition, singing to me often seemed to mean inviting me to question this harmony.

The case of Bronwyn Davies is a good example. I do not remember exactly how I first came across Davies's work, but I am guessing that it was in a doctoral course in qualitative research in which one of the assigned readings was an article entitled *Producing possible Hannahs: Theory and the subject of research* that Davies (2000) had written with Eileen Honan, Michele Knobel, and Carolyn Baker, all Australian scholars. As fourth author, which I did not realize at the time probably meant that Davies had very little to do with the writing of the text (if one designates authorship based on the *writing* that occurred to produce the actual published text), when I think of that article to this day, I think of it as Davies's text. I have always imagined her as the professor, the mentor of some string of doctoral students who wrote the piece without much copy level help from her (I have no idea if that is the case since I am actively preventing myself from Googling this information and continuing to type!). Perhaps this is why I have found myself reading her texts and not those of the other authors, or perhaps I harmonized with multiple citations of her work within the text. At any rate, I remember finding the article fascinating, and although the detail I provide in the next paragraphs may seem tangential, I anticipate that doing so might help me to provide some theoretical background useful for the

story I plan to tell related to the above excerpt and my incessant (un)avoidance of placing the "real" on character.

Producing Hannah and George. In the article, the authors had produced three different possible readings of ethnographic data from Knobel's dissertation study of which the 12-year old girl of the title, Hannah, had been a part.[62] These readings were based in three different theoretical approaches which consequentially produced three versions of Hannah, each of which assigned her different powers and made her into a different kind of subject. Knobel's reading, for example, involved her thinking the data with Gee's (1992) D/discourse theory and asking about the Discourses that constituted the ways Hannah enacted being a student.[63] Such a reading produced Hannah as a subject who was "a practitioner of and negotiator of Discourses that also coordinate her activities and her identities and subjectivities in and out of school" (p. 30). As such, Hannah was attributed powers that were the taken-for-granted powers that she necessarily would have within each Discourse that had coordinated her, such as her compliance with Discourses advocated for by her teachers that taught her how to act as a model student. Knobel read this Discourse as Hannah's primary one and any contradictory behaviors, such as when Hannah acted up with her friends during lunch, as a possible resistance to or shift away from that Discourse.

Quite differently, Honan, along with Davies, engaged in a poststructural reading in which they examined the ways that Hannah actively took up certain subject positions (i.e., "model female student, model daughter, and bawdy teen performer" (p. 18) and used these positions to her advantage.[64] They asked, "How do we see the dual processes of being subjected and of becoming an agentic subject playing themselves out in the episodes of Hannah's life that Michele [Knobel] has made available to us?" (p. 10). They subsequently produced a reading of a

subject who could not have power without being subjected to it but in being subjected, could go beyond the conditions of her subjection. Honan and Davies described how Hannah worked at being recognized as a model student by helping others with their work, answering affirmatively when her teacher presumed she knew a certain fact, looking up words she was unsure how to spell, and even calling upon the teacher for help when she was uncertain she had written down the word correctly. In contrast to this position as model student, though, Honan and Davies noted interview data in which Hannah said she enjoyed her class because she and the students "muck around and have lots of fun" (p. 21). Furthermore, while Hannah sat next to a boy in class who had a reputation as a trouble maker with teachers (poking Hannah with scissors, etc.), Hannah had told the researcher that she found him quite funny and sometimes she had to "risk it" (getting in trouble) in order to talk with him (p. 13).[65] Thus, unlike Knobel who wrote Hannah as a subject negotiating and resisting various forces acting upon and pulling her toward or away from what was Hannah's normal way of being, here, the subject Hannah was *necessarily* contradictory as she drew upon (and actively produced) multiple, contradictory positions that were already recognizable, legitimate, and often desirable.

In other words, like with the *George* Davies (2003) described in the excerpt at the start of this writing story, deciding who Hannah was, was undecidable—an impossible task given that who she was could only be understood through the contradictory and messy language (Caputo, 1997; Derrida 1974/1967). Who Hannah was necessarily exceeded the rules, norms, or codes available for the thinking of Hannah.[66] As such, Hannah had to be read and imagined by the authors who had quite explicitly "exploited the research materials about and relating to Hannah to show the work [they] can do from different analytical positions" (p. 31). And as the authors noted, the reading of Hannah was perhaps less about a subject called Hannah and more about the

analysts and readers who did the reading. Hannah, like George, was a character, who could be imagined in multiple ways, and thus whose construction was never finished. In addition, the discourses through which these characters made sense of themselves and others were never finished since Hannah and George were always in process of constructing them as they were constructed by them. They were always becoming. With such a theorizations, the authors invited readers (other analysts) to take up questions such as, "What type of subject is being produced through theory and/or analysis? (p. 30) since, as Davies (2003) said in the first sentence of the above excerpt, producing characters such as these often just can't seem to be avoided (and shouldn't be).[67]

Characters and "The real." And so I bring us back to that first sentence which begins this writing story—". . . *but what I cannot seem to avoid is constructing a character called George"* —a sentence (or part of a sentence) that I have often found myself reading, again and again throughout this study, hoping perhaps that there, in that excerpt, I would find out what to do about the problem of character construction. By *character* I do not mean a role, as in the role of Hermoine Granger, the brainy over-eager student, played by Emma Watson in the Harry Potter film series and written by J.K. Rowling long ago. Such roles are fixed, and as Davies has said elsewhere (Harre & Davies, 1990), are often seen as separate from the person who plays them, who merely take on the way of being the role dictates. In contrast, characters like the *George* and *Hannah* that Davies wrote were theorized as spaces where thought and action could happen in the same moments that the thought and action, in a sense, *happened* the space. As Davies (2003) said, these thoughts, actions, ways of speaking, knowing, and being did not "float free" but had to be attached to something or somebody (some character or category) (p. 148). By way of this attachment, these practices could be made to *mean* within the particular social and

historical spaces (and storylines) in which these characters and categories came alive. As such, each character necessarily came alive differently depending on their ever-shifting location (or position) in these different, often contradictory, stories. Hannah, for example, like Hermoine, was a character in the storyline of school, which involved multiple available positions for her such as class clown, eager student, or shy introvert. The type of character she became, or how she became known as a certain kind of person, depended upon her location in relation to multiple others, and this location meant that sometimes ways of being were excluded and sometimes not.

The problem of character construction for Davies (2003) was determining how to avoid pinning down the characters themselves as fixed beings while also avoiding the tendency to generalize actions and attribute them to cultural categories. In other words, she had to constantly try not to construct the category as the character *or* the character as the category. This was a familiar problem in my study, as I often found myself wondering how to think the pre-service interview participants[68], who all self-identified as a member of the category "Christian" over and over again during interviews, as some*ones* other than the category they cited. This became particularly difficult since each participant described this category membership and the ways of living and being that such membership invited (and necessitated) as being *the* primary marker of their identities. Or as one participant said:

> If I try to define my calling, then it, I feel uncomfortable because like I can't find my identity in some kind of calling except the calling that Jesus Christ has given me for my life. That is like what I know I need to find my identity in. . . (personal communication, 2010).

Statements like these seemed to invite, or even demand, that I take Christianity as the primary marker of identity, and not surprisingly I often complied, incessantly referring to participants as

"Christians" or even "those Christians" in my dissertation log or conversations with writing partners. I knew that *identity*, like all categories (e.g., "children, others, people with power, and so on" (Davies, 2003), was merely an already cracking nutshell (Caputo, 1997), or as Biesta (2001) said, "any attempt at self-identical presence can only be done with the help of that which is excluded by this presence, presence needs the help of that which is absent" (p. 39).[69] Davies's (2003) assertion that my chances of "coming to something new" would be "opened up far more" (p. 148) by placing each individual as a locus of analysis, as she had done with George and the other children in her study, did not feel right for this study. Yet, not doing so made me doubt not only if the work I was doing could be called *poststructural* but also wonder what opportunities might be lost. I address these concerns in the next section.

My struggle with categories and characters. Davies (2003), like so many of the other women I count among my people, not only identifies her work as poststructural but as poststructural *feminist* work. In her (Davies, Browne, Gannon, Hopkins, McCann, & Wilhborg, 2006) article entitled *Constituting the feminist subject in poststructural discourse*, she, along with the other authors, discuss how feminists have found poststrutural work useful for a project of exploring what possibilities for women might be opened up with a deconstruction of the male/female binary and its associated practices. Such work builds upon the poststructural conception of identity, in which the subject (self) is seen not as the kind of coherent, stable, and centered self, born so or produced through structures deeply ingrained in society. Instead it is an "an interactive, discursive *process*. . . .vulnerable to the discourses through which it is spoken and speaks itself into existence" (Davies, 2000, p. 26). That is to say, the subject is an effect of available discourses that produce her as she produces them. This problematizing of categories, hierarchies, and binaries does not imply, as Derrida (1995a, 1995b) said, the 'liquidation of the

subject' but rather 'a subject [that] can be reinterpreted, re-stored, reinscribed" (p. 256). St. Pierre explained that if "woman [as a category] is defined once and for all, then there is no hope of a reconfiguration that might offer different, strategic possibilities for ethical, political, and relational work" (St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000, p. 8).

Although feminist work attends to the binary opposition of male/female with the desire to persistently deconstruct and re-envision this relation in a way that would open up new ways of being for persons who identified as males, females, or transgender, this binary was not the focus of my work. This was not because this type of work did not seem relevant to my study. I was interviewing all women, and I knew that gender and Christianity intermixed in many ways that had repeatedly been deemed oppressive for women (see Caputo, 2007, pp. 89-116). In fact, early in my doctoral program I had done an IRB approved in-class interview project in which I talked with three female preservice teachers about their experiences as women in education, and each of them had talked extensively about this in relation to Christianity. Even though this work seemed interesting and important, I did not feel called in that direction. Perhaps this was because it felt too close to home, having been raised to be a good Christian woman under the influence of numerous Christian women whom I deeply admire and respect (and one in particular whom I do not but that is not a story for this dissertation). I suspected it was something different though.

As I thought of some of these women who lived in ways that many might consider oppressive and the conversations we had over the years about that very thing, the binary between Christian and non so often seemed to be the defining factor in their discussions and understandings of those relations. I had read something similar in an article (Hyland, 2010) that related to social justice and education. In it, Hyland (2010) explored how his preservice teacher students enacted subject positions related to race and sexuality, particularly in relation to efforts

to sustain a classroom community. Based in a combination of in-class field notes, audio-taped and transcribed class sessions, and journals entries from the 24 students in the course, Hyland described how while many of the African American women in his class were proponents of anti-oppressive education as it related to race, when discussions related to homophobia or heterosexism emerged the women referenced their Christian beliefs to claim that these were not social justice issues. Hyland discussed the difficulty that these women had in renegotiating their position especially in relation to sexuality and in particular in relation to an out lesbian student in class. He described how because social justice education had roots in the African American community after the U.S. civil rights movement, the "dominance of Christianity within that community creates a hegemony that can exclude the voices and oppression of members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community and reify a hierarchy of difference that positions sexual orientation at the bottom" (p. 399). Hyland concluded that in this instance, forms of discrimination were not equally weighted.

As I began talking to participants, I noticed that they talked of the binary between Christians and non-Christians as seemingly trumping all other binaries. One participant described a specific mission trip as helping her to "kind of erase your normal social lines and see some people have Jesus and some people need Jesus" (personal communication, January 19, 2010). Furthermore, the binary between Christian and non-Christian was becoming more prevalent in education, with articles popping up about Christian privilege (Blumenfeld, 2006; Fairchild, 2009; Schlossher, 2003) and recent talk about the potential problems that Christianity might cause for in relation to religious diversity (Huerta & Flemmer, 2005; Subedi, 2006), sexual diversity (Kahn, 2006), or linguistic diversity (Edge, 2003; Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003).

While I was not interested in making claims about which binary was most important, I was not sure that the Christian/non-Christian binary was inviting the same kind of work that other binaries did. Weedon (1987) described, for instance, how it is by recognizing oneself as fictionalized that one could become someone different. I could be become someone more able to be reflexive about its self was shaped, a process which might open up new possibilities for shaping. I understood how this might work in relation to gender binaries. Davies (2003) explored how the possibilities for George and the other preschool children in his class to make sense of themselves and others in relation to gender might be opened up by reading a collection of feminist tales that subverted traditional narratives that children's books usually have. Davies would want to keep George as a locus of analysis in that George, as a space where thoughts can happen as Davies wrote and rewrote, could actively work as space for keeping gender open for rethinking for George and other children. Exploring with a group of Christian women or the fictionalization of the binary Christian/non-Christian seemed to be a bit trickier. For one, membership in one category or the other required knowledge that only God had. I was not sure I was so keen on making claims about God's knowledge or about my participants' relationship with God.

A focus on the individual as a locus of analysis seemed even more complicated considering that the women I was interviewing made sense of themselves as sinners—as women who were constantly trying to make sense of what God commanded but often unsuccessfully. As such each individual was deeply involved in a relationship with God who helped her understand who she should be and how she should act in the world. In a focus group interview, for instance, four of the women talked of how difficult it was to live the way they believed God wanted them to. A partial excerpt is below:

Participant 1 (P1): . . . it is hard. When I say all this, I don't at all mean that this is what I do all the time.

All: Oh yeah, no, oh yeah

P1: It is really like, this is what God teaches us to be like, but

Participant 2: but we are sinners so I maybe do this maybe 25% of the time

Participant 3: if I could do this half the time or 25% of the time, I'd be ok.

What constituted sin, though, was often debatable in Christianity (Caputo, 2007). Although participants did not engage in such a debate with one another, I collected/analyzed other data that I read as pointing to the disagreements related to sin and good moral behavior and made me wonder about the possibilities available for ordering and hierarchizing Christians within Christian communities. One night, for instance, my writing partner, Missy, and I were eating at the bar of a local restaurant discussing some of my data collection/analysis when the bartender overheard our conversation, interjecting with something like, "Are you guys talking theology at my bar?" We soon found out that he was a Baptist preacher's son and he had plenty to say about what he thought grace was and how it could be enacted (which was what Missy and I had been talking about). Within moments, others at the bar began piping in with their opinions, which differed greatly, with talk of how to define who or what actually be constituted as grace in God's eyes.

A similar situation occurred in one of the interviews I did with a professor who worked in the same school where preservice participants attended in order to get a sense how or if students talked of Christianity in the classroom.[70] This professor, who told me she identified as a Christian, talked of how she believed that some of her Christian students were struggling to make sense of Christianity. She talked as if there were some Christians who were more in line with

God as others who were not. Participants had said similar things in the same focus group mentioned above. In that conversation, participants talked often about how loving others related to what they talked of as a "Christian lifestyle," which they described as this way of living that was set apart from what was often referred to as the "world" or "the world's view." Below I have excerpted a portion of that conversation:

> **Participant 1(P1)**: Hmm, I feel like, in some ways the hmmm, the American church and the American [indecipherable] resemble more of the worldly view of things than anything else, which is why some people who aren't a part of church don't go to church because they think church is just this hypocritical thing.
>
> **Participant 2 (P2)**: a social club
>
> **P2**: yeah, yeah, that can call themselves good whether they really are or not.
>
> *I interject and share a story of a friend who told me that she was explicitly warned against going to certain churches in their area because prayer requests (which are sometimes written in bulletins or spoken in church) became an excuse for gossip about those in the community.*
>
> **P1**: Yeah, that sort of thing. Also, even churches [are] kind of creating this, like the way that they do church, making it more about the event or the results after the event. More so than God being glorified and the power of the holy spirit actually working
>
> **P2**: It is all numbers
>
> **P1**: Yeah, numbers and
>
> **P2**: Best and biggest
>
> **P1**: Flashy. This is going to attract people because we are going to do this and this and this, not because God is pulling me and He wants to show His glory.

P2: And I think it is part of the American part

P1: The American dream

P2: We are so caught up in comfort

P1: The American dream in our churches

P2: Comfort in like we are the best and everyone else is doing everything wrong.

My notes told me that other two participants present nodded almost the entire time. This conversation led me to wonder whether writing individual Christians might not be an invitation for other Christians and non-Christians to slot these women into groups as good Christians or bad—as in line with God or not. I not necessarily concerned about protecting participants from such categorizing. In fact, as described above and as explored throughout the chapters (see Dinner Conversations, Preparation in particular), participants struggled with not judging other and named it as a part of their sin struggles. They, themselves, had claimed to be of the world, so-to-speak. Rather, my concern was that separating these women into distinct characters would detract from the work I wanted to do in this study. This work explicitly involved the attention to categories, like Christian, and an exploration of how these functioned and what they were produced. As such, I felt I must use the category so that I could watch as it deconstructed in the process (Caputo, 1997). As Butler (1992) said, I needed to "continue to use them [categories and concepts of metaphysics], to repeat them, to repeat them subversively, and to displace them from the contexts in which they have been deployed as instruments of oppressive power" (Butler, 1992, p. 17).

The composite/not composite. In the midst of my continuous thinking and rethinking about character construction and my persistent returns to Davies's text (2003), I had already begun writing a character that I was calling P, which I think stood for Participant. I had no idea

who this character was but she seemed to be heavily informed by the data I was collecting/analyzing related to interviews. I had let my committee chair, Mark, read an earlier draft of a conversation and upon meeting with him, one of his first questions was "Who is P?" I fumbled around, not quite sure, and stated what I knew—that P was a Christian preservice teacher. I also talked through how I was thinking about character construction, drawing upon some of what is mentioned above. Upon leaving the meeting, I became certain that if I was going to proceed with what was happening in writing, I better be able to talk about it with others.

I bumped into another professor on my way out and we sat in his office for a bit discussing what was happening in my writing. He declared that I was writing a composite character, what he said was quite common practice in journalism. He mentioned a name or two which I scribbled on a piece of paper which is long since lost along with the names of those mentioned. I had Googled them though and sure enough found many examples of composite characters of members in political or other social groups. I was not quite sure that I wanted to call this P a composite character though. A composite was something that was made up of distinct parts, but it operated as a whole, a compound of sorts (webstersonline). If P was a composite, I would have to determine what "distinct" parts she was made from. As described elsewhere (see pretty much anywhere in the dissertation but notably Apéritifs /Digestifs, Citing God and Citing Theorists), this was not an easy task.

Nevertheless, I began exploring this idea of a composite in more detail. I tried to search for other qualitative researchers who had used composites, but the task proved very difficult. The phrase did not yield results despite that I harassed numerous reference librarians for help over instant messenger. I started asking around instead. I asked my writing partner, Jessica, who had heard a professor say something to the effect that the use of composite characters was an old

and common strategy in qualitative research. She cited Theodore Sizer's (1984) book *Horace's Compromise,* which luckily I had read in an educational foundation course years ago during my bachelor's degree, not for his usage of composite characters but for his depiction of life in public schools. I pulled up an article that Sizer had written more recently (Sizer, 1997) to see what he had to say about the text. Sizer (1997) began the article by saying:

> I met the English teacher Horace Smith about fifteen years ago. Horace actually doesn't exist. He is my creation, an amalgam of high school teachers whom I had come to know in the early 1980s while I was visiting high schools across this country and Australia. (p. 20)

He continued on to say that he had built Horace from the patterns he had noticed throughout the years and in particular a sense of "concern and distress" (p. 20) amongst teachers. He had made Horace white and male out of ease (He too was a white male), and he had made him to be a character who he believed other teachers might easily identify with. This seemed inviting for me to think about, but as mentioned above, I wanted this character to be a space where easily identifying with the character was not necessarily my main goal. Rather, this character needed to allow me to explore this category Christianity as it related to the multiple other categories of interest in this study.

My other writing partner, Hilary, reminded me of women we both knew from a writing retreat a few years back name Lisbeth Berbary. Lisbeth had talked of using composite characters in her dissertation and had since published an article about that work (Berbary, 2011). Berbary (2011) wrote a screenplay based in her ethnographic work exploring how gender operated in a college sorority that she called Zeta Chi. She described her character construction as follows:

> The characters were constructed by pulling multiple characteristics exhibited by my ten key participants and combining them into a composite character. Although the characters are fictional in the sense that they do not represent a single individual with whom I conducted research, their personalities, appearances, interests, and experiences are grounded in my data and are representative of my ten key participants. Each of these characters was carefully constructed to provide the opportunity to explore different aspects of Zeta Chi culture. (p. 190)

This description did not seem in line with what I was doing. I was not making claims at representing these women as individual people or as a composite. In fact, it seemed quite impossible to organize these subjects in advance of action. Instead, I needed a space where different thoughts and words might be played out and necessarily constitutes subjects in the process.

Finally, in the late days of the study, I ran across Carolyn Ellis's (2004) work who wrote of composite characters in her methodological novel about a fictional course she instructed on qualitative research. In one scene, she engaged with students and Laurel Richardson, the character, in talking about how research, and autoethnographic work in particular, might potentially harm those we do not want to harm (pp. 174-175; see Apéritifs /Digestifs, Uninvited Guest 4 for further discussion of autoethnography). A student talked of how she wrote of her mother in her work and her mother took it in a way she had not intended. She wondered if she should have used a composite instead. The conversation proceeded with discussions of how with a composite the ability of autoethnographic work to connect with the reader is compromised because the power is in that it happened to one person, the author. The conversation continued with characters wondering if all research did not, in fact, present composite characters since it

only provided fragments of information (such as age and gender) and queries related to if composites could be used for anything other than saving time or writing the typical (Ellis, 2004; pp. 174-175). Characters also said that creating such a composite would require the author to alter her position in the text and therefore her relationship with other characters. It was this last point that made me think. Altering my position in the text and watching it change relations with characters was exactly what I was looking for.

Movement in thought. I began to view this *P*, who later became a character called *Love*, as an invitation for exploring my*self* and my subjectivity in relation to her and other characters. This was not a displacement of myself or a move to try to remove myself from Love. Rather this was a space to explore those moments when I felt myself *wanting* distance between myself and others—when I caught myself wanting to be able to cite myself as *not* another. This had particular importance for me as a teacher educator (or a preservice teacher educator) who would most likely have multiple Christians in my classrooms over the years—multiple Christians who I imagined I would align myself with at some moments and try to distance myself at others. I would also possibly have multiple students who I might see as a *Freire* or *Derrida* or *Caputo* or *Foucault* and I might produce them as members of certain categories as they worked to take up and resist those categories. The endnotes, then, became spaces to explicitly attend to how I was coming to think differently as I had to write myself in and out of specific moments in the conversations. They became spaces to explore the multiple intersections between my characters and myself as I watched myself become the characters these multiple ways.

Another Beginning

As mentioned in the introduction, deconstruction is a work of beginning, again and again, in the multiple spaces where we find ourselves (Derrida, 1967/1974). Above, I have situated this

study in three stories—three beginnings. Each extends from stuck places I have experienced in my data collection/analysis. Each explores decisions I had to make in order to proceed and as such these decisions had to be repeated over and over again as I wrote my way through the time allotted for this study. All three deal with questions related to *Who were participants?, What were researcher questions?, Where was the field of study?,* and *When would the study end (or begin for that matter)?* As such, this chapter has become a space to explore the *who, what, where,* and *when* of qualitative research—providing answers that are complicated when writing becomes yet another field of inquiry. In this way, the entirety of the dissertation acts as an invitation to continue providing answers, to continue moving thought, but to watch as those answers deconstruct along the way. In this section, I briefly explore two ways that I think such work might *matter* to those in two fields of inquiry, qualitative inquiry and teacher education. While I claim this study in relation to two "fields," I recognize that like all categories erected for the sake of convenience, communicative ease, and necessity, these fields act as inaccurate descriptions of complex and contradictory spaces for claiming allegiance.

Qualitative Inquiry

In the final months of writing this dissertation, a professor asked me and another doctoral student to come and speak to his doctoral level class on academic writing. In part, he asked us to speak about our processes of writing our dissertations. During the question portion of the hour, a student raised her hand and asked me something to the effect of "How did you come up with all of that?" referring to how the final product of the dissertation would look. Many of the remaining students echoed her cry with "yeahs" and various other queries. I answered that I had not. What happened was more often than not, nothing like what I had planned. I talked of what seemed to just happen in writing, reading, and talking with others and in the time I could allot to

this dissertation. I talked of how Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) wrote of their awareness that their text could have been something entirely different. I said, also, that I would *not* have planned this if I could since living in the flux of not knowing what to write, think, or say next was exhausting.

This experience has led me to believe that this doubt and this struggle that can happen when plans go awry and research and writing get in the way of life (and vice versa) are important to the field of qualitative research and more importantly for doctoral students learning to *do* research. As Denzin and Lincoln (2005b) said we are in a moment where "a new ethic" is rising (p. 1117), one that involves an attention to responsibility and obligation to all involved in the research process. I believe that such a task, as mentioned above is impossible, but as Caputo (2001) has said, what is deconstruction if not the search for the possibility of the possible? In the writing of this dissertation, I have tried to attend to multiple impossible-possible aporias (Derrida, 1989/1992), in which there was no clear answer as to which was right and which was wrong. As such, this work has turned out something very different than how a conventional dissertation looks and perhaps functions. For one, it is something uncomfortable to read, requiring that the reader move back and forth between untidy beginnings that look like conversations, endnotes, writing stories, or perhaps something nothing at all familiar. Two, it is something that skirted the boundaries between the planned and unplanned as it became something different in the writing and reading. I started for instance, dreaming of a short chapter, and have ended with another dissertation.

I do not wish to make the case that all qualitative inquiry should look like what I have produced here. But because it has looked like this, new questions arise. Preissle (2010) said that the boundaries of the field are affected by what people are doing and thinking when they make

claims at doing qualitative research. She was not advocating (I don't think) for an *anything goes* type of work. Rather a researcher *makes* and *remakes* the field as she works the theory/practice binary, always taking into account the work that has come before her. If this is the case, what might the space of a dissertation become for a doctoral student who wishes to embark on a career in qualitative inquiry? Might it become a space where plans are allowed to fail, struggles are put at the forefront of the research, and what seem like trivial decisions are given more weight (or space) than more conventional ones? And if so, what might this mean for traditional timelines, due dates, and methods of feedback? What, also, might this mean for evaluation techniques?

Honan, Knobel, Baker, & Davies (2000) have said of work that invites questioning about the research itself is "at least as informative as studies of documentary materials for showing the constitutive force of theory in qualitative data analysis" (p. 31). Could a work such as this, which puts *writing as a method of inquiry* (Richardson, 1994; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) at the forefront, be "at least" as informative for a doctoral committee for showing the constitutive force of the dissertation research on the researcher as a more conventional study might? I believe that an answer can be (and should be) yes. As I also told the class that night, this dissertation has trained me to be an academic writer in a way I had not expected. By putting in writing those decisions that might not be included in more traditional academic writing such as what effects might be produced by the writing an ellipses (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 1) or of capitalizing a word (see Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 1), I was able to explore what can drop out of view in tidy articles with clean sections. As I theorized these instances allowed the practice to inform the theory, I was also able to explore how theory informs knowledge production in more ways imaginable. And as I decided whether or where to attend to my uninvited guests (endnotes) and paid particular attention to what a

reader might be looking for or might expect, I had to become hyper aware of academic conventions. In other words, like Derrida (1989/1992) said, by troubling "the norms and the etiquette of academic writing" I explored and "what they are protecting and excluding" (p. 85).

Teacher education. A conversation I had with a friend related to her experiences as a teacher educator has sparked questions about the possible implications of this work for teacher education. This friend and I had talked often about my ongoing data collection/analysis. She knew, for instance, that in part, I had trying to make something (literally, in writing) of what I had been reading, hearing, thinking, and saying in relation to ideas of vocation and calling in education. In particular, I had talked with her often about my thinking and writing about how the talk of *being called* I had read about often in teacher education (see Chapter Three, Uninvited Guest 1) seemed treat it as a fixed and one-time event, as something a preservice teacher either answered or did not upon deciding whether or not to teach. I had told her that I was making something different of vocation in my data collection/analysis, both in relation to my own callings and the expressed callings of participants.

One night, over dinner, the friend excitedly shared with me how our discussions had affected her interactions with a preservice student who was in a class she was teaching. The student, who happened to identify herself as a Christian, had written in a journal entry that she did not know if she was called to teach anymore. Instead she might be called by God elsewhere. The friend talked of how while she might have dismissed this work before, thinking that it was not her business to intervene in matters of spirituality or religion, with my work in mind, she was able to talk with this student without, she thought, stepping over some invisible boundary between church and state. The friend merely suggested to the student that there were many ways to think about vocation and some conceptions of vocation involved ideas that it could be

shifting--that it was okay to not see it necessarily as a one-time ordeal. The two did not discuss which way was *right* or *good,* just that there were possibilities.

Although this moment may seem small and insignificant, this conversation made me think about the possible implications of this work. First, I began to think vocation as one of the spaces for talking across religion that have become thinkable for me in this study (another is love). The teacher educator was able to hesitate and think differently about a situation which she had originally thought was out of her comfort zone. Second, I began to wonder about how my friend's conversation with her student might have been extended to include a discussion of possible effects that might occur due to the student's decision not to teach anymore. Perhaps the teacher educator could have shared with the student research that discussed some effects that not teaching or leaving teaching after only a year or two might have on the Pk-12 population, and in particular those school communities with high populations of poor and minority students (see Dinner Conversations, Preparation, Uninvited Guest 1). Perhaps the student and teacher could explore together the varied ways that people in multiple cultures and religions have talked about answering calls and examined the possible effects of these decisions.

This attention to decisions that must be made, no matter how large or small they seem, feels similar to what Julian Edgoose (2001) described as attending to the "hesitations of learning" (p. 129) or the aporias of responsibility that urge action in the face of an impossible reconciliation between the universal and the particular. In the case above, the student had to make a decision on whether or not to leave teaching and the teacher educator had to make an urgent decision as to whether or not this she should address this in any way. I have talked about the preservice teacher in relation to such a decision elsewhere (see Dinner Conversations, Preparations, Uninvited Guest 1). For the teacher educator to have not talked with the student

based on a responsibility to a rule she understood to mean that this was talk was inappropriate, the possibilities of her being responsive to the student were closed down. Edgoose described how moments of decision can expose an educator to an ethics that is beyond ethics in a traditional sense—that extend beyond justice based and caring-based ethics in that they seek to privilege neither the universal or the particular. Instead, the space of education becomes one where ethical decisions abound and where the path to justice can only come through a leap to the unknown.

Endnotes

[1] Peters and Burbules (2004), described poststructuralism as a "complex skein of thought embodying different forms of critical practice (p. 18). Peters (1996) cautioned that the use of the term 'homogenizes the differences among poststructural thinkers' (p. 19). In this study, I use this term in part for convenience and communicative ease (Derrida, 1994, p. 16) in that it allows me to speak broadly about what Britzman (1994) described as a "set of theories about the work of language and about the constructedness of meaning"(p. 73). But I also use it as a reminder to myself that like any categorization this one necessarily excludes. Thus my ongoing attempts to define a field of poststructural work (along with those contained it in) will always, as Caputo (1997) has said exceed its mission. This seems particularly important in a study in which my object of knowledge is the production subjects in relation to articulated missions. In particular, I am mindful of Davies's (2000) suggestion that we should look at our own lives and the discourses in which we find ourselves as researchers as important data in our studies. As such, my constant attempts to uphold the mission of undertaking a poststructural dissertation (and saying it out loud) while also deconstructing that mission has become necessary data (See *Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guest* 30 for further discussion of data and *Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guest* 14 for what I describe as an overlapping process of data collection/analysis).

[2] In their introduction to Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (2005a) provided a historical and contemporary map of qualitative research. They identified eight historical moments which, although categorized in certain historical spaces, are not to be taken as fixed moments in time. Instead, these overlap throughout both history and the present day and more generally mark shifts in multiple ideas and practices such as "style, genre, epistemology, ethics, politics, and aesthetics" (p. 27). Denzin and Lincoln defined them as follows: traditional (1900-1950); modernist or golden age (1950-1970); blurred genres (1970-1986); the crisis of representation (1986-1990); postmodern or period of experimental and new ethnographies (1990-1995); postexperimental inquiry (1995-2000); methodologically contested present (2000-2004); and the fractured future (2005-). The eighth moment is widely concerned with working against evidence-based social movements and, as such invites qualitative research to become a space of critical and ethical work and thought.

Within these moments, qualitative research is thought and practiced differently and thus a researcher, the data she collects and analyzes, and the research reports written by her can be thought quite differently. While it is beyond the scope of this note to provide a description of each moment, I briefly describe a few moments in order to help situate this dissertation within a time in which the relations between the written text, the researcher and the material world are always already blurring. Below, I rely chiefly upon Denzin and Lincoln's (2005a, 2005b) text because I have found it instructive throughout this study as I have worked to think writing, research, and the researcher within multiple contexts and to do the work of coming to some understanding of the persistent "stuck places" in contemporary educational research (Lather, 2006, p. 48). Throughout the dissertation, I provide specific examples of particular texts and theorizations of those texts that I have found useful in allowing me to situate this dissertation in a long line of thinking and rethinking of what qualitative inquiry can and cannot (and possibly should and should not) do. In this endnote, I highlight how I found one such text because I believe it demonstrates the blurring of these moments within an ever-shifting field of qualitative research and highlights particular stuck places I have encountered in this study.

Moments

Denzin & Lincoln's (2005a) first moment is reflective of a positivist paradigm marked by a great concern for objectivity including a desire by researchers to offer "valid, reliable, and objective interpretations in their writings" (p. 15). The researcher, for instance, who was often "lonely, frustrated, and isolated" (p. 15) had the task of going out into the field to collect data which were often stories about what were described as strange or exotic peoples. Returning from the field, a report could be written that would provide an objective account of the culture visited that would presumably archive the "other" as a timeless truth. In contrast, in the moment marked by blurred genres (the third moment), postpostivist and constructionists paradigms (among others) gained power as other new approaches such as poststructuralism and neo-Marxism emerged. These brought with them a blurring of the boundaries between social science and the humanities and the belief that the researcher no longer had a privileged position in written interpretations and was instead actively interpreting. Such new theorizations invited new experimentation with textual formats, such as with the following examples that Denzin & Lincoln (2005a) provided:

"documentaries that read like fiction (Mailer), parables posing as ethnographies (Castañeda), theoretical treaties that look like travelogues (Lévi-Strauss)" (p. 18). As Denzin & Lincoln (2005a) described, the question became one of how the researcher could "speak with authority" if "there are no longer any firm rules concerning the text, including the author's place in it, its standards of evaluation, and its subject matter?" (p. 18).

Such a questioning of authorship and calls for researchers to think themselves as important and necessary influences on the research they enacted was exacerbated in the period called the crisis in representation, what Denzin and Lincoln (2005a) described as a "profound rupture" (p. 18). In this moment, research and writing became more reflective and issues of validity, reliability, and objectivity became even more problematic since it was doubtful that data could be gathered, arranged, and written up without the explicit interference by the researcher's constant interpretations. As such, issues of gender, class, and race came to the forefront as researchers openly discussed their positions in relation to these identity categories. Denzin & Lincoln (2005a) discussed how Stoller (Stoller & Olkes, 1987), for instance, wrote himself as a character in his own story in order to confront the crisis in representation which he experienced as a researcher studying the Songhay of Niger. After realizing that his informants had lied to him and his neatly organized piles of data were worthless, he wrote himself into a text that allowed him to analyze how his world collided and interacted with that of those he studied.

With this crisis also came many discussions about what or if a focus on the written text in isolation of other research processes could do to move one out of the crisis. Denzin and Lincoln (2005a), for instance, described how Clough (1998) critiqued the idea that any field work could be separated from the act of writing, given that in writing, an author still claims a moral and scientific authority based in the premise that reality still can be captured even if only in one's memoirs or textual experimentations. Such moves often fail to attend to the constitutive effects of writing, and instead perpetuate the hegemony of the empirical sciences and moves away from engaging with other forms of social criticism. This work was echoed by Richardson and St. Pierre (2005), whose work I have found particularly instructive throughout this study, in that like Clough, they have doubted the distinction between the final product (the writing) and the fieldwork. Such discussions have invited a rethinking and a movement toward more critical directions in qualitative research which make problematic key assumptions in the field of qualitative inquiry. Denzin & Lincoln (2005a), for example, discussed two additional assumptions that intertwined with the doubt sparked by the crisis in representation that led researchers to question whether lived experiences were captured or created in the written text. This "triple crisis" added a crisis in both legitimation and praxis to the crisis in representation. The first drew into question and demanded a retheorizing of the traditional criteria for evaluating and interpreting qualitative research such as validity, generalizability, and reliability. The latter crisis asked about the possibility of affecting change in the world if society was theorized as a text. These crises have sparked many responses including multiple forms of experimental writing and moments where methodological work was contested.

I situate this dissertation as a response to this triple crisis in representation, legitimation and praxis and in particular in a space marked by what Denzin and Lincoln (2005a) have called the "rise of a new ethic" (p. 1117) which involves an attention to responsibility and obligation to all involved in the research process. In addition, it explores a teleological framework which takes "performing social justice" and "examining the ways in which our work can serve social justice" as a starting point (p. 1124). As discussed elsewhere (see introduction to Apéritif /Digestif), my exploration is informed by poststructural theories, which suspect, for example, that the center (the origin or the telos) cannot hold (Derrida, 1978, pp. 278-290). With this in mind, such an exploration of social justice is necessarily never finished and marked by the impossible—a notion that is not in opposition to the possible, but relies upon the idea of future present and the absolute future. The former is the future that is planned, what we see coming, (i.e., what we save for when we save for our retirement). The latter is the future of the unforeseeable, that which takes us by surprise. While both are necessary, Caputo described them as follows: "For the relative future we need a good mind, a decent computer, and horse sense, those three; for the absolute future, we need faith, hope, and love, these three" (p. 8). With the absolute future, "we set foot, for the first time, on the shore of the religious" (p. 8). Or put another way as Caputo (2004a) said of Derrida's work in an obituary he wrote upon his death:

> We make use of such materials as have been available to us, forged in the fires of time and circumstance. We do not in some deep way know who we are or what the world is. That is not nihilism but a quasi-religious confession, the beginning of wisdom, the onset of faith and compassion. (p. 9)

Hence, in a way writing has been my tool making use of available and forging in the fires of time and circumstance. Below I describe one example of a text that has been particularly influential in my efforts to make use of that which is available –even though I just happened upon it moments ago. While I describe what use I make of this text elsewhere in the dissertation (see introduction to Apéritif /Digestif), below I highlight how I came to find this text as an example of the attention to detail and decision making that I aimed to take up in this dissertation, an attention that marks this 8th moment). I have provided it to invite the reader into my "stuck place" of writing and planning a qualitative study but also to further explore this 8th moment of qualitative inquiry.

Nomadic Inquiry

As described elsewhere (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 14), the final weeks of writing this dissertation were marked by frantic cutting, cleaning, and theorizing and retheorizing, especially of those sections I knew I needed to wait until the end to write. One such section was a section that would appear near the end of the introductory section the *Apéritif /Digestif*, in which I discussed writing, more specifically, in relation to the dissertation as a whole. I had written around the section and included many notes, returning to the space in the text many times as I cut, reorganized and cleaned up the text and endnotes that are throughout this dissertation. I continuously refused to write the section though, still waiting to see how I thought I might like to theorize how I thought the parts of the dissertation might function together. I saw it as an example of what Lather (1997) had described as her belief that "practice always exceeds theory's grasp," an idea which necessitated a "gesture toward a third space of both/and and neither/nor of theory and practice" (p. 235).

The notes I had dumped into the space that would discuss the dissertation's function had many notes from a variety of theorists. For instance, I had thought that Derrida's (1967/1974) discussion of the supplement might be useful in that space. The term supplement is undecidable in that it can mean contradictory things at the same time. Its definition, for instance, implies both an *adding to* and a *completing* (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 1 for further discussion of the supplement). Writing, then, became something which could complete speech (supplying that which is missing) or/and something that adds to speech (if speech is already complete). As I reread Derrida (1967/1974) and many other related sources (e.g., Biesta, 2001; Caputo, 1997; Culler, 1982; Royle, 2000), I began to envision possible relations between the various parts of the dissertation and explore how a Apéritif /Digestif, for instance, as a supplement might work as both an addition and a completion. Additionally, I had thought I might think the parts of the dissertation in relation to Foucault's (e.g. 1978) genealogical work and seeing how these texts, and the various times and spaces in which they were written, might work together in a way that might make the present that might appear to be *represented* in the dissertation seem less natural. While this is only an inkling of the section I thought I'd write, it is beyond the scope of this endnote to go into more detail here (and I have not yet thought all that much more detail that is coherent enough to share).

I had no idea how to proceed as I worked in a space where I tried not to feel like my theories were failing me or my practice was failing. I talked through my issues with multiple others and fretted over the fact that I felt like I was creating two (maybe three) dissertations. In one particular conversation with my writing partner Jessica, she suggested that I *had* to go to Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) to help me think about this writing. Their figurations, which were not clean metaphors but more like images that they invited others to take up and make their own, would help me think and more importantly might offer a way for the reader to think with me about how these writings worked together (and not together). I had read some of their work before but had not spent time rereading and rereading as I had with other scholars. Now, in the moments before my dissertation was due was not the time to go into an in depth reading. Yet, I could not seem to think this dissertation with the theories I was trying to use. So instead, I went to one who I knew had found their work useful before, Elizabeth St. Pierre and more specifically a sprinkling of texts she had written in the same year (1997a, 1997b, 1997c). This was a difficult decision, knowing that I had tried to read those theorists whose work the educational scholars I referenced had drawn upon. I remembered that Derrida (1997) has said that careful reading was a part of responsibility, if such things as responsibility were to be possible. I had also remembered the warnings of multiple professors throughout my doctoral work who had told me to "go to the source!" Yet, I continued, since time always seemed to be off my side.

Interestingly, St. Pierre (1997a) situated her text, *Circling the text: Nomadic writing practices*, in what at the time was known as Denzin and Lincoln's (1994) sixth moment of qualitative inquiry. This moment came after the crisis in representation and its subsequent fifth moment, the present. Hence that sixth moment was Denzin and

Lincoln's speculations about the future which they predicted would be ripe with ethical complications, similar, it seems, to the "rise of a new ethic" that Denzin and Lincoln (2005a, 2005b) wrote of and that I mentioned above. Drawing on Denzin & Lincoln (1994) as well as texts in which they elaborated on these predictions (Lincoln, 1995; Denzin, 1997a, 1997b), St. Pierre (1997a) said, for example, that in this space:

> Ethical dilemmas proliferate in the sixth moment's vortex of crises that have emerged from the ruins of traditional epistemology and methodology, and each research study produces specific, situated, and sometimes paralyzing complications that have no easy resolution. The richness and power of qualitative researcher is confirmed as its practioners work through such complications, searching for less harmful possibilities for making sense of people's lives. (p. 404)

Hence, this study is situated in multiple overlapping moments including this space of ethical uncertainty (this sixth/eighth moment).

[3] In this note, I provide a brief description of Derrida's (1974/1967) critique of logocentrism. In addition, I discuss a popular counter argument to this critique, that relates to Derrida's (1974/1967) oft cited statement that "there is nothing outside the text" (p. 158), which Caputo (1997) has said is "one of the most thoroughly misrepresented utterances in contemporary philosophy" (p. 78). I do so in order to provide the reader with some theoretical background for the study as well as signal to the kind of critical work undertaken in this study.

Since the crisis in representation (see Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guest 2), when the ability of language to say what we mean and mean what we say was seriously questioned in much of academic research, educational scholars have been taking up the poststructural critiques of language, and specifically Derrida's (1976), famous critique of logocentrism, to question how to think research differently if the *logos*, the thing itself, is always marked by presence and absence. Caputo (1997) described how structural linguist Ferdinand de Sassure critiqued language's ability to capture and mirror reality by stating that language reflects not what something is but what it is not, or its difference from other words and ideas (pp. 100-103). As Caputo (1997) put it:

> What you will never find in the dictionary is a word that detaches itself from these internal relationships and sends you sailing right out of the dictionary into a mythical, mystical thing in itself "outside" of language, wistfully called the 'transcendential signified.' A serious dictionary is a good sober example of the 'play of differences,' of the differential spacing within which, by means of which, all users of language make what sense they are able to make. (pp. 100-101)

For Saussure, these differences, what Derrida (1967/1974) called repeatable traces, could then be studied for their structurality and meaning could be attained.

Derrida's extension of Saussure's critique marked a break between structural and poststructural thought by claiming that despite attempts to tie down any deep structure, the play of differences cannot be closed off since the possibility always exists of repeating a trace differently (Peters & Burbules, 2004). Yet at the same time, since we must continuously refer to one word after another (a process of deferral), all of which must already be known in some way in order to communicate, we are prevented from knowing other than in terms of what is already known. The full presence of any structure or word thus cannot be known and instead, the illusion of presence is the effect of the play of differences and deferral (Caputo, 1997, p. 101). In other words, as Caputo (1997) described, like a nutshell, meanings are gathered together in words or structures (or identities) which compact them and make them seem as if they have a unity. But like a nutshell, these gatherings can be cracked and are actually always already cracking (deconstructing) because words can mean multiple and contradictory things at the same time (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 14; Dinner Conversations, Dinner, Uninvited Guests 10, 20 for further description and examples). In reading a text for instance, communities can seemingly agree upon orthodox meanings of a text (e.g., Here is what *Christian* means) allowing a subject (an individual) to appear to fit neatly into an identity category (e.g., I am a Christian) and become recognizable as a member of that category. The play of differences in the traditional reading might appear to be the only possible structure, but a different set of differences could always be possible. Thus as subjects work to describe themselves and narrate themselves as coherent selves who can be recognized by others, they must necessarily take on board contradictory thoughts and hold them together. Regardless of any number of attempts, finding and mapping all possible meanings is an impossible task, preventing us from ever really knowing ourselves or others fully (Peters & Burbules, 2004, p. 69). A different

reading might produce a different understanding all together. In the words of Derrida (1974/1967), since "*[t]here is nothing outside of the text"* (p. 158), our reading must "remain within the text" (p. 159).

Such a notion that there is nothing outside the text has been oft discussion and critiqued in educational research, which as a field, works within and across multiple epistemological and ontological paradigms (see Lather, 2006 for discussion). While many researchers, like myself, have found that working within research spaces which are theorized as contingent, ever-changing, and always open to new interpretations of both the context and the boundaries, others have read Derrida's critique, and this statement in particular, as a problematic and relativistic one which believes the world to be one without bodies, chairs, or even educational research. In his book *Who's Afraid of Postmodernism: Taking Derrida, Lyotard and Foucault to Church*, James K. A. Smith (2006) discussed how many Christians, for instance, worry that Derrida's idea would stake a claim that all the world is nothing more than a story in the mind of God. Smith discussed this concern at length, using a scene from Disney's *The Little Mermaid* in which the main character, Ariel, is told by her seagull friend that a fork is called a dinglehopper and is used for brushing hair. In a later scene, Ariel is seen as strange by the prince with whom she is eating dinner (with forks) because how she has come to know the object of the fork/dinglehopper as hairbrush was deviant to the dominant notion of fork as eating tool (pp. 40-43). Smith used the example of Ariel to show that although our worldly understandings take place in certain contexts in which everything is an interpretation—a possible reading—this does not mean that the possibility for the real does not exist. Rather our cultural practices, by way of which we make sense of ourselves and others, are caught up in plays of language and power. In other words, the real is marked by an experience of the impossible, which is not that which is not possible but that which cannot necessarily be foreseen as such (Derrida, 1992, p. 27).

That is not to say that poststrutural researchers do not take up commitments, such as social justice or democratic relations, and work toward these with persistence. As Foucault (1988) has noted, "I believe too much in truth not to suppose that there are different truths and different ways of speaking the truth" (pp. 51-52). Similarly, deconstruction is not marked by an anti-realism as much as what Caputo (2004b) has called a "hyper-realism" or a "love of things themselves, which always slip away" (p. 40). In fact, Derrida's critique of presence is driven by a continual search for the impossible and an openness to the other (Biesta, 2001; Caputo, 1997; Lather, 2006), which Derrida, himself, described as an act of love (Derrida, 1994, p. 14) that is directed toward a desire for justice to that which is excluded (Derrida, 1992). Furthermore, Peters & Burbules (2004) described in *Poststructuralism and Educational Research*, that poststructural commitments are directed toward change for the better coupled with a desire to "identify the plural faces of inequality and understand its dynamic changing character" (p. 99). Such notions of change for the better, explorations of multiple truths, and work toward justice are necessarily complex endeavors though in that the very idea of justice, better, truth, and love are necessarily marked by impossible decisions that are beyond calculation. As Derrida (1992) said, such decisions are not oscillations between two possible choices (one just and one not) but are heterogeneous experiences that are "foreign to the order of the calculable and the rule" (p. 24). One is still obliged to calculate and act though even if, as Derrida (1992) said, justice cannot be spoken of without betraying the very idea of justice. Once one declares oneself or some decision to be just, the other can no longer decide whether or not justice has been carried out.

[4] As discussed elsewhere (Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guest 2), what an author should or should not do and claim to *be* has been and continues to be highly contested in educational research especially since the crisis in representation. Many qualitative educational scholars, in particular, have used the reporting of their research to question not only the relation of the author to the text but also that of the researcher to the research field (Barone, 2001; Berbary, 2011; Freire & Macedo, 1987, 1995; Glesne, 1997; Holbrook, 2010; Lather & Smithies, 1997; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 1983; Richardson, 1997; Shor & Freire, 1987; Sizer, 1984). In this note, I discuss one departure from the more conventional research texts which have often been critiqued as relics of a positivist moment in qualitative research where an author/researcher is seen as someone who can stand outside of the research—arts based research. While there are numerous possible examples I could have discussed, I have chosen to use the space this note provides to discuss arts based research since, at present, it has gained considerable attention and critique within and amongst various theoretical frameworks (Finley, 2005; Slattery, 2003). As such it has been an interesting point of inquiry for me throughout my doctoral career. The data I draw upon in this note to describe this category of arts based research is in no way and nor does it aim to be. Instead, I offer it here as example of an ongoing conversation in which this dissertation can be situated. I begin by describing my relationship to this complex category of arts based research that is actively being defined within its own special interest group by that name at the

American Educational Research Association and by the actions of those who work under that name. I then, provide examples as well as theoretical assumptions undergirding these.

Finally, I discuss how my work in this dissertation departs from this work while still being situated within it—skirting the line of categorical membership that poststructural work often invites.

Arts-Based Research

The works of those who call themselves arts based researchers, a/r/tographers, and scholartists have been quite influential in my thinking throughout this study. In fact, part of the text of this note is excerpted (and supplemented with more recent data) from an earlier paper I wrote during one of my first doctoral seminars in which we examined and actively produced this emerging field through our own arts based works. Interestingly and instructively for the content of this note, I have never sought publication on that piece although I have presented and received favorable feedback at a university conference (Bridges, 2005). I describe this work briefly later in this note as a way to demonstrate the tensions that claiming this as arts-based text has brought about.

Arts-based methods of inquiry use aesthetics as a central part of the meaning making process. Maxine Greene (1995) described the power the arts may have in this process by saying:

> At the very least, participatory involvement with the many forms of art can enable us to *see* more in our experience, to hear more on normally unheard frequencies, to *become* conscious of what daily routines have obscured, what habit and convention have suppressed. (p. 123)

The arts, she said, help us to release the imagination which "deals in unpredictability's, in the unexpected," requiring a "reflectiveness on our part to acknowledge the existence of these unexpected and unpredictable vistas and perspective in our experiences" (p. 125). In arts-based research, the role of art is found in its "usefulness in recasting the contents of experience into a form with the potential for challenging (sometimes deeply held) beliefs and values" (Barone, 2001, p. 24). Thus, arts are used in the research process because of their heightened degree of ambiguity in meaning without presenting a final solution because the readers and viewers will always be a part of the meaning making process. This is a process of questioning more so than that of arriving at a final solution, or as Barone (2001) said, arts-based research aims to "disturb, to interrogate personal and cultural assumptions for their intent" (p. 25).

Autoethnography Critiqued

While there are many types of work that fall under the realm of art-based research, I discuss one, autoethnography, here for the sake of brevity and familiarly and that it allows me to draw upon earlier work as a form of critique. Tierney (1998) described autoethnography as writing that "confronts dominant forms of representation and power in an attempt to reclaim, through self-reflective response, representational spaces that have marginalized those of us at the borders" (p. 66). In authoethnography, the field of inquiry begins with the body and memory of the author who writes as the situated experiences of the author become a space to explore culture (Ellis & Bochner, 2000).

Earlier in my doctoral coursework, I wrote a paper, mentioned above, entitled *Multiple Meanings, Multiple Méxicos: Connecting photographs and writing to understand self and other.* In it, I explored autoethnography as a way to make sense of my experiences during a year-long trip to Mexico in which a fellow elementary teacher and I, among other things, learned some Spanish, visited many elementary schools, and spent time with some of the extended families of our previous US students. During that trip, I collected a number of pages of journal writing as well as quite a few photos which became data for the paper. While both of these arts (writing and photography) had been a powerful means of not only making sense of what was around me and of questioning assumptions, upon return to the US I felt overwhelmed with the large quantity of potential data sources I had collected. Thus, I wrote the paper, in part, as a means of deciding what to say when others, including preservice teachers, asked me questions like, *How was Mexico,?* Or *What it like in Mexico*?

Situating the paper in arts based literature, and more specifically a subset entitled A/r/tography, a type of arts-based inquiry that has been defined as "living inquiry where an artist/researcher/teacher is engaged in inquiry

through artistic ways of knowing (Springgay, Irwin, & Kind, 2005, p. 899), I designed a way to think data in a way that I felt would keep it open. In brief, I juxtaposed specific excerpts from my journal which I had re-worked into what I called prose poems along with various photos. These poems and photos combined to inform the autoethnographic work through which I explored myself and culture. I had theorized that this move had created an in-between space where the words of the poem worked with the photos *want* of text to explore it. While these juxtapositions created interesting movement in thought for me, I had quite a few problems with the process. I discuss two here for the purposes of exploring auto-ethnography as it informs this study.

One of my main troubles with this work was that I could not seem to depart from seeing *art* as this fixed category, a fixed way of knowing, that somehow was more desirable than other ways of being and one that was regulated in ways I was not sure I wanted to conform to. I found myself fretting over whether I could call my work "art" considering I was neither trained in photography or poetry. I knew that in arts based research, there was much concern about making art a legitimate form of knowing and doing research (see Slattery, 2003). Johnny Saldaña (2003), for instance, wrote a "how to" article about ethodrama, a method where participants were portrayed as actors on a stage. He described himself as a 30 year veteran of the theatre arts and knowledgeable in writing for the stage. Similarly, although Barone (1987) wrote of all ways of knowing as "fictions," he described certain modes of knowing that were more in line with arts based work.

This *fixing* of art as a way of knowing made me feel as if I, too, had to be *fixed* as an "artist." Like Slattery (2003) wrote, this persistent tendency to categorize oneself as a three part being researcher/educator/artist in the field of arts-based research felt confining. I was not sure if I *was* any of these three, especially since the paper I had written was based in work that might not be considered research, was questionably related to education, and as mentioned above was not produced by someone trained in any of the arts. Susanne Gannon (2006), in her article, *The (Im)possibilities of Writing the Self-writing: French Poststructural Theory and Autoethnography*, troubled the assumption that an author who writes autoethnography can speak for herself and be known by the self—that she can claim to have her voice heard, so-to-speak. She stated that the speaking and writing position of the author is problematized in poststructural work since a subject is always in the process of becoming something other than she claims to be (see Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7 for further discussion of the poststructural subject). Mazzei and Jackson (2009) also wrote of this trouble with voice by stating the following:

> Letting readers 'hear' participants' voices and presenting their 'exact words' as if they are transparent is a move that fails to consider how as researchers we are always already shaping those 'exact words' through the unequal power relationships present and in our own exploitive research agendas and timelines. (p. 2)

Mazzei and Youngblood (2009) encouraged researchers not to give into the paralysis that can occur when voice is theorized as an inadequate construct, but to heed Denzin and Lincoln's (2005a, 2005b) call to experiment and explore with what a reconfigured notion of voice might produce.

A Reconfigured Autoethnography

Similarly, Gannon (2006) called for a reconfigured, poststructural autoethnography that highlights "discontinuity, displacement, and estrangement" and allows the writing to write the writer "as a complex (im)possible subject in a world where (self) knowledge can only ever be tentative, contingent, and situated" (p. 474). These texts might involve an author writing herself as "unreliable and contradictory" while weaving fragments from theoretical texts, memories, photographs, other people, the body, or a variety of other texts throughout (p. 491). She provided examples of how Foucault, Barthes, Derrida, and Cixous's such as Derrida's (1993a) writing with Bennington in the text *Jacques Derrida*. In the split text Bennington wrote on the top of the page summarizing Derrida's thinking in a section called "Derridabase" and Derrida wrote on the bottom about his life and his dying mother. As Derrida (1993a) said, it was "as if I were trying to oblige him [Bennington] to recognize me and come out of this amnesia of me which resembles my mother (Bennington & Derrida, 1993, p. 33). In this space of writing, Derrida explored the difficulty of writing his mother into his text at the same time as he wrote of the impossibility to write himself without her. In this sense he was writing *about* himself but not as someone who could be separated from others.

Building upon this reconfigured autoethnography, I have used the endnotes in this dissertation as a way to cite myself differently (and others) as a researcher who has struggled to make sense of the ongoing data

collection/analysis in this study. I ran across one such example the other day while I was "cleaning up" the conversations which are written in the main text of the dissertation. In *Dinner Conversations, Dinner*, for instance, I had written a character, Caputo, who was largely informed by my readings of theologian John Caputo (1997, 2001, 2004a, 2007; see also Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 10 for further discussion of Caputo). In the conversation, Caputo described the phrase *What Would Jesus Do?* as a "radical call for social justice," a statement I cited from his 2007 text entitled *What Would Jesus Deconstruct: The Good News of Postmodernism for the Church* (p. 78). Weeks after I had written that conversation, I wrote another, *Dinner Conversations, Telephone One*, a conversation between a character entitled Responsibility and an unknown other (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 1 for further discussion) in which Responsibility referred to Jesus as the "original social justice educator." I noted the text (see Chapter Two, Section One, Uninvited Guest 15) and wrote in the note that I had no idea where I would have come up with the notion to refer to Jesus in this way. I presumed it was related to Caputo (2007), but had no idea. While this is just a small example of a self who knows differently in different spaces and time, there are multiple others throughout this dissertation. It is my belief that by attending to the detailed decisions in the research process and the contradictions which abound when voice is troubled, spaces might become available for reimagining our relations with others.

[5] According to Derrida (1991), any sentence that tries to state "'deconstruction is X' or 'deconstruction is not X' *a priori* miss the point" (p. 275) since as Caputo (1987) emphasized, the goal of deconstruction is to keep things in process, to disrupt, to keep the system in play, to set up procedures to continuously demystify the realities we create, to fight the tendency for our categories to congeal" (Caputo, 1987, p. 236). In other words, the goal is to crack nutshells—to open, expose, expand, and add complexity to any attempt to keep in place the illusion of the self-sufficient presence of any identity (Caputo, 1997, p. 31; see also Biesta, 2001, pp. 44-46). Yet, as Derrida (1994) said on numerous occasions in various ways, "sometimes it may be useful to try nutshells" (p. 16), especially given that to communicate without using the tools of metaphysics is not only impossible (Derrida, 1978, p. 280) but undesirable since to fail to risk speaking to the other is also to fail to respect, respond, or provide space for the incoming of the other (Derrida, 1992).

With this in mind, below I provide a nutshell about deconstruction that has been particularly useful for me throughout this dissertation work. While I provide an excerpt of a particular text I have thought with, I am not implying that such a text represents the thoughts and intentions of Jacques Derrida or any other speaker. Instead, in reading excerpts such as these, I invite the reader to join me in thinking about a particular moment where deconstruction is discussed. That is not to say that this moment is the *closest* to the truth of what deconstruction *is*, nor that this excerpt is *better* than others I might have chosen. It is also not to say that this excerpt represents any complete moment or thoughts of speakers. Instead, deconstruction fixates on small moments in a text and watches as it threatens to collapse the *meaning* of other moments (Spivak, 1974). The following is an excerpt from an interview with Paul Cilliers (1999). I invite the reader to think this excerpt in relation to all the methodological decisions discussed in this dissertation. I see this an incitement to validity:

Jacques Derrida: ". . . when you define deconstruction as something that does not necessarily produce a result, I would say yes and no. I would say yes to the extent that the result, the effect, could not be programmed. There is no criterion for the fact of a decision, of the act of writing, thinking, production. To that extent deconstruction … deconstruction is more and more a way of thinking what responsibility and decision should be. Decision and responsibility worthy of these names should not be controlled by previous knowledge, it should not be programmed. That does not mean that we have given up knowledge. Not at all, on the contrary, we have to know all that we can know. But we should also know and think that between the act of knowledge, between science and the act itself, the decision, there will be a gap, there is a heterogeneity between knowing and doing. So when I make a decision, when I take responsibility, to some extent it must be in the night. I have to prepare a decision to know where I can go as well, as consciously as possible, but I should acknowledge that between the accumulation of knowledge and the moment I make a choice, I take a responsibility, I make a decision, there is an infinite abyss because of the heterogeneity of these moments. That is why I also constantly insist on the undecidabililty, which does not mean that you are simply paralyzed and neutralized because you do not know what to do. Simply, in order for a decision to be a decision it has to go through a moment where, irrespective of what you know, you make a leap into the decision. This leap into the responsibility is an infinite one and you take a decision only in a situation when there is something undecidable, when you don't know what to do. You don't know. That is, if you knew what to do, there would be no decision, you would have already done. . .

Paul Cilliers: You would have calculated. . .

Jacques Derrida: You would have already known. So, this is true for ethical, juridical, and political decisions, even for existential decisions. You have to go through an ordeal of undecidability in order to decide. So, to that extent the result, by definition, is unpredictable, unknown -- unpredictable if by predictability you mean knowledge, you mean calculation. Something must remain incalculable for a decision to be a decision. That is why it is an intervention which has -- because it is not linked essentially to knowledge -- something obscure, something even mystical. I have no objections to people who define this decision as something mystical.

Paul Cilliers: That looks like another question that we will not have time to ask you today.

[6] For examples of qualitative scholars who have taken up these or similar questions about writing with varied textual results and authorial positioning, see Amatucci, 2010; Anzandula, 1987; Behar, 1994; Berbary, 2011; Bridges-Rhoads & Parks, 2009; Burbules, 2000; Davies, 2000, 2009; Bennington & Derrida, 1993; Frank, 2000; Gannon, 2005; Holbrook, 2010; Sizer, 1984; Lather & Smithies, 1997; Richardson, 1997)

[7] I begin this note about how subjectivity is conceptualized in this study with a lengthy quote by Bronwyn Davies (2000) which informs my descriptions of subjectivity:

> Deconstruction, for me, has meant a turning away of the reflexive gaze from the achievement and maintenance of an essential self and towards the folding and unfolding of life's possibilities. The success of life cannot be judged by how well I fit my allotted categories ("Am I a good woman?") or on how well I position myself within dominant discourses ("What prizes and recognition have I had?"). Instead, the categories through which we are each positioned, the processes of positioning, and the discursive practices through which such positioning is made possible and defensible are made both visible and revisable. (p.170)

As Davies alluded, poststructural work invites a conception of the subject as one that is not fixed and instead is constituted through cultural practices and categories which invite the taking up of certain positions in available storylines. In other words, this subject is not that which is contained and self-identical to itself, but in the gathering process required in responding to another, the subject becomes thinkable and knowable. Biesta (2001), drawing on the works of Levinas (1979), who I have not read but who Derrida has shown great affinity toward (see Biesta, 2001, pp. 44-46; Caputo, 2004b), provided insight on this type of subject as it relates to Western philosophy's attempts to understand the singularity of the subject. He said that contrary to common belief, this type of subject cannot be analyzed as having an epistemological relationship to the world where, as an "isolated, self-present mind" it attempts to "get accurate knowledge" of the world or of the other (p. 45). For something to be known, it would have to be conceptualized, and to do so would have to affiliate the other with a more general concept. But if the other can only be thought of as an affiliation with a more general concept, it cannot appear in its alterity. Thus the subject never arrives in understanding but is constantly being made to mean through available conceptualizations. Instead of doing away with the idea of the subject though, Derrida (1992) has insisted that a reconfiguration of the subject that involves a necessary openness to that which is unforeseeable, unknowable, and wholly other.

Poststructural scholars have engaged in many attempts to explore how this reconfigured subject functions in the material world. A Foucault reconceptualization of power (1978, 1980, 1982, 1984) has proved useful for examining these shifting and often contradictory meanings that subjects take up and resist as they make sense of themselves and others (e.g. Berbary, 2011; Bridges-Rhoads, 2010; Fendler, 2003; Meadmore, Hatcher, & McWilliam, 2000; Parks, 2009; Schmeichel, 2010). For Foucault (1978, 1982), power is not merely repressive in that one does not simply possess it and use it act upon someone or something, but rather "[p]ower is everywhere" and "comes from everywhere" (p. 93). As that which is "mobile, reversible, and unstable" (1997, p. 292), power not only weighs down on people by force but "reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (Foucault, 1980, p. 39). Here, power is productive, creating subjects through relations of power/knowledge which create "truths" within certain regimes. As Rabinow and Rose (2003) described, for Foucault, these regimes of truth, are essential to the ways in which human beings have come to govern themselves and others (p. xii), in that they produce, as St. Pierre (2000) noted, "very real, material, and damaging structures in the world" (p. 481). She described, for instance, how the common gathering of multiple ways of being under the term woman allows for differences to be

erased and for those who fall in the category to be slotted into a hierarchy and then "manipulated, dismissed, and oppressed" (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 480). Foucault (1978/1990) called these gatherings discursive fields in that they are spaces where certain knowledges have become accepted as truth-as natural and as normal-at certain moments in time—necessarily excluding other possible truth claims as unthinkable or falsehoods. This subject is always embedded in multiple networks of truths and thus is "always the site of conflicting forms of subjectivity" (Weedon, 1997, p. 32). In this way *discourse* is taken as a time and space within which certain thoughts, actions, and words are assumed more right, more true, or normal than others (Foucault, 1978, pp. 100-101).

St. Pierre (2000) described how discourse extends beyond just linguistic language because language is organized into ways of thinking, speaking, and acting that help name and explain our world and ourselves. As ways of speaking, thinking, and acting are continuously defined and re-defined through day-to-day practices in various contexts and historical moments, certain storylines and subject positions become available with which subjects can tell themselves about themselves or use to describe themselves as they try to make sense of their lives and selves in that space. Truths about a preservice teacher, for instance, are already playing themselves out in education before she even enters the profession. Furthermore, the types of knowledge a teacher should have about herself as a religious teacher or one who has a mission, for instance, is different within different regimes of truth, within which we are conditioned to actually *want* to be a certain type of person (Davies, 2000). As Davies (2000) stated, "having taken on as one's own the discursive practices through which these memberships are articulated, the knowledge of how to belong in that category and the desire to be correctly located...are read as coming from one's 'inner' self (pp. 31-32). In this way, the ever-changing and ubiquitous power/knowledge connects itself to the body (Mills, 2003, p. 91), making it 'the inscribed surface of events '' (Foucault, 1991/1984, p. 83).

[8] As described elsewhere (see Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guest 6), with the body theorized as an inscribed surface of events, thoughts, actions, feelings, and so on come to *mean* certain things in certain historical and social spaces as the subject who describe them in language continue to reinscribe that meaning in different ways. In other words, as the subject is made possible and understandable within these spaces, at the same time, the subject continues to constitute the "nature" of the body, including the "unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life" of the subject (Weedon, 1987, p. 108). In the field of teacher education, educators such as Zembylas (2005) and McWilliam (1999) have questioned how a rethinking of emotions and desires as situated outside of one's head and in the social world might create fruitful spaces for discussions. Zembylas (2005) for instance, encouraged a move away from seeing a teacher's identity as fixed and instead a move toward examining the historically contingent emotional rules and norms in relation to which teachers' identities are constituted. Similarly, in this study, I have not aimed to investigate the realness or reasons behind the expressed emotions of mine or others. Instead, these have become fruitful spaces to explore subject formation both in relation to qualitative inquiry and teacher education (see Dinner Conversations, Dessert for example)

[9] While this note is attached to a text that considers the troubling of writing as an ethical project, I take the space of this note to discuss, in brief, education as an ethical project. In a dissertation which, in part, aims to explore mission work in relation to the preservice teacher and qualitative research, a discussion of such seems necessary. Missions, by definition, involve an act of taking up a task one is charged with or is sent to undertake (meriam-webster.com). As such, claiming educational missions can involve a complex process of ensuring that a mission or practice does not conflict with other norms or codes upon which much of ethics in education is based upon (see Edgoose, 2001 for discussion). One such ethic that is often taken up by social justice teacher educators is Nel Noddings (2003, 2005) ethic of care. The current editors of the *Journal of Teacher Education* (Spalding, Klecka, Lin, Odell and Wang, 2010), discussed Nodding's ethics of care as part of an invitation for teacher educators to enact a three part conception for social justice, involving what they deemed a song, hammer, and bell. The hammer involved the theories and ideologies that help fight against injustices, and the bell was the idea that one must know themselves, students and communities in order to teach well. Care theory was a part of the "song about love for one another" (p. 193) that they said intertwined with the other two conceptions. Spalding et al. (2010) described how Noddings care theory was based in that idea that interpersonal relationships are the key to ethical teaching. They described for instances where care (or love) was needed but not enacted:

> In those unfortunate instances where teacher educators guilt students and teachers into confessing that they are part of the problem of social injustice (a message that may not be personally persuasive to them), any affective motivation the students and teachers have to change social injustice in the world may be diminished. The song that promotes love and caring for one another needs to be heard and acted upon in

> order to unify and motivate teacher educators, teachers, and students to combat the forces of oppression that, in all likelihood, they truly detest. (p. 193)

In line with Spalding et al.'s (2010) notion that the care and love must be "heard" in order to do its work, from reading Noddings's works, I have come to understand that these caring relationships must be mutually responsive interactions between two people (e.g. teacher and student). The *carer* is "seized by the needs of another" (p. 16) and the *cared for* must recognize that the need is met in order for the care to exist and for the *carer* to be able to call herself a *carer.* These positions shift in relationships and involve ongoing connections with one another and ongoing efforts to ensure that the care is enacted. This is different than caring *about* something or someone as it allows for a space for the *carer*'s intentions to be denied by the *carer*. As Noddings (2005) said, despite the *carer'*s intentions, if the *cared for* does not receive it, "something is very wrong" (p. 15).

While this is only a brief discussion of care theory and there is much more to this theory to be explored (and its critiques, see Weidman, 2002), I noted it here in order to invite such exploration (either by me at a later date in relation to the ongoing data collection/analysis for this study or a reader in relation to her ongoing data collection/analysis). I believe that this theory has interesting intersections and departures from my data collection/analysis. I have wondered, for instance, how a focus on care, despite that it is often intertwined with love, might enable difference conversations than a focus on love might. As explored in *Citing God* and *Citing Theorists* in this chapter and throughout all of the chapters in this dissertation, love is often quite connected to Christianity in multiple ways. This receipt of this love, though, is not always so easily received and the desire or responsibility for ensuring the receipt of that love is not necessarily a priority.

[10] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7 for discussion of power/knowledge, discourse, and subjectivity; See also Foucault (1978) chapter entitled Method for a concise description and Davies (2003) for a reflexive look at how power/knowledge was useful in her work related to gender.

[11] This note acts as example of one of the ways a note functions in the chapters of this dissertation as an unplanned happening that I had to determine whether or not I would attribute attention to it. In it, I discuss how I came to find Holbrook's article and a subsequent critique, and from there data that became useful in conjunction with other data. I do this in order to highlight the interweaving of data collection/analysis (see *Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guests* 14, 30) and to continuously provide examples of how separations of literature reviews, theoretical frameworks, data collection and analysis have been impossible in this project. I also use it to sign this project not as a loan scholar, but as a part of a series of conversations that have informed it (Foucault, 1980).

I found Holbrook's (2010) article through a person connection with Holbrook herself. Having been a past student at UGA and a woman who I took a few classes with, I had been often mesmerized by her creativity and theoretical understandings. Since she graduated, I had not had contact with her until I applied for a position at Georgia State University where she currently works. While searching through vitas of faculty members, I came across her 2010 article and found it quite useful for my purposes since she, too, was departing from a conventional research text. I passed the article along to Hilary Hughes-Decatur, my writing partner, whose dissertation (Hughes-Decatur, 2011) was a multi-genre work, so that she could use Holbrook's citational trail to help situate her work. From there, Hilary happened upon Badley's (2011) text in which he questions whether Holbrook's multi-genre work is really a marker of an "ability traitor" as she claims. Liking what she saw, she looked up some of Badley's work, finding an article useful for both me and Hilary in that Badley (2009) questioned the shifting of academic writing from more conventional approaches, especially as it related to the dissertation format. Hilary sent me that article, which I have cited elsewhere in this dissertation.

While such a data trail might seem too wordy or unnecessary for the purposes of a dissertation, I see the inclusion of such trails as a way to continue to the work of "troubling clarity" that Lather (1996) explored. Such clarity, at present, is even more in demand as qualitative researchers find the value of their work under increased scrutiny under the auspices of a greater push towards being scientific. By highlighting the details that complicate an easy idea of a coherent and linear research process, I aim *not* to suggest that all research should or must be done in this way. Instead, I aim to highlight what traditional research plans and reports exclude so that these exclusions can be examined for what they produce (Derrida, 1992). I have written the conversations, in particular, as invitations to teacher educators, specifically those who work for social justice (even as they question what it is), to use as a space for thought to happen. As readers contribute their own details to these conversations that complicate the actions and

words of the characters, I hope that these data trails can provide examples of how all of our readings are situated and contextual and can and must be rewritten.

[12] Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) discussed stirated and smooth spaces in their text *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (pp. 352-353, 474-500). They noted that such terms were actually used by Pierre Boulez long before (see Uninvited Guest 22, p. 518). While I read Deleuze and Guattari's text early in my doctoral work and again in parts late, late in my doctoral work (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 2) I have never read Boulez (refusing my urges to Google him as I type). In fact, I had never read the note in which Deleuze and Guattari referred to him. I found it in one of St. Pierre's (1997a) texts entitled *Nomadic Inquiry in the Smooth Spaces of the Field: a Apéritif/Digestif* (p. 380), which I had also read early in my doctoral work and again late in my doctoral work after my writing partner, Jessica recommended a good rereading. In that earlier reading, I suspect, I also had not read St. Pierre's note. While this noting might seem inconsequential, I bring it up here in an effort to mark and explore at least some of my methodological stuck places in this dissertation—here being one where responsible citational practices began to blur. As I sit here, for instance, along with Deleuze and Guattari's text, I am reading St. Pierre's (1997a) text (I mean literally, as in both are open on the table with my computer). I shift back and forth between the two texts (as well as two others by St. Pierre (1997b, 1997c) and a third by Nicolas Burbules (2000) that I found while reading about aporias and remembered that he mentioned Deleuze). When words fall onto the page I have no idea which text helped me think them. I also have no idea what words (or notes) have dropped out of view only to find new significance at a later date, such as here, where they have become an example of how citational trails are never finished as is the task of knowing how to cite responsibly. While I am not sure what to make of this here, I am sure I will be interested in exploring it at a later date.

[13] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30 for more information on the dissertation log and other descriptions of data.

[14] For the purposes of ease in communication, I have split my data collection/analysis practices into two distinct phases. Like the inevitable blurring that has occurred between the collection/analysis which I refuse to write without the slash, I also have chosen to add a slash to these phases which I call the writing/real writing. In this note, I briefly describe the difficulties I have had in this naming ,but I refer the reader to another text in which I have written more extensively about what Hilary Hughes-Decatur and I have come to term *PhDness*. (While the paper mentioned was presented at SQUIG conferences (Bridges-Rhoads & Hughes, 2010) and is available upon request from the authors, we are in the process of revising the paper for submission to *Qualitative Inquiry*. This paper is a marker of the kind of methodological writing which I believe this dissertation process has invited and one example of how the dissertation cannot contain all that *happened* during the research project).

Writing/Real Writing

I call my writing phases writing/real writing in order to draw attention to the necessary situating of this study within the limits of time and also academic discourses. Such a situating highlights the impossibilities of ever finishing data collection/analysis and thus ever finishing interpretation while also bringing to light the necessity of having to have a finished product in order to publish, or in this case defend as a part of the PhD process. This process of obtaining a PhD is often seen as being that of a hierarchical and linear steps leading to a written up study which must prove to a committee that one is able to do research (coursework, comprehensive exams, prospectus, data collection, data analysis, writing, defense). This process has been critiqued through notions such as Richardson & St. Pierre (2005) which doubt the separations of individual research components. But the ladder still persists in multiple ways, in research that looks at the PhD process as a developmental trajectory, in text books which lay out the research process itself as linear, in hierarchies of doctoral students who are said to come give advice on how to enact research or negotiate the terrain of doctoral programs, and even in the mentoring of professors who always seem to be asking questions like "How's the writing coming?" or "Are you writing yet?" as if the only writing that counts is what will be on the page and turned into the graduate school.

While this discussion of the ladder might seem like a rant, Hilary and I have talked often about how the hierarchy has deeply affected our attempts to give what we always wondered was enough time for analysis and the writing through of analysis—a process which often involved, but was not limited to, the numerous readings, re-readings, writing, and re-writing of data as well as our weekly conversations about our these processes that often sparked new beginnings, middles, and stopping points for our writing. We have also pondered how to juggle the re-

thinking and re-writing of the work we had done during coursework, comprehensive exams, and prospectus stages that unlike many of our friends, did not seem to invite a cutting and pasting into the final dissertation format. Each of us have talked and written of numerous times when we have stopped writing through something not because we thought that was the appropriate thing to do in relation to our studies, but because of the pressure we had felt from the ladder of PhDness. We had previously theorized this pressure in two ways, Hilary using phenomenological theories and specifically Heidegger's (1962/2002) notion of a phenomenon begin buried over time and me using poststructural and specifically Foucault's concept of disciplinary power that transverses and acts on us from everywhere, including ourselves (see Foucault, 1976). The writing of that text became a way to think, talk, and write about the difficulties we encountered when told to *stop reading* and just *write*.

Hence using the stages that PhDness invited, I talk here about this split of writing/real writing that marks a stopping point of the dissertation log and the starting point of multiple texts that would find their way into the actual dissertation. Such a split presumably would mark a stopping of data analysis and a starting of a "writing up" but for me this split occurred in late October, 2010 as I began preparing to write a paper, which at the time I thought would be a chapter in this dissertation. I was planning to present the paper at the annual meeting of the Language Research Association (LRA), formerly known and the National Reading Conference (which incidentally I did not attend due to an incessant pain in my upper abdomen that began just prior to my scheduled departure and which my physical therapist later determined was due to my ongoing knee problems which had been exacerbated in the previous months as I spent less and less time taking care of my body and more and more time writing (see Hughes-Decatur, 2011 for discussions on bodies and the writing of dissertations). These new documents which were sorted into new folders with new names which looked like *LRA, draft 16* and so on marked the phase of "real writing." The other became the writing that was *not yet* the real (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30 for a detailed explanation of the contents of the dissertation log).

Of course, this split can be deconstructed and was already deconstructing without my help since it relied upon a binary relation *before/after* where one term is privileged over the other. Here what comes after is privileged over what comes before in a staged research process. The *real writing* and *analysis* as the *after* and the *writing* and the *data collection* as before. The real writing, for instance, supposedly is outside of the writing, performing the task of organizing it and making it *mean* for a reader. Similarly the data analysis would be said to do the organizing of that which is collected. As such, the privileged terms, the real writing and the analysis, mark their counterparts as being below--not yet complete--in a hierarchy where completing the task (publishing an article or completing a dissertation) are privileged and successful. Deconstruction does not suggest that one should merely reverse the binary though, privileging the *before* rather than the *after*. I am not, for instance, calling my dissertation log *the dissertation*. Instead, the terms must be made to show how they both rely on the same logic to be upheld. If, for instance, it is acknowledged that data collection is never finished and that writing is never finished (which does not mean that is always the case) we must ask if it follows that real writing or data analysis necessarily come *after* or that these could be considered outside of other acts of writing or collection. To say so would invite a consideration that normal ideas of analysis or real writing are not truth, or fact, but are instead, as Biesta, (2001) said, are "ethical and teleological determinations of what normal. . . is" (p. 36). Furthermore, to maintain the purity of these ideas of normality would require an act of exclusion where what comes *after* tries to keep outside that which possibly already inhabits the inside. Data collection and writing become outsiders or deviants to the desirable end product. These terms (data collection or writing) then, must "returns to sign the act of its own exclusion" an act which "outlaws the legality of this exclusion in the first place" (Biesta, 2001, p. 36). That is to say that the possibility that data collection or writing might never *be* never-ending must be taken into account. I cannot choose between one or the other since each are contaminated by the other. Data collection and writing are always at risk of being also analysis and real writing. In many ways then, this dissertation is an invitation to watch the before/after binary deconstruct.

[15] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 3 for exploration of cursing in relation to care and discourse

[16] See Appendix B for timeline of some of the events in this dissertation study. I have placed this as an appendix because I wrote it last and never knew if I would have enough time to complete it (It might not even be there now!)

[17] Short term mission trips are a booming practice in the United States at present. Named as such for the short duration of the trip, anywhere from one week to a semester long stint, these drive-by missions (Corwin, 2000) often

involve traveling to a location with a set group of people who has been identified as being in need by a national, international, or local organization or church group that has planned it. They offer a variety of opportunities for service for the millions of Christians who attend them each year, such as building houses, working in orphanages, cleaning up after natural disasters, and so on (Corwin, 2000). As discussed elsewhere in this dissertation (Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God), the selection criteria for interview participants for this study, in part, required that participants had experienced at least one trip in the past seven years. While the literature often focuses on trips as being out of the state and country, I did not specify the duration or location of the trips but meant for them to be specific bouts of time where participants traveled to a location where they did not intend to stay indefinitely. I have chosen to keep the names of the locations and organizations or individuals who organized these trips anonymous to protect the identities of participants and because the details of these particular trips and organizations are not the focus of this dissertation. I cite them by description (e.g., Christian organization website).

Citation without Details

I digress for just a moment to discuss this citational decision. While I understand that this act does not allow the reader access to some data, it is my belief that this access is counterproductive to my purposes here. As a doctoral student, I have come to understand throughout my doctoral program that the dissertation is supposed to, in part, demonstrate my understanding of how theory and research practice (including methods and any decisions related to participants, interview transcripts or other data) should be theoretically ground. I have described elsewhere (*Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guests* 3, 4, 5, and 14 in particular) that I ground this study in poststructural theories which do not ascribe to notions that data is "out there" to be readily interpreted by others. Rather data is made in the production of this study and in the production of this dissertation. I have also discussed, at length, in Aporia 3, my reasons for not using individual participants or organization as a locus of analysis. Furthermore, while I understand that opinions on this matter will vary, the ethics that I explore in this dissertation (see Apéritif/Digestif, Introduction) do not invite me to claim that I am *right* or *wrong* in this matter. Rather, they obligate me to act and to do my best to calculate that decision before the action. I have done this and now, the decision becomes one I must repeat (or not) each time I cite. I am also thrown back into the realms of questioning the effects of such a decision and how they might relate to the field of qualitative research and citational practice. One of those questions popped up below in the writing of the remainder of this note in relation to the possible citation of comments posted under web based articles. While the person's commenting usually post usernames, there is little to no extra information available about the person. The space of the comment literally becomes a space where thoughts can happen. How might these sources change notions of responsible citational practices (Time does not permit me to search this to see who else has discussed this).

Mission Work

Below, I provide a list of the types of tasks, locations, and identified "in need" groups that interview participants mentioned:

- general maintenance and interaction for children living with HIV/AIDS in an orphanage
- street performances in a country where Christianity was forbidden
- door-to-door distribution of gospels combined with efforts to build local churches in a country where a different type of Christianity was practiced than that of the participant,
- building and fixing up houses for persons affected by a natural disaster
- mowing lawns and doing yard work in an area of town where residents had been identified as economically poor
- helping a missionary family to build a church
- build a school and distribute water to a community
- minister to Christian children in church settings and also camp settings
- hold Bible studies and share Bible stories in parks and community centers

Although often seen as a valuable practice in religious literature for helping attendees challenge their own cultural assumptions (Crouch, 2007; Jeffrey, 2001; Schroeder, 1995*;* Van Engen, 2000; Walling, Eriksson, Meese, Ciovica, & Gorton, 2006), these trips have come under scrutiny for a wide variety of reasons. For instance, the cost

of these trips has come under much scrutiny by both Christians and non-Christians throughout the years (e.g., Schwartz, 2003). Fundraising often involves sending out letters to family, friends, and community members, soliciting money (and prayer) for the trips. One participant, for instance, along with the 24 others who took a week-long trip with her, was able to raise approximately $1500 (a total of about $37,500 for the trip). The spending of such large sums of money has raised concerns about not only who benefits from these trips (Schwartz, 2003) but whether such practice is ethical.

A local paper, for example, in the state where this study took place, ran a story about the practice which the author feared too often turned into funded vacations (Local paper, 2010). He pointed out that the typical cost of one particular week long trip cost more, per person, than the annual salary of some workers in that country. The online article sparked numerous comments representing a range of reactions from questions as to whether these were tax-free vacations to congratulating trip participants for doing such needed work. Three days later, another article appeared in the same paper, by a different author, in which a particular national mission organization (one which a participant in this study traveled with) was lauded for the positive experiences that its trips had on the travelers. And again, a flurry of comments ensued, one of which was ". . . would never want an inexperienced teenager roofing my house. It's more complicated and requires more skill than people think. If the roof leaks, then what?"

Whether or not these trips are desirable or appropriate for a preservice teacher to attend is not the focus of this dissertation. I share this as an example of the contested ground upon which these types of "cross-cultural" experiences exist, a ground quite similar to that of "field experiences" and "cross-cultural" work often discussed as desirable in teacher education as a part of the important work of being culturally responsive (e.g. Baker & Giacchino-Baker, 2000; Faulconer, 2003; Melnick & Zeichner, 1996; Moule, 2004; Pence & Macgillivray, 2008; Sleeter, 2008; Willard-Holt, 2001). Yet, highlighting such contested ground does contribute to the focus of the research in that it highlights a space where preservice teachers might be positioned and position themselves as those who are or are not undertaking work that is in support of social justice. I have begun to wonder, for instance, how discussions of how to cite one's cross-cultural experiences on a resume might invite interesting queries about the pervasiveness of Christian practices in certain spaces.

[18] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 3

[19] Conklin (2008), Jones and Enriquez (2009) and Hughes (2010) have all made efforts to rethink the idea that the teaching population, who are mostly white, female, middle-class, and monolingual (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005), should be seen as a monolithic group resistant to critical teaching practices. Conklin (2008), for example, referenced Sleeter's (2008) literature review (which I have since read) on preparing white teachers to teach diverse student populations (p. 657) and Sleeter's (2008) finding that "white preservice teachers who continued to resist or dismiss what the program was trying to teach related to diversity" (Sleeter, 2008, p. 573). Conklin (2008) wrote of how this resistance can turn into anger among preservice teachers, an anger she experienced herself with a preservice teacher she wrote about which she worried might interrupt teacher educators' efforts to promote equitable and just practices. Conklin proposed that teacher educators might consider supporting preservice teachers' necessary growth and change with compassion (Hahn, 1987, 1993). This work might look like teacher educators being mindful of how they talk about their students with their colleagues, trying to avoid the sort of deficit thinking that Sleeter (2008) demonstrated when she listed problematic qualities the her literature review produced related to white teachers. She suggested that conversations might shift toward discussing the conditions that might help preservice teachers grow, building from what students did well.

Throughout this study, I have often run across research supporting ideas that religious beliefs, practices, and ideological frames can negatively affect a preservice teacher's abilities to enact culturally responsive teaching practices (e.g. Huerta & Flemmer, 2005; James (in press), Subedi, 2006). Spector (2007) suggested that addressing religious frames of understanding is necessary for teachers and students because these frames "may implicitly or explicitly subvert goals of civic pluralism" (p. 12). In addition, Carter (2009) suggested that the examination of religious metaphors of teaching (i.e. saints who can perform miracles) might increase a preservice teacher's awareness of structural and institutional constraints to equity that a focus on miracles might impede. More specifically, teacher educators have identified religious beliefs and structures as negatively impacting a preservice teacher's ability to be open and responsive to the students they teach when issues of sexuality arise (Hermann-Wilmarth, 2010; Hyland, 2010; Kahn, 2006; Meiners & Quinn, 2010) as well as the specific cultural and linguistc

needs of English language learners (see Baurain, 2007 for discussion; see Edge, 2003 and Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003 for examples).

I have not run across many teacher educators who have explored how their own tendencies to focus on the possible deficits might affect their abilities to teach for social justice. Such a silence in the literature about the necessity or perhaps difficulty that teacher educators might have in modeling responsiveness toward religious preservice teachers does not necessarily infer that such discussions are not or should not occur outside of the teacher education literature. In fact, it is perhaps behind closed doors, so-to-speak, that these discussions must take place (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 13). Throughout this study, I have wondered how teacher educators might engage in this practice of critically reflecting upon their own willingness and abilities to model culturally responsive practices in relation to their religious preservice teachers as well as critically examine the effects of such interactions.

I have used this study, in part, as a way to write through these queries. One way I have done this by explicitly stopping the conversations written in the chapters at the points where I could not find a way to progress without one character performing what Hilary and I (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 58 for discussion of writing partners in this study) have come to term the "smack down." This *smack down* involves a person deploying their theories in a way that shuts down a conversation when one party presenting the *Truth* about something or another. I have described this in various ways in this dissertation without naming it as such (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 11; Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guests 27, 28). I have often thought the smack down as an intentional act where the speaker has calculated the outcomes prior to enactment, but writing these conversations has allowed me to situate this practice outside of the speaker's head and into the field (the field of this dissertation in this instance). As such, each conversation has additional pages which have been cut. I cut them not due to time as much of the other cutting in this dissertation has been. I cut them do to how I saw them functioning as deal breakers or door closers. In relation to the stopping point, the conversation then became something different. It became a space where conversation might be possible across and within religious differences.

This practice of theorizing our stopping points and smack downs has important implications for both teacher education and qualitative research. For the former, the conversations become spaces for exploration of possibilities but also explorations of our own stopping points. Each time I read them again, for instance, I comment (often aloud) about what I wish one character or another had said or *known* in a certain instance. In my conversations with my writing partners, Hilary, Missy, and Jessica, similar "out loud" comments have occurred. I hope these conversations might invite such exploration amongst others as well. For the latter, qualitative research, I see this practice of theorizing our stopping points as being related to mentoring of doctoral students. While I have experienced wonderful mentoring in more ways than I could ever have imagined, when it comes to *just getting the dissertation done* and getting on with *stopping* of my data collection/analysis, I have often felt quite alone. Stopping has not been easy. It has been yet another aporia to contend with. The urgency of the deadline calls upon me to stop but would prevent work that I have to decide is important enough. Here and now, for instance, as I write this note, I am approaching my deadline. Literally, it is upon me. Yet, as I read through the final pass, I find myself attending to this guest that requests attention, a note to myself even, to remember this experience when mentoring my own doctoral students.

[20] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30 on the use of *social justice* in this study

[21] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7 for a description of discursive practices and power-knowledge; see also Foucault, 1978, 1980, 1982, 1984

[22] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 8 for description of emotions in relation. See also Zembylas (2005)

[23] I have no idea why I noted this text.

[24] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30 for discussion of dissertation log

[25] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guests 9, 13 for descriptions of the site of the research

[26] For discussions of Christian privilege see Blumenfeld, 2006; Fairchild, 2009; Schlossher, 2003; see also Dinner Conversations, Preparation, Uninvited Guest 5; Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 19.

[27] Despite the religious connotation of terms like *mission* or *vocation*, many teacher educators who focus on training teachers for public schools believe that claiming a personal mission (often used interchangably with vision and vocation) is necessary for work in support of social justice and service to the public good (Cochran-Smith, 2006; Fairbanks et al., 2010; Freedman & Appleman, 2009; Irvine, 2003; McDonald & Zeichner, 2009; Nieto, 2005a, 2005b; Quartz, Olsen, Anderson, & Lyons, 2009). Nieto (2005), for instance, has claimed that "good teachers" have vocations to "serve the common good" (pp. 204-206) and Cochran-Smith (2006) has called for "lovers" and "dreamers" with a mission toward the betterment of society. In recent years, these discussions of vocation in relation to teachers and preservice teachers are especially prevalent in relation to reform movements in teacher education which aim to recruit, train, and retain teachers who are willing and able to teach *all* children—especially as it relates to the widespread agreement that public education is wrought with inequities (see Zeichner, 2009 for discussion) and that poor and minority children, in particular, more often receive a far inferior education than their middle to upper class and white counterparts (Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2002; Ingersoll, 2003). The common belief that teachers are a key ingredient in alleviating these inequities (Cochran-Smith, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 1999; Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Ingersoll, 2004; McDonald & Zeichner, 2009; Zeichner, 2009) combined with the widely discussed problem of teachers leaving the profession after only a few years, especially in areas of high poverty and high diversity (Bondy & McKenzie, 1999; Cochran-Smith, 2003, 2004, 2006; Freedman & Appleman, 2009; Henke, Chen, & Geis, 2000; Ingersoll, 2003, 2004; Johnson & Kardos, 2009; Liston, 2000; Nieto, 2003, 2005a, 2005b; Palmer, 2003; Quartz et al., 2009; Zumwalt & Craig, 2009), leaves teacher educators eager to find teachers who are likely to stay in teaching "for the long haul" (Freedman & Appleman, 2009).

In the religious educational literature, authors have engaged in an ongoing theorization of the meaning of vocation in a variety of ways ranging from a listening to an inner voice which directs your life (Palmer, 1999) to a necessary calling which is mediated by the church (Snow, 2001; see also, Chater, 2005; Hartnett & Kline, 2005; Miller, 2007; Nagahara, 2009; Palmer, 1999; Placher, 2005; Schuurman, 2004 for additional examples). In secular teacher educator literature, the attention is often in determining the relationship between claiming a vocation and staying in teaching (see Dinner Conversations, Preparations, Uninvited Guest 1) as well as determining how to help teachers negotiate the difficult task of instruction so that they stay in teaching (Cochran-Smith, 2006; Cookson, 2005; Eisner, 2006; Nieto, 2004; Whitcomb et al., 2008a, 2008b). As such, discussions of vocation have stayed largely out of the religious realm in that they ask different questions than those interested in determining the nature or definition of one's *calling.* Michael Miller (2007), a professor at a religious university in Maryland, for instance, recently carried out a campus wide exploration of vocation funded by a two million dollar grant from the Lilly Endowment addressing what it means to be called by God. On the other hand, the widely cited study by Farkas, Johnson, Foleno, Duffet, & Foley (2000) addressed questions such as, "Are young teachers so uncommitted that anyone who can leave, will? Are they so discouraged that escape seems the only route?" (p. 7).

As such, with no mention of God or religious organizations, such as churches that might be helping teachers negotiate such callings, discussions of *vocation* (personal mission, calling) can exist as a largely ambiguous concept that can represent both a humanist notion of inner landscape to be mapped (Whitcomb et al., 2008a, 2008b) or a postmodern one which situates the called subject within contextual and historical spaces.

[28] The public purposes of education have been highly debated for years (Apple, 2006; Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1970, 1998; Glickman, 1998; Goodlad & McMannon, 1997; Hargreaves, 1994; Noguera, 2003). While it is widely agreed that education should be a space for transformation, what that transformation should look like is much contested. As I searched for appropriate citations to situate the statement to which this note is attached within ongoing conversations (a method which ended up being one where I skimmed my bookcases and file cabinets and pulled off a sampling of texts I had read throughout my courses pertaining to educational purposes), I ran across a text I had read during my early doctoral coursework, Pedro Noguera's (2003) *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education* (2003). In it, Noguera wrote of the plight of urban schools and teachers to close the achievement gap and restore public confidence in American schools. As part of an assignment in the course I took, we were required to write short three page book reviews of texts in order to not only prove that we read it, but to give us practice summarizes and creating academic arguments. For this particular text, I remembered using the space of the book review to explore how I might think differently about a series of ongoing conversations

with a friend which were often marked with disagreement about the responsibilities of citizens (and educators) to do something, anything, about societal inequities. I took a moment to locate the review in my computer files and found it quite interesting and quite relevant to my work in this study. First, it was my first attempts at imaginative writing within academia and second, I was exploring the very conservative discourses that often intersected with Christianity in education in ways that were not only often seen as counter to social justice teacher education but dangerous to the stability of teacher education as a whole (e.g., Apple, 2006; Kumashiro, 2009; Noddings, 2008).

In this note, I provide a brief description of the writing of that review as well as two brief excerpts from the text. I do this, first, because I believe this note functions in a way that will be instructive to the reader of this text that I call Apéritif/Digestif in that it provides an example of how notes function in the dissertation as spaces where data (conceived broadly to include literature, theory, participant info, etc.) collection and analysis blur. Denzin and Lincoln (2005a, 2005b) noted that one of the major contributions of writing *on* writing, such as that done by Richardson (1994) and Richardson and St. Pierre (2005), is the recognition that data analysis and data collection are an ever-blurring processes. As described elsewhere (Apéritif/Digestif, Introduction), such a notion has been instrumental to the writing of this dissertation and the undertaking of this study. Second, this note highlights the difficulties I have encountered throughout this study of drawing the boundaries of a scope for research when, as described elsewhere, the field is everywhere. In particular, this note questions *when* the field is and *when* does data collection/analysis begin and end. Here, for instance, I draw upon data that was collected, in part, years before I began my doctoral work. By addressing this here, I am taking up Koro-Ljungberg's (2010) call to attend to the decisions one must make as a researcher and St. Pierre's (in press) call to explain what you are doing when you think you are "doing analysis" (p. 36). It is my belief that doing so is important for continuing to complicate conventional qualitative methods in hopes that new relation to the *other* can be invented where power can circulate more freely.

Book Review

In order to write the review of Noguera's text, I decided to write myself into a space that felt not only uncomfortable but somehow morally wrong to me. While I entitled the piece "I fundamentally believe in educating all children," echoing a sentiment that those in Noguero's text repeated over and over again, I did not disagree with that statement. What confused me was how it could mean so many contradictory things. I was reminded of an encounter I had with a friend a few years back who had questioned where the limits of responsibility lay in educating *all* children. He and I were arguing about an ongoing disagreement related to my frustration at not knowing the Spanish language which I believed was a necessity as a teacher of many students who were part of a relatively transient immigrant population. What I aimed to explore at the time was how it might have felt to *believe* in a different set of limits of responsibility than I claimed. I wondered what it would be like, for instance, not to believe that exploring students, families, and community's funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992), or their cultural resources, was not only a necessity but an ethical imperative of all teachers. Two brief excerpts are below (pardon the very long sentences, but we all know I have a propensity for run-ons!):

Excerpt One

Although Noguera claims to frame his book around openness and honesty and a wish that we would stop blaming one another for the failure of our schools and, as the title suggests, start taking actions to reclaim the hope in public education as a tool for democracy, he repeatedly doubts whether Americans truly value all of its children (p. xii) and seems to assume if Americans, and specifically educators, cared "enough" about all children they would adopt a pragmatism which takes into account the social and economic conditions of communities (p. 9) and would help the poor develop social capital (p. 96) and civic capacity (p. 98), empowering them to help themselves and their families. Although I am not disagreeing that schools should take some steps to help our nation's problems of "racial inequality, poverty, and violence" (144) and that we each have an obligation to ensure the future of our nation (p. 157), I do not agree that the responsibility so heavily lies with the teachers and schools as Noguera suggests.

Excerpt Two

He [Noguera] seems appalled by those [teachers] who do not even know exactly where their children live (p. 48) or do not reach out to parents (p. 96) and organizations to help them make connections (p. 100), actively

recruit students of color in various school clubs (p. 73), or find out how children perceive violence and developing units accordingly (p. 132). While I understand that teachers have a responsibility to go beyond just pitying children and that good practice does take into account the needs of the individual, but how far do we have to take it? We are to "invest in the rights of children and their families to a good education" (p. 8), but all of this extra teacher investment takes away from my right to invest in my own family and the time that I can invest in teaching my children the academics they need. If I have my students calling me at home, like Paul Kurose does, a teacher who Noguera applauds for illustrating how teachers work "within the environmental limits to find possibilities" (p. 149), then I am taking away from the time I could be spending with my family, helping my children on their own school work that they do not understand because their teacher was acting as a half time social workers and half time teacher. I should not be made to feel guilty for not spending my time to offer services to children that should be provided by the families themselves or by other social services.

Movement in Thought

After finishing this text, I remember experiencing some sort of movement in thought. While previously I had experienced a deep anger with my friend, now I was able to situate the problem outside of my friend's head and into discourse in a way I had not remembered experiencing or was unable to name (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 19 for relevance to teacher education). I remember sharing this writing with others in my class and discussing with them how while I based my writing in the recollections of numerous conversations with this particular friend, as I wrote I found myself drawing on a much wider knowledge base, which included the conservative politics of the Bush administration and years of watching television and film which exacerbated the just-pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps-American-dream-myth among other things. As we talked, my frustration and anger became less and less directed at my friend and more and more at a way of thinking, what I have now come to describe with poststructural thought as a discourse.

I was able to explore how writing could be useful as a space where not only thoughts but identities could come alive. Similar to what Davies (2000) has said, writing allowed me to try "to see what is possible, to see what 'I' am capable of. That 'I' I am trying, at least momentarily, to extract from the sticky discursive web[s]" (p. 16). This move is similar to the moves I aimed to make in this dissertation in multiple ways as I wrote characters whose *I*s, quite frighteningly so in some cases, did not always seem so far from the *I* that I worked to narrate in multiple occasions. In this way, the distance between oneself and another becomes almost indecipherable at times (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God).

In addition, it was interesting to see how time changes the meaning as I returned to this writing and I produced/analyzed new data in relation to this *I*. In the second excerpt, for instance, the *I* in the book review wrote of her frustration at being expected to have her friends call her at home, pointing out that her time might be better spent with her own children doing what other parents should be doing with their own children. I remembered my friend saying a similar thing and feeling almost attacked in a sense at what felt like a combative statement. Reading this, now, though, complexity is added when I thought of participants who often talked of such work with children, such as allowing them to call them at home, as an act of love—a way of doing the work of loving your neighbor that God had called them to do. Now, with not only love involved but God involved, the issue seemed different. Not only might this *I* be thinking her time with her children in relation to love, but if that was the case, what might the effects of such a statement be when attached to claims about how other parents should be spending their time. Might there be an implication they did not love their children as the speaker had?

Although I did not know it at the time (given that the text I am about to cite had been written yet!), Amy Parks (2007) wrote of this phrase, *all* children in her dissertation work in which she examined, in part, the construction of the elementary student in discourses of equity and reform-oriented mathematics. Building upon the work of Popkewitz (2004) who asserted that the use of the phrase produced images of children who came to school without certain mathematical capabilities, she examined the language surrounding the phrase in a reform-oriented report. Parks described how the use of the phrase often did not in fact refer to *all* children but to those children who were not a part of the white, middle class norm. For instance, the phrase was used in the section of the text that dealt with equity issues in ways that linked it with certain categories of students such as non-white students or female students (pp. 3-5). Parks stated that the use of this term in this way worked against goals of equity that aim to

recognize and value the knowledge and experiences students bring with them to school. Instead, it conjures up images of a certain type of student who enters school already in need of help.

While I would love to do some similar exploration here, time does not permit. I did, though, run across the phrase *all* children, *all* youth, or even leaving no child behind in the following texts related to social justice teacher education: Ayers, Quinn, & Stovall, 2009, p. xiv; Banks, Cochran-Smith, Moll, Richert, Zeichner, LePage, Darling-Hammond, Duffy, & McDonald, 2005, p. 233; Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Lahann, Shakman, & Terrell, 2009, p. 637; Nieto, 2005, p. 220).

[29] For the work of this dissertation, I have decided not to cite the Bible or go to the Bible for descriptions or understandings of various sins and practices. As a widely read text and having been read and studied for years, there are many highly contradictory interpretations available. As such, there are varying degrees of how literally and explicitly it should be followed and what are the non-negotiables of following *What Jesus would Do?* as the popular phrase goes (see Caputo, 2007 for discussion and also Chapter 4). Recently, for instance, I read a text by A. J. Jacobs (2007), *The Year of Living Biblically: One Man's Humble Quest to Follow the Bible as Literally as Possible*, in which Jacobs set out to follow the Bible literally, despite his suspicion that "almost everyone's literalism consisted of picking and choosing" (p. 6). He began his text, for instance, by saying, "As I write this, I have a beard that makes me resemble Moses," (p. 3) referring later to a passage in Leviticus which required him, he said, "to leave the edges of [his] beard unshaven" (p. 4). His quest led him to struggle to do things he read as mandated based on his biblical interpretations such as avoid winking (p. 205), "accept Jesus as Lord" (p. 255), build a hut and live in it for a week to reflect upon ancient Hebrews wandering in the desert for forty years (p. 78), and "bear a child" (p. 146).

Like any reading of a text guided by poststructural theories, I might have situated these interpretations in wider social and historical contexts which govern, regulate, and aid in the circulation of certain interpretations which meet certain social needs while excluding others (e.g., Foucault, 1983, 1984b). Such work might be similar to what Noddings (2008) suggested in that if schools take up the Bible as literature, it should be read critically by examining which parts have been left out of various discussions of the Bible due to morally objectionable material. Such work might critically examine the conditions under which certain parts of the Bible have been omitted in favor of others, contributing to certain images of a Christian God and not others. She drew, for instance, on evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins's text, *The God Delusion* (2006), quoting from him the following excerpt which described his reading of the Bible:

> The God of the Old Testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction: jealous and proud of it; a petty, unjust, unforgiving control-freak; vindictive, bloodthirsty ethnic cleanser; a misogynistic, homophobic, racist, infanticidal, genocidal, filicidal, pestilential, megalomaniacal, sadomasochistic, capriciously malevolent bully (p. 31) (Noddings, 2008, pp. 371-371)

Noddings (2008) suggested that such vocabulary of unbelief, as well as reciprocal assaults, should be a part of a critical religious literacy provided for all students in countries where Christianity dominates (p. 373).

To do this sort of work, I could have opted to return to various verses participants cited from the Bible and tried to decipher if their interpretations were in line with more orthodox ones. I made the choice at the beginning of the study that what interested me was not how the text was being interpreted, but what certain citations of the text (and others interpretations) produced. Namely I was interested in how such citations not only produced further knowledge of the category Christian but also the category of preservice teacher in relation to it (see Dinner Conversations, Preparations, Uninvited Guest 1 for example).

[30] I use the space this note provides to discuss the simultaneous process of data collection/analysis in this study (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest14 for further discussion as well as theorization of documents as data). After a brief description of this collecting/analyzing, I provide one example of this ongoing process that is relevant to the text to which this note is attached (i.e., ideas about religion as a social justice issue).

Data

Because I wrote and read simultaneously throughout the study, data collection and analysis were continuous and continuously blurring. While I included (and wrote often about) conventional data sources such as data produced during interviews, transcriptions and subsequent readings and listenings of interviews (Patton, 2002), I also welcomed a rethinking of both what counts as data, what produced that data, and the boundaries between data collection and analysis and researchers and researched. Poststructural theories cast doubt that the data to be collected are "'pure,' 'raw' data, uncontaminated by human thought and action" (Freeman, deMarrais, Preissle, Roulston & St.Pierre, 2007, p. 27). Since language is persistently slippery (Schuerich, 1995), the words collected as data are placed with a "residue of ambiguity" despite a researcher's attempts to word questions carefully or code data thoroughly (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p. 697). Thus, no method can be used to find an "ultimate truth," and all methods for data collection are "suspect" (Richardson, 1994). Britzman (2000) described this as not trying "to represent 'the real story'" but aiming to "get at how 'the real' of teaching is produced as the 'real story'" (p. 31).

To help me think data collection/analysis in this study, I have relied heavily on the work of St. Pierre (1997, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2009, in press, as well as in the five courses I took with her during my doctoral program). I did this because St. Pierre has written of data as well as her discomforts during data collection and analysis in ways that felt very familiar. I found a strange comfort in her "reticence" to describe or represent her participants and her demand to have readers "Go find [their] own older women and talk with them" instead of asking her to tell tale after tale about the women she studied (St. Pierre in Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005, p. 971). With St. Pierre's (1997a, 1997b, 1997c) theorization, data is broadly conceived to include not only data produced through emotions and memories but also data produced during dreams and other "out-of-category" (p. 175) spaces that are usually not accounted for in qualitative research. Such data St. Pierre (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) described, "cropped up unexpectedly" in her writing (p. 970) and may have not been collected or analyzed at all if she had not written. As such, writing was a space where data was thought and thought again in particular ways at the same time as it was analyzed. Or as St. Pierre (Richardson & S. Pierre, 2005) said:

> As data are collected in writing—as the researcher thinks/writes about her Latin teacher's instruction that one should thrive in adversity; about a mink shawl draped elegantly on aging, upright shoulders; about the sweet, salty taste of tiny country ham biscuits; about all the other things in her life that seem unrelated to her research project but are absolutely unleashed within it—she produces the strange and wonderful transitions from word to word, sentence to sentence, thought to unthought. (pp. 970-971)

With data conceived broadly and collection and analysis blurring in writing, I saw my work as a researcher as always in process, never finished in that new writings (and readings) were always possible. As such, I have also opted to not write of data collection and analysis as separate entities and instead connect them with a slash.

My Data Collection/Analysis

Throughout this study, which aimed to examine the production of the preservice teacher particularly in relation to the constructs of social justice and Christianity (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists for rethinking of research questions), I was on the lookout for the terms social justice and Christianity as well as terms that appeared in multiple data sources and I deemed relevant (i.e., *multicultural, diversity, difference, equity, Jesus Christ, saved, vocation, calling, religion, mission, missionary, love*). Although, as I have discussed elsewhere (e.g., Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 28) data collection/analysis began long before the official timeline of this study in ways that would not conflict with human subjects review processes, after approval from the University's institutional review board in January 2010, I began officially keeping track of the sightings of these terms. I did so not only in relation to education but also my everyday life, including the magazines I read weekly such as *The Week* and *Slate*. I began what came to be titled my "dissertation log," a document (currently totaling 492 pages, not including over 200 pages of "dictionary" entries which include quotations amassed throughout my doctoral program, and an additional 130 plus pages of notes on literature read throughout the study—all single-spaced), which I have religiously opened almost every day of this study and typed away in for at least an hour and sometimes twelve.

In addition to these happenstance sightings, I performed multiple searches on multiple occasions meshing these terms together in various ways in data bases suggested by University reference librarians (ALTA Religion

Database, Dissertation Abstracts, ERIC, Education Research Complete, Sociological Abstracts, and PsycInfo) as well as in Google and Google Scholar. Since I repeatedly seemed to see citations in other's articles that had not popped up in my searches (despite that I often searched with reference librarians via the online chat function the university has), I also skimmed through the titles and abstracts of the past five years of journals that I found kept popping up over and over again in the articles in my searches for anything that appeared relevant or interesting : *Equity and Excellence in Teaching, Intercultural Education, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education , Journal of Beliefs and Values, Journal of Christian Beliefs and Values, Journal of Teacher Education, Qualitative Inquiry, Religious Education, and Teaching and Teacher Education.* Relevance was continuously redefined throughout the study but when I skimmed for the final time in April of 2011 I focused only on those studies that related to teacher education or preservice teachers in the United States and directly related to teacher education. Generally speaking, I explored the intersections of the terms that made up my research focus as discussed in Citing Theorists of this chapter. I chose to only skim the last five years due to time constraints.

As described elsewhere (see Apéritif/Digestif, Introduction), writing was an important method of inquiry in this study. Sitting down to write each day, I did not often know what I would write. I sometimes wrote incomplete sentences, lists, stories where I tried out different subject positions, frustrations, sorting and tables, and many other methods. In addition, I wrote during my sleep often and in those hours when I lay awake at night trying to convince myself not to think about my study any longer. I would find myself waking up to write full paragraphs and scrambling to take notes in the dark. Just last night, for instance, I woke up thinking that writing about writing outside of the dissertation log seemed important, and hence, here I am in this paragraph which was partially written in a dream or dream like state. I also wrote with others as a part of conversations, on the stationary bike, during walks around the neighborhood, and in multiple other places and spaces.

While at the beginning of the study I had intended to take one afternoon each week to re-read the week's dissertation log and compile all of my notes, I found this process to be overwhelming and thus much more sporadic. For quite a few months, for instance, I spent every Thursday evening reading through the log, but I found myself producing even more data through writing as I wrote about what I had just read. Additionally, the process felt like an attempt to produce themes or codes, which is a task I was trying to resist as I thought more broadly about what data collection/analysis might look like and more importantly what responsibility to participants might look like. I decided, instead, to print out the log every now and then (probably 6 times throughout the study) and read through the document in print; making notes on it with pen instead of by computer. This process, I felt, allowed me to stay open to the possibilities that might occur in writing such as the attention to the stopping points in the writing of conversations (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 19).

Example

As I wrote and read through various sightings of terms related to Christianity and social justice, one connection popped up over and over again—the relation between homosexuality and Christianity as something irreconcilable. While this was not surprising based in the personal experiences, I had not explicitly sought out data, such as academic literature, that addressed the specific identified needs of students who openly identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender in relation to either teacher education or elementary education. I noted over and over again such connection in my dissertation log as I recalled conversations I had with Christians who believed that homosexuality is a sin and markedly against God's wishes (Dissertation log, October 6, 2010). I had also written of television shows which depicted the struggles of openly gay students (Glee, October 5, 2010), described articles I had read in *the Week* (August 20, 2010), and noted interesting binaries in the articles I read such as in Noddings (2008) when she wrote of finding common projects to work across the chasm of belief and unbelief:

> It may not be possible to forget the differences, but we can put them aside to work on common projects. For example, pro-life and pro-choice women can work together to provide better conditions for children already alive. Baptists and secularists can work together to save life on earth. Gays and straights can work together to improve old neighborhoods. (p. 386)

I noticed, for instance, how "gays" and "straights" were set in opposition as "pro-life" and "pro-choice." The latter binary, which is marked by a long-running political battle largely related to religion, and the former is joining its ranks with ongoing national debates about who should be legally allowed to marry and receive the connected benefits and privileges. Additionally, I noticed how organizations for college students in the town where interview

participants attended school were often affiliated with religion accept for the one which aimed to provide a safe space to address the spiritual needs of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered community (University organization website, retrieved from dissertation log, August 18, 2010).

Furthermore, I noticed a concern about Christians' (teachers and non-teachers) abilities and desires to respect and support homosexuality or openly gay students in the academic literature I read. Such was the case with one search I performed on January 5, 2011 and again on March 18, 2011 of the databases mentioned above including the terms *Social justice* and *Christian.* The search yielded 24 results and after I excluded those studies and discussions which did not take place the US, were concerned with the relationship between children and religious curriculum, liberation theology, or were related to eco-justice (as quite a few were), nine articles remained, three of which were in journals whose focus was on religious or spiritual content (Brady, 2006, 2008; Chubbuck, 2007) and the remaining in journals that expressed no religious focus (Gorski, 2009; Hyland, 2010; Juarez, Smith, & Hayes, 2008; Kahn, 2006; Meiners & Quinn, 2010; Renner, 2010). Of the six in the more secular, three, (Hyland, 2010; Kahn, 2006; Meiners & Quinn, 2010). I have referred to these throughout the dissertation (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 19 for further exploration of implications of these works for teacher education).

[31] For the purposes of this dissertation, I used *social justice* to refer to what is often recognized by teacher educators and policy makers as an ambiguous term used in multiple and often contradictory ways (See Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Lahann, Shakman, & Terrell, 2009; Grant & Agosto, 2008; Kapustka, Howell, Clayton, & Thomas, 2009; Marshall & Ward, 2004; McDonald & Zeichner, 2009; Spalding, Klecka, Lin, Odell, Wang, 2010; Zeichner, 2009). While there is quite the call to define and clarity *social justice* in teacher education (See McDonald & Zeichner, 2009 for discussion), my goal in this work is not to clarity what *social justice* means or if it exists at all, why it should or should not be enacted or promoted in teacher education or who is responsible for enacting it if that is the case. I also do not make claims about the goodness or badness or the neutrality or non-neutrality of those persons or institutions which use the term in their research or teaching practices. In fact, I situate this study within a context in which teacher education is considered necessarily value-laden and political work (e.g. Cochran-Smith, 2004; Kapustka et al, 2009) and as such, there is no teacher educator or school of education who can claim innocent, neutral goals and practices. As Cochran-Smith et al (2009) put it, I worry that what most critics want "is not a value-free teacher education, but one that matches their values, not an apolitical teacher education, but one with a more hegemonic and therefore invisible politics" (p. 625).

Nevertheless, I do take the space this note provides to briefly discuss how the term *social justice* is often talked of at present in teacher education, and more specifically in social justice teacher education (Zeichner, 2009). As such, what follows is not a comprehensive literature review of the use of the term in teacher education. Such a task would be impossible in the time limits of this study. Dolan, Ehrilch, McIntosh, Whitlock, & Adams (2007), for instance, noted 1700 books and articles with social justice in the title or abstract in the year 2006 alone. Such a task would also be considered impossible given the theoretical underpinnings that guide this study (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 3). What follows is drawn from the texts I consulted often while I wrote my way through this study on my nomadic journey. I was introduced to some during coursework (e.g. Cochran-Smith, 2004). Some I found in the various handbooks I have had checked out of the university library since about 2008 (e.g., Ayers et al., 2009; Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, McIntyre, & Demers, 2008). Others I found by following the citational trails of other scholars (e.g., Zeichner, 2009), and some I happened upon during one of my numerous Google searches, meetings with reference librarians, or searches in the data bases I most often frequented (e.g., Kapustka et al, 2009; Marshall & Ward, 2004). I use this information to provide the reader with a further understanding of the construction of the character called *Responsibility.*

The Ambiguous Social Justice

As mentioned above, the call for clarity over the term *social justice* is quite prevalent in teacher education. Such prevalence has often been in response to critiques of its use as an institutional goal or as Kapustka et al. (2009) described the belief that schools of education are "promoting 'groupthink' and advocate for parroting social justice dispositions in their coursework" (p. 501). They cited two articles from the popular press (Leo, 2005; Will, 2006) which painted pictures of teacher education in crisis, under the attack of ideological forces. Images such as Leo (2005) and Will's (2006) are so pervasive that Kapustka et al (2009) claimed to be "surprised" (p. 501) by the findings of their study which countered such a notion of a monolithic body of teacher education out to promote "group think." For instance, their examination of the conceptual frameworks for 519 schools of education

accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the largest accrediting organization, produced results that only 96 used the term *social justice* directly and of those only 32 used it as a key concept in the framework. Furthermore, those who did use the term varied widely on a number of conceptions including who is responsible for social justice (teacher candidates, faculty or both), how social justice is approached (action is classrooms and schools, action in larger communities, or knowledge-based), how social justice is connect to the teaching and learning context, and what rationale was given (critiques of societal structures, values-based, or multicultural basis) (pp. 494-501). Given the commonly expressed belief that social justice is "imperative for democratic education" (p. 489), such findings left Kapustka et al (2009) calling upon teacher education institutions to "articulate clearly…why, how, and for whom social justice is used" (p. 503). This call has been echoed by other teacher educators who solicit the conceptualization of a social justice agenda as a "central, animating idea for educational scholars and practitioners (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 45).

As a result, a number of social justice teacher educators have been putting forth various definitions and practices associated with teaching for social justice or learning to teach for social justice as Cochran-Smith (2004) said. The editors of the *Handbook of Social Justice in Education* (Ayers et al., 2009), described what they termed the "three pillars" that social justice education as a whole rests upon; equity, activism, and social literacy (p. xiv). The first term, equity, relates to principles of fairness, educational access, equitable outcomes, and repairing historical and structural injustices. Activism, the second term, relates to participation in not only seeing and understanding the world but changing it when possible. The last, social literacy, relates to a situatedness within communities and histories that nourishes identities and moves away from the "abiding social evils" such as "white supremacy, patriarchy, homophobia" (p. xiv). These three together produce a motto for social justice education: "Relevant, rigorous and revolutionary" and the ideas that changing one's life can change the world. (p. xiv).

Zeichner (2009), in his text *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*, provided a more specific discussion as it relates to teacher education. He described a social justice agenda as one of three reform agendas (professionalization, deregulation, and social justice) geared toward remedying the injustices and inequalities in public education. While all three vary greatly in their visions and connected practices, which I will address briefly in a moment, Zeichner cites a long list of current educational inequities that interest these reform movements, including the social justice agenda. While I have not read all of the texts Zeichner cites in his discussion of inequalities, I have included two excerpts below in part because time does not permit me to consult each of these texts for the specific statistics and statements about inequities. Also, for my purposes here, I am less concerned in the accuracy of these reports as I am in how they are circulated and what effects they induce. I have read of these inequities, and more, in various places throughout my doctoral and teaching careers and have found Zeichner's (2009) discussion to be expansive and succinct at the same time in that it offers readers as range of inequities while doing so in a brief space: Zeichner (2009) described some of these inequities as follows:

> achievement, as measured by standardized tests in reading and mathematics (Rothstein & Wilder, 2005); high school graduation rates (Heckman & LaFontaine, 2007); increased segregation of students according to their race, ethnicity, and social class backgrounds (Orfield & Lee, 2005); school funding (Carey, 2004); access to fully prepared and experienced teachers (Peske & Haycock, 2006); access to advanced mathematics courses that provide the gateway to scientific careers (U.S. Department of Education, 2003); and access to broad and rich curriculum that educates students to think critically and develop their aesthetic and civic capabilities (Dillon, 2006; Koxol, 2005). There has also been documentation of the disproportionate assignment of children of color to special education classes. (Artiles, Harry, Reschly, & Chinn, 2002, pp. xiv-xv)

In addition, Zeichner (2009) included a description of the oft cited cultural gap between teachers (and teacher educators) and their students (See Cochran-Smith, 2004; Conklin, 2008, Jones & Enriquez, 2009 for additional descriptions):

> Currently about 38 percent of public school public are from an ethnic/racial minority group, whereas close to 90 percent of their teachers are not (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). In large urban districts, the percentage of pupils of color is more than 70 percent; overall, one in five children under 18 lives in poverty; and more than one in seven children between ages five and 17 speak a language other than English at home (but more than one third of these are considered to be limited English proficient). (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, p. 3)

As stated above, these concerns are not unique to the social justice agenda. (Note to the citation above: Zeichner (2009) cited Villegas & Lucas (2002a) p. 20 as the source of his statistics, but he did not provide a reference for the citation in his reference list. The statistics are present in Villegas & Luca (2002a) on p. 20 as well as their citational trail that led me to Educational Research Service (1995) and National Center for Educational Statistics (2000).

The professionalization agenda uses performance based assessments of teachers and students as part of an aim to ensure a consistent knowledge base for teaching. The idea is that by investing in public schools and raising standards for all teachers to ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions thought necessary, societal inequities can be remedied. The deregulation agenda or the "commonsense agenda" (Zeichner, 2009, p. 12) has been linked to neoliberal and neoconservative agendas which aim to deregulate and privatize P-12 schools and teacher education. Out of this movement comes alternative certification programs and moves to make subject matter knowledge and verbal ability the key determinants in teacher quality. In this agenda is also often against what is often multicultural bias in teacher education. Zeichner cited one study from the Pacific Institute Report (Izumi & Coburn, 2001) that has received public attention and that accuses teacher educators are "indoctrinating students into student-centered instruction, being against high educational standards, and being overly concerned with political correctness" (p. 14). Based on what Zeichner described as "25-year old reviews of process-product research of the 1970s and 1980s" the report identified "evils" (not sure if this is Zeichner's term or Izumi & Coburn, 2001 but I suspect it is the former's but could not find it on Googlebooks or the university library to check) in the California State University teacher education programs. These included "constructivism, discovery learning, thematic and integrated curriculum, and cooperative learning, as well as the identified gurus of this poison propaganda, such as Dewey, Vygotsky, and Freire" (p. 14). The report also positioned moves toward social justice as being in opposition to high academic standards.

The third agenda is the social justice agenda which Zeichner (2009) said is concerned first and foremost with the preparation of teachers for cultural diversity. Although, as noted above, what it means to work toward social justice is highly contested, Zeichner (2009) said that researcher have identified a consistent set of knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to this teaching and preparation of culturally responsive teachers or what Grant & Agosto (2009), elsewhere, have called "a package of understandings, skills, and commitments" (p. 194) (e.g., Gay, 2000; Irvine, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Nieto, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, 2002b). Villegas and Lucas (2002a), for instance, identified six salient characteristics based in their literature review of conceptual and empirical articles addressing teacher preparation, their personal observations in culturally and linguistically diverse schools, and experiences as teacher educators. A list of these desirable characteristic for preservice teachers are follows (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, p. 20). I have directly cited their words but have organized the reference in the form of a list (omitting commas and conjunctions). In their vision of culturally responsive teachers, a teachers:

(a) are socioculturally conscious,
(b) have affirming views of students from diverse backgrounds
(c) see themselves as responsible for and capable of bringing about change to make schools more equitable
(d) understand how learners construct knowledge and are capable of promoting knowledge construction
(e) know about the lives of their students
(f) design instruction that builds on what their students already know while stretching them beyond the familiar.

Responsibility

In developing the character Responsibility, I aimed to write a character who might call herself a social justice teacher educator but was unsure that social justice, as a thing, could be reached. As such, I did not necessarily set out to describe what Responsibility *meant* by social justice and nor did I envision that she necessarily knew either. Instead, she tried to live up to the sort of vision for culturally responsive teaching mentioned above. She wanted to do this in her work as a teacher educator but also in her daily interactions with others, such as during her interactions with a preservice teacher, Love, whom she had met in a coffee shop and had subsequently invited to dinner. This was a dual process involving a looking *out* and trying to understand how cultural characteristics and culture are produced in certain social and historical contexts. It also involved looking *in* at oneself and how she was shaped in similar of different social and historical spaces. I have written these conversations to explore how these processes might be carried out in the face of what might or might not be religious differences.

[32] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7 for other descriptions of the poststructural subject.

[33] See Dinner Conversations, Dinner, Uninvited Guest 10 for other descriptions of nutshells (see also Derrida & Caputo, 1997, *Deconstruction in a nutshell*)

[34] See Chapter 4, Uninvited Guest 19; Chapter 1, Uninvited Guest 5 for discussion of deconstruction as a call from the wholly other

[35] See Caputo 2001, 2007

[36] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 71 for interview methods

[37] While interview protocols are traditionally inserted in the appendix of dissertation, I opted to include the protocol I used to guide all first-round individual interviews in this note. I do this in order to highlight how while this study began with a narrow practice, mission trips, the scope quickly broadened.

As discussed elsewhere (Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 71), I had planned individual interviews to be semi-structured which allowed me to deviate from the planned protocol in response to the participants words and my own queries. As such, while I read the first two paragraphs to participants, I found that I rarely referred to the protocol after I issued the invitation for participants to "tell me about your trip." The scope of the study quickly became much broader (in fact limitless) as all interview participants told me that they considering their mission field was everywhere. At the same time though, the scope of the study narrowed as all talked of *love* as being their mission in many ways. While this protocol was a starting point, as were the mission trips themselves, it was just that, a starting points, and lines of flight were taken.

Interview protocol:

Thank you for agreeing to talk with me today. I have asked you to come so that I can ask you some questions about the mission trip(s) you have attended. I have never attended a mission trip before. I'm interested in learning about the basics of your trip (how it was organized, how you got involved, your day-to-day activities and responsibilities, your favorite parts), as well as how or if you think this mission work relates to other aspects of your life. As we talk, please feel free to share anything else you'd like, but also feel free to not answer any questions I ask if you feel uncomfortable. If possible, I'd like us to view this more as a conversation.

I'd like to start by asking you to tell me about your trip. [If relevant] You've brought pictures to share, and I've brought a list of questions I plan to ask throughout if you do not answer them on your own as you talk.

What was the purpose of the trip?
Who organized the trip? (religious affiliation)
What kinds of contact/preparation, if any, did you have with the organizers beforehand? (attend church, Bible study?)
How long did the trip last and where was it located?
How did you find out about it? What got you involved?
What were your responsibilities on this trip?
What was your favorite/least favorite part of the experience?
Tell me about a typical day on the trip.

I'd like to shift away from the specifics of the trip now and ask you a few more questions about your life after the trip.

When you returned, what kinds of information or stories about your trip did you find yourself sharing most often, if at all, with others?

How frequently do you find yourself thinking about this work/trip? What exactly do you think about?

I hear mixed ideas about whether or not people feel changed by travel and specific trips. Some people have told me they feel different in some way after the experience and others say they feel the same. Some say they don't know. I am wondering if you have noticed any changes in yourself since the trip.

I know that this was a short-term trip with a specific mission for a specific location. I am wondering if you find this type of mission work applicable to other aspects of your life?

What has helped and hindered you when you attempt these applications?

Thank you for talking with me today.

[38] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 71

[39] See Dinner Conversations, Dessert

[40] See Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1

[41] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 3 for a critique of logocentrism

[42] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 19

[43] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 3

[44] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7

[45] The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy (1999) has no entry for love. Instead, it directs the reader first to an "ethics of love," which then directs one to "divine command ethics" a theory that says all morality "depends upon the will of God" and has an important place in Christian ethics (p. 241). Liston and Garrison (2004), in their text *Teaching, learning, and loving: Reclaiming the passion in educational practice*, noted that four basic ideas of love have emerged in western culture, eros (passionate desire), agape (self-transcending and giving), philia (friendship), and romantic (sexual) (pp. 7-16). The editors highlighted an eastern conception of love, most notably in Buddhism, which involves compassion and hope among other things (p. 16). I agree with Liston and Garrison who noted that it is impossible to confine love completely into specific categories (p. 7) nor is making an effort to do so the goal of this work. Instead, in this dissertation I aim, in part, to see how claims at love function. I do this, in part, through the explorations of the character Love as she interacts with multiple others (see Chapters and Uninvited Guests).

[46] See Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 2 for discussion of finding Derrida and Freire

[47] As described elsewhere (Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30), I conceived of data broadly in this study to include conventional data sources as well as those that were not traditionally accounted for in qualitative research (St. Pierre, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c). The dictionary mentioned in the text to which this note is attached is one such data source for this study. It, like other dictionaries I compiled during and before this study, became yet another document to be taken into consideration and made to *mean* something through my analysis. Scott (1990) described a document as an artifact which has text as its central feature. McCulloch (2006) extended this definition to explain that these texts should be understood in reference to their context, how they were received, but also in "reference to their *author/s* and to what they were seeking to achieve" (p. 6). By doing this, a researcher can get a "behind-the-scenes look" (Patton, 2002, p. 307) or "peer into the past" (McCulloch, 2006, p. 6) accessing "potent evidence of continuity and change in ideals and practices" (pp. 6-7). Although McCulloch identified the challenges and impossibilities of attributing meaning to a text or author and provided different methods for working within these constraints, I found documents useful for attending to "the surfaces of events, small details, minor shifts and subtle contours'' (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982, p. 106) where power relations are "operating on the smallest and most insignificant details" (Tamboukou, 1999, p. 205). I used these details to look to different modes by which human beings are made into subjects (Foucault, 1982). In particular examining documents enabled me to focus on how the Christian preservice teacher, for instance, was produced in ways that might or might not be problematic to critical education. Like with most documentary work, because I did not know exactly what to look for before I begin, I

immersed myself in the work--reading, making notes, and reflecting in order to determine where to go next (Glesne, 2006).

[48] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 4 for discussion of arts-based research

[49] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 14

[50] See Chapter 2, Uninvited Guest 1

[51] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30

[52] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 58 for discussion of writing partners; See Chapter 1, Uninvited Guest 1 and Chapter 2, Uninvited Guest 1 for examples of communicating with writing partners

[53] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 17 about mission work

[54] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 37 for interview protocol

[55] ***Freire****:*

Must we start out so combative? Tisk, tisk. I must say that I was hoping we'd all think of this conversation as a dialogue of sorts, where we all come to the table ready to rethink this object of knowledge, love, that you have so kindly brought forth. As you have noted, we all have some things to say about love, and of course, like all words we use to describe ourselves, our worlds, and others, it should be rethought in a space where we can stimulate one another to think and re-think the former's thoughts and re-word the world I don't want to speak for you Derrida, but if I am not mistaken, no one here is claiming to have received a mandate from God to save the other, with the undiscussed truth in hand to be inserted into another's head.

Derrida*:*

Yes, thank you for the intervention, Freire. I find my work is often taken up in ways I had not intended. Nevertheless, I do believe that we can all claim to be here under a pretence of openness to the other, even if you and I have very different ideas about this truth you speak of. At any rate, if I may offer a little precautionary advice on the matter before we proceed though—language does have a way of allowing us, how can I say this, to say "more, less, or something other than what [we] would mean."

Freire*:*

Derrida, if I may intervene again. I must beg you to explain what you are trying to do with all this talk of language? Scare her into saying nothing? With these precautions, should we not proceed then? Should we just call off the conversation all together? Of course it is important to recognize that language is never neutral, but we cannot fail to realize that it is through language that we make sense of the world. And it is through a focus on language that we can come to know our place in the world and our true humanity. I am sure we can return to this point in a bit. First, though, let's get back to Responsibility's concerns. Before you speak again, I'd like to thank you, Responsibility, for your hospitality. I am glad that you have invited us here to help you think. I am sure there are many others who you could have invited to converse with you today about love. I remember you telling me on the telephone, for instance, that you have found that many of your undergraduate students often talk of love along with references to a Christian God, which you often see referred to, for instance, in email signatures which state "With love in Christ" or "Jesus is love" and so on. You have invited us here today, instead of, for example, Jesus, so I hope that in time you will share with us your reasons for bringing us here instead of others. (Chapter Two)

[56] See also Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 3 about interpretations and texts

[57] Throughout this dissertation, I mention three peers who I have talked with often throughout this study, Hilary (e.g., Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 1), Missy (e.g. Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 3), and Jessica (e.g., Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 2). All three were my

friends long before the study began and people who I highly respect. As such, the three of us have spent time together in a number of contexts, including ones where we have locked ourselves away in cabins or hotels, away from friends and families, in order to write our dissertations and talk about our data collection/analysis processes. In this note, I explore the difficulty I have had in determining how to write this note. In fact, it is one of the very last I have written in this entire dissertation due to my hesitancy to make decisions about what to call these peers (i.e., writing partners, key informants, peer debriefers, with pseudonyms or without) and how to think them in relation to this study. Below, I begin with a discussion of one text (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002) I found in the *Research News and Comments* section of *Educational Researcher* during the process of making decisions related to these peers. It appeared in a Googlescholar search for the terms "qualitative inquiry" and "peer debriefer" (retrieved April 15, 2010). In it, the authors address standards for assessment of research and, in particular for doctoral students' work. I then describe how I believe these peers have functioned for me in this dissertation process and use the article mentioned above to *think* (in writing) these peers in relation to notions of validity in research. I do this because I believe it offers insight into my research process and decision making in relation to validity concerns—a call that has been issued in the article mentioned above and by others as well as in others I have frequented (Koro-Ljungberg, 2010; St. Pierre, in press). I also do it because I think it lends insight to the processes of calling upon experts to help guide our missions, something that has been discussed in relation to this study elsewhere (e.g., Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 2; Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God, Citing Theorists, Citing Selves).

"Analysis on Stage" (Anfara et al., 2002)

Anfara et al. (2002) entitled their research commentary, *Qualitative Analysis on Stage: Making the Research Process More Public*, in which they aimed to address validity and rigor as it related to qualitative inquiry. In the first paragraph, the authors described how qualitative studies were often judged against positivist, quantitative standards of validity and found to be lacking based in the criticism that qualitative research is fiction and cannot be verified (p. 28). Although they echoed this concern, stating that providing access to the decisions made during the research process was important, they added to this a concern voiced from the "inside" of qualitative research that related to the use of "literary stylings" and "performance" in research (p. 28). The authors referenced Denzin and Lincoln's (2000) discussion of the triple crisis of representation, legitimation, and praxis that has led researchers to explore alternative forms of representation and research and rethink key concepts in research such as validity (see Apéritif /Digestif, Note 2 for discussion of Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, 2005b). As a means of considering validity, the authors drew upon two dissertations to explore how "analytic openness" might enable "freedom from bias" (p. 28). As they said, "We operate from the basic premise that how researchers account for and disclose their approach to *all* aspects of their research process are key to evaluating their work substantively and methodologically" (emphasis added, p. 28) (see Apéritif/Digestif, Note 28 for brief exploration of *all* children; see Appendix A for further exploration of validity in relation to decision making; see Apéritif/Digestif, Note 17 for discussion of anonymity and citation).

This recommendations to make public *all* aspects of the research process included information related to statements such as "themes emerged," interview protocol, and general information about how analysis was carried out (p. 29). They mentioned as an example that researchers often talked of member checks or meeting with peer debriefers as a means of validity, but they did not tell what actually happened in that process. In short, their concern was about the lack of "public disclosure of processes" (p. 29). These recommendations of public disclosure were based in assumptions about the nature of the research process as one which aimed to "bring meaning, structure, and order to data (p. 31) and "reveal [the] world of secrets" (p. 29). They recommended, for instance, a process of code mapping, which entailed researchers being specific about the ways their themes emerged from the data.

Although I am not refuting that processes such as code mapping can contribute to valid and responsible research practices, practices such as these only make sense within certain theoretical paradigms (see Lather, 2006 for discussion of paradigm proliferation in qualitative research). Coding, for instance, is not the type of analysis I have taken up in this study since it is situated in poststructural theories which doubt that data can necessarily be reduced to words or that these words can ever exist as uninterpreted (St. Pierre, in press). Furthermore, calls for full disclosure of the research process are impossible in that decision making is infinite and never finished (Derrida, 1992). Calls such as Anfara et al. (2002) can never be answered in that they necessarily exclude multiple other decisions and parts of the "process" that are not necessarily considered in conventional academic reports. The

attempts I have made throughout this dissertation to describe my research process have actively *produces* a research process that can be neatly contained in the field of the dissertation. As such, I have taken up others calls (Koro-Ljungberg, 2010; St. Pierre, in press) to explore decision making as a complex ethical project. This type of work floats into the realm of what St. Pierre (2011, in press) described as *post qualitative inquiry* a space where researchers work in "'entanglement, in assemblage, in the "AND, 'and . . . and . . . and . . . '" (Deleuze, 1990/1995, p. 44 cited in St. Pierre, in press, p. 9). Below, I discuss a complex decision related to the influence of peers in this study. I do so not to reveal hidden secrets of this a fixed process, but to explore how the process (and the research and the participants and the researcher and the peers) were produced and producing along the way.

Peers

Throughout this study, I have been concerned with three intersecting missions related to Christianity, social justice, and poststructural research. While poststructural theories cast doubt upon the idea that a mission can be tied down (Caputo, 1997), I have explored these in various ways as they relate to the production of the preservice teacher—a term I have taken broadly to also include myself as a preservice teacher educator and even a preservice researcher (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists). I have been on the lookout for these terms, as described elsewhere (Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30), and have written voraciously about them in multiple ways in my dissertation log. I have not written yet about the relation to these to three peers I mentioned above. I do so here.

Hilary

Hilary and I have known one another for a bit over five years now. Our graduate assistant offices were near one another and we talked often. Throughout this time, Hilary and I have become not only good friends but also theory junkies, in a sense. We have spent many hours on walks, at restaurants, in our living rooms or back porches talking excitedly about the theories we were reading and how they might related to and be complicated by our practices as teacher educators and researchers. Because Hilary drew upon phenomenological scholars (e.g., Ahmed, 2006; Merleau-Ponty, 2002) and I poststructural (e.g., Derrida, 1967/1974; Foucault, 1978), we often had interesting conversations about making sense of the world. In addition, we often talked of our work as teacher educators and our struggles to enact pedagogies that would contribute to a more socially just society. Hilary had written about her struggle in an article (Hughes, 2010) which I have cited throughout this study. In addition, the two of us have written and co-presented a paper together (Bridges-Rhoads & Hughes-Decatur, 2010) and are currently working on those revisions.

While this is only an inkling of my description of Hilary and my interactions throughout this study, I believe it has particular importance for this study for two reasons that are both intersected. First, because Hilary and I have written a paper together and I have referred to it throughout, it did not make sense for me to call her by a pseudonym. I asked Hilary, and the other two peers, if they minded my using their names and all three told me to feel free to say whatever. Hilary even knew that I was planning to cite her work (Hughes, 2010) in various places as I talked about social justice teacher education. This brings me to the second point in that I have often treated Hilary as a member of social justice teacher education. That it is to say, she has functioned as one who worked to uphold a mission of social justice in her work despite how ambiguous social justice can be (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 31). As such, her role has perhaps not been so dissimilar to that of a key informant (Patton, 2002), or one who is "particularly knowledgeable about the inquiry setting and articulate about their knowledge" (pp. 321-322). This person is often one who the researcher spends much time with and is trained to understand the purpose and focus of the inquiry. Patton (2002) cautioned that this person can only offer perspectives and not truths and that their influence should be marked in research logs and field notes. Such discussions though would often entail pseudonyms since key informants were part of the site of the research and had often given consent.

Here, perhaps you can see that I have run into a stuck place, in which I need to cite Hilary but then need not to do so at the same time. I have run up against similar problems with Missy and Jessica which I describe in brief below.

Missy and Jessica

Although I have not cited Missy or Jessica's work in this dissertation, each of these women have also taken on a role of key informant in various ways. Missy was one who I went to often to talk about Christianity since she

was a professing Christian. Jessica was one who I talked with about poststructural theories since her dissertation was informed by Foucault's (1991) notion of governmentality. Like with Hilary, I shared writing with them and engaged in numerous discussions about data collection/analysis throughout study. While I did not necessarily have to cite them by name, it felt strange to not do so since I was citing Hilary as such. And because both welcomed the idea of me using their names, I decided to do so. I still had no idea how to refer to them throughout the study as key informants, peer debriefers or something other. Like Patton (2002) advised, I did not take their words or feedback as truth, instead I used them as other data to think with as I might with a theorist, for instance (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists).

Writing Partners

One evening, in fact last night (I am not going to tell you today's date though), I woke up reminding myself that I had to write an acknowledgment page for the my dissertation. It was 3:00 am and I was irritated with myself that instead of sleeping, I began to list through the persons I wanted to make sure I acknowledged in the section. The three peers mentioned here were amongst them. This realization led to me to consider that the persons who are acknowledged are often those who have had considerable influence on a person's thinking or being throughout a process. I was reminded of a celebrity (I do not remember which one) who forgot to thank her husband as a part of her long list of acknowledgements she professed upon receiving an award. I then began to consider all of the types of acknowledgements I had read in past dissertations or articles. Hilary (Hughes-Decatur, 2011), for instance, had thanked her physical therapists and massage therapists for helping her body make it through the dissertation. As I lay in bed, body aching from typing for days on end, I thought of how my body had failed me the previous day and I had to stop writing, cutting short a note I was working on, in order to stretch and take a break. I began pondering how to cite my body in this study, as I have done throughout, and then finally drifted back to sleep.

This morning though, I began to think these peers differently though—not as key informants or debriefers who might be planned into a study as a measure of validity—but as part of my acknowledgement list. This list, though, did not sit neatly at the front of the dissertation, but instead found its way throughout as I touched upon particular moments when these three peers had done or said something I was particularly thankful of in that it made me think differently than how I had been thinking before. As described elsewhere (Apéritif /Digestif, Introduction), this process of thinking differently has been a marker of this study, an aim, a mission. Thus, I have decided to refer to these three as *writing partners*, who, in other dissertations might have stayed in the acknowledgements section, but here were explored for their part in the *writing* of this dissertation as a field of inquiry.

[58] In this note, I provide a paragraph from St. Pierre's (2000) article on poststructural feminism in order to provide further information about the doing and deconstructing that poststructural work invites. As such, this note marks a decision I made in the interest of time to not sift through, reword, and reorder, but to inside provide large chunks of a conversation for the reader's benefit and for my benefit as I build from this work in the future. In addition, I have not provided commentary on this description but instead treat it as yet another part of this rhizomatic text which can connect, overlap, and contradict in multiple ways.

In the paragraphs previous to the excerpt I provide below. St. Pierre had written that the poststructural critique of humanism (or the critique that through reason, truth and knowledge could be produced) is perhaps "too supple and diverse for reflection" (p. 478). She pulled, for instance, from Butler's (1992) questions about the reasons for grouping such different theories under one roof, "Do all these theories have the same structure (a comforting notion to the critic who would dispense with them all at once)? Is the effect to colonize and domesticate these theories under the sign of the same, to group them synthetically and masterfully under a single rubric, a simple refusal to grant the specificity of these positions, an excuse not to read, and not to read closely?" (Butler, 1992, p. 5). St. Pierre continues by saying:

> At any rate, easy understanding and easy dismissal are both careless, even unethical practices since they betray, as Butler (1992) points out, an unwillingness to read and think about the theories that both describe and critique our fondest attachments and, most importantly, about the effects on real people of whatever system of meaning our attachments produce. Nietzsche (quoted in Spivak, 1974) warns, 'One seeks a picture of the world in *that* philosophy in which we feel freest; i.e., in which our most powerful drive feels free to function' (p. xxvii). Butler (1995) elaborates this warning as follows: "For the question of whether or not a position is right, coherent, or interesting, is in this case, less informative than why it is we come to

> occupy and defend the territory we do, what it promises us, from what it promises to protect us (pp. 127-128). Surely, this is the hardest work that we must do, this work of being willing to think differently." (p. 478)

[59] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 1

[61] See Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God for (not) reading Deleuze

[62] Hannah was the pseudonym assigned to the young girl in Knobel's (Honan et al., 2000) dissertation study upon which the data for her article, *Producing possible Hannahs: Theory and the subject of research*, was based. Knobel introduced Hannah to readers in her section of the article by describing what might be considered physical and emotional characteristics [i.e. "slight build" or "quirky sense of humor" (p. 11)] along with descriptions of her family ("close and loving one" (p. 11)) and school population ("drawn from predominantly working-class and underclass families" p. 11). As discussed elsewhere (see Chapter 3, Uninvited Guest 5), I have resisted this practice, noting a page in my dissertation log, for instance when I wrote, "I want to write about my study but I don't want to tell you about my participants" (dissertation log, October 3, 2010). I believe that such a resistance might offer spaces for exploration of categories in a way that providing them might not. My writing partner, Jessica, for instance, commented on one occasion that she could not read about the character Love without thinking of a person she knew who happened to be male. I am not implying that gender does not have any bearing on a study or that it is somehow less important than other binaries useful for sense making. Rather, I believe that by way of exclusion, a reader might be invited to think how her own details actively produce the *meaning* of categories and persons. This work has important implications of teacher education (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 19).

[63] While I had intended to provide more information in this note about Gee's discussions of discourse as well as how these differ from poststructural work, I ran out of time, having decided to spend time elsewhere (see Honan et al., 2000, p. 12 or Schmeichel, 2010).

[64] See Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God

[65] See Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1 for writing related to "risking" it in relation to separations between church and state

[66] As described elsewhere, deconstructive work is aimed, in part, at thinking what responsibility and decision making should be, given that it must take place in spaces of non-knowing (Derrida in Cilliers, 1999). As such this work involves moments of undecidability. I provide an excerpt from an interview with Derrida below (in Cilliers, 1999). I do so in part to make an explicit attempt to highlight that all citations come from conversations we are a part of:

> **Jacques Derrida**: "…I also constantly insist on the undecidabililty, which does not mean that you are simply paralyzed and neutralised because you do not know what to do. Simply, in order for a decision to be a decision it has to go through a moment where, irrespective of what you know, you make a leap into the decision. This leap into the responsibility is an infinite one and you take a decision only in a situation when there is something undecidable, when you don't know what to do. You don't know. That is, if you knew what to do, there would be no decision, you would have already done
>
> **Paul Cilliers**: You would have calculated ...
>
> **Jacques Derrida**: You would have already known. So, this is true for ethical, juridical, and political decisions, even for existential decisions. You have to go through an ordeal of undecidability in order to decide. So, to that extent the result, by definition, is unpredictable, unknown -- unpredictable if by predictability you mean knowledge, you mean calculation. Something must remain incalculable for a decision to be a decision. That is why it is an intervention which has -- because it is not linked essentially to knowledge -- something obscure, something even mystical. I have no objections to people who define this decision as something mystical."

[67] For more information about doing and deconstructing, working under erasure, or using and erasing (see Spivak, 1976; see also Parks, 2009 for an example).

I have inserted a citation from Derrida in this note though for two reasons. First, Derrida's reference to metaphysics, which Derrida uses as a shorthand for the "science of presence" (Spivak, 1974, p. xxi) Second, I use it here as an indication of the complexity of the data trail in that all data collection/analysis in this study was marked by the limitations of time (see () for discussion). For this quote, for instance, I did not go to Derrida's text or to any dictionary I had produced to find this quote. While I have read the text multiple times, in the interest of time, I went to St. Pierre's (2000) article on poststructural feminism because I knew she packed quite a few quotes from Derrida in a small space. Knowing St. Pierre, I know that she, too, keeps a dictionary and perhaps she had extracted this quote from her dictionary. In this way, this excerpt could possibly be twice removed from Derrida's actual text (which of course was already translated by another). I look at in now unsure if I typed it in correctly. Such a move further complicates the complex process of tying down data to cite. Derrida (1970/1966) said:

> There is no sense in doing without the concepts of metaphysics in order to attack metaphysics. We have no language—no syntax and no lexicon which is alien to this history; we cannot utter a single destructive proposition which has no already slipped into the form, the logic, and the implicit postulations of precisely what it seeks to context. (p. 250)

[68] While I also interviewed professors and graduate students in order to get a sense of how Christianity was prevalent in the specific context where participants went to school (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 70), in this lengthy note I provide detail about the individual and focus group interviews conducted in this study. This discussion includes some theoretical background of the conceptualization of planned interviews as well as how they actually took place, some of which was cut and inserted from my dissertation proposal.

Individual Interview

In this section, I first discuss the necessity to reframe conventional interviews in poststructural work. I follow with a description of why interview is useful for this study. Finally, I describe how interview was used.

Definition and Issues

An interview is often defined as conversation between two or more people focused on a topic (e.g., Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Glesne, 2006; Patton, 2002) with a purpose "to find out from them what we cannot directly observe" (Patton, 2002, p. 340). Poststructural work takes issue with the assumptions that these descriptions rely upon which privilege the language conversations are built on as something that can capture feelings and thoughts and which presume a negative power which can allow or prevent an interviewer from accessing the interviewees' thoughts. In Schuerich's (1995) postmodern critique of traditional interviewing, he described how "the language out of which the questions are constructed is not bounded or stable; it is persistently slippery, unstable, and ambiguous from person to person, from situation to situation, from time to time" (p. 240)--laced with multiple intentions and desires from both interviewer and interviewee. In this way, "'being there' does not guarantee access to truth" (Britzman, 2000, p. 32), for either the participant or the researcher.

Instead, in postructural work, one cannot say fully what one hopes due to the multiplicity of meanings available in any attempted categorization. Speaking is similar to a promise in that it requires one to continue to say yes to communication despite recognizing that understanding will be incomplete (see Derrida, 1994/1997, pp. 27-28 for further discussion of this *yes*). A researcher, for instance, cannot expect to fully understand a participant's words or assume that a participant will understand her questions, but the act of using language to communicate is a constant hope to understand and be surprised by what might come about in the process of the interview (Derrida & Caputo, 1997a). Thus the purpose of interview in poststructuralism is not to find the truth of the experience, *per se*, but to encourage the "wild profusion of events" that Foucault (1970) said constitutes our experiences (p. xv).

In addition, attending to power in poststructural interviewing is important, since power is not a possession that can allow one to accurately transmit information through conversation but is always in play in multiple ways (Foucault, 1978). However, as Glesne (2006) emphasized, interviews are necessarily different from a regular conversation since only one person, the researcher, is responsible for bringing the topic to the table. For Foucault (1978), though, since power is shifting continuously, the power dynamics of an interview shift as well. In addition, since power and knowledge are interconnected, what is and can be said (and what is not said and cannot be said) is an effect of ever-changing historical and social positionings (Foucault, 1978). This consideration is important for

this study since what can and cannot be said about religion is much disputed in education and what participants do not say is not necessarily only a result of conscious intentions. Lisa Mazzei (2007) considered how attending to what is not said, or "silent words," can "challenge the limits of spoken words" (p. 26).When writing about interviews with participants, she said, "I came to recognize the silences encouraged by...history, ones purposefully present in the conversations that we were speaking, but with no history or context with which to give them voice" (Mazzei, 2004, p. 27). This work suggests that what matters in an interview is often more than just spoken words.

The Use and Function of Individual Interviews in this Study

As spaces where what could and could not said could be examined, interview data was useful for examining the multiple subjectivities available to participants through their mission work and how they negotiated these as they made sense of themselves as future teachers. Because religion is so rarely talked about in teacher education in relation to the preservice teacher, the interview was needed as a starting point to know where to go from there. In this study, the interviews were semi-structured purposeful conversations (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p. 652; Patton, 2002, p. 347) in order to encourage power to shift freely. I used a semi-structured protocol (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 37 for initial interview protocol) but found that I did not often refer to it. I read the opening paragraph and asked participants to tell me about their trips. I found that asking participants to take the lead allowed me to focus on listening in preparation for asking questions in response. Often short comments or head nods were all that was needed to encourage participants to elaborate. This type of structure also allowed me to attend to my own thoughts and take notes on how I was responding both physically and emotionally to their words as a way to continually check my own certainty. In addition, I found photo-elicitation, where participants used the photographs they had taken during their mission work (Cappello, 2005; Darbyshire, MacDougall & Schiller, 2005; Harper, 2005), to be a useful tool in helping participants stimulate memories of their experiences that word-based questions had not.

After obtaining the appropriate consent, I conducted seven total one to two hour interviews and an additional six follow-up interviews of the same length. I did not do a follow up with one participant since she had graduated and moved by the time I solicited the follow-up. These interviews took place in coffee shops of participants' choosing, and interestingly all participants chose different coffee shops. The purpose of the first was to situate the participants within the context of mission work, following the same procedure with each participant of using photo elicitation and having the protocol available if needed. The remaining interviews were based upon the data collection/analysis from the first as well as ongoing questions that were arising as I thought across interviews (Reinharz, 1992, p. 36). For instance, I asked each participant to discuss concepts that were repeated across the first round as well as other data such as mission field, love, being blessed, lifestyle, and calling.

Interviews also became opportunities to focus on the blurring of both data collection/analysis and also the blurring of me and participants. As St. Pierre (2009) described in her critique of voice in the research interview, she could often not tell the difference between her and participants. I often found this to be the case as I was unsure of how we came to talk about what we were talking about. Additionally, I often found myself shifting between what felt like advocating for participants, with statements like "yeah", and giving them the smack down (see Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1 for examples) in which I could not hold back asking them to think about something I thought they *should* think about. The complexity was heightened when during the multiple readings of interview transcripts and listening to the interviews, the status of my "yeahs" was questioned as I found myself talking back to myself, wondering what I could possibly be saying "yeah" to. Such confusion in interviews has been discussed throughout this dissertation.

Focus Group Interview

In this section, I build upon the definition and issues with the individual interview described above to include the group interview. Next, I describe how focus groups functioned in this study.

Definition and Issues

As a broad definition, focus groups are "collective conversations or group interviews" (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 887). Patton (2002) said that the purpose of a focus group is for participants to "hear each other's responses and make additional comments beyond their own original responses" (p. 386). This social

interaction often allows for additional insight about the topic of conversation that individual interviews might not permit (Kreuger, 1988, pp. 15-18) and allows a researcher to recognize these "interactional dynamics" as important and relevant parts of meaning making (p. 902). Because focus groups are often considered group interviews, where the researcher chooses the focus and facilitates the discussion, the same considerations about language and power relations are at play as in the individual interview described previously. In a group, these considerations about language and power can become even more apparent as participants actively borrow language from one another and negotiate space to talk and listen (Lather, 2001).

The Use and Function of Focus Group Interviews in this Study

I chose to use focus group interviews in addition to individual interviews because I had hoped the group structure would allow participants to build off one another's ideas. I noted in my dissertation proposal, for instance, moments during individual interviews when I thought talking in a group might produce different data. For instance, all participants talked about love (e.g., love of children, being loving teachers, love of the world, love of God) as an important part of their mission work both inside and outside the classroom. When I asked for more specific details about their practices of loving and how these played out in the classroom, participants did not elaborate much. Since focus groups have been said to promote synergy, I had hoped this might be a space to encourage elaboration (Krueger & Casey, 2009), which they did as participants built off of others ideas, often finishing one another's sentences (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 3 for example).

In addition, I used focus groups to allow me to complicate other data I collected in relation to my object of knowledge. Kamberelis and Dimitriadis (2005) claimed that this type of data collection can help researchers "work against premature consolidation of their understandings and explanations" in that, among other considerations, they can actively decenter the researcher (p. 905). As mentioned above, I have noticed my own desires to give participants the "smack down" especially where issues of justice are concerned. As Kamberlis and Dimitriadis (2005) suggested, focus groups became a way to encourage dialogue. It is my belief that such an environment allowed participants to shift the focus away from my influence upon them as an interviewer and produced a space where participants could discuss their faith in ways that my questioning perhaps had not. Since they all self-identified as "believers" as they introduced themselves to one another or caught up with one another after having not seen each other in a while, I believe the shared status added comfort for discussion. This coming together also allowed participants to network with other believers, a difficulty some participants said they had expressed in various contexts.

I held two focus groups that were structured using a modified version of what Krueger and Casey (2009) called "opening questions" (p. 39) or open-ended questions designed to generate conversation. The content of the focus group was determined based upon the ongoing data collection/analysis in the study.

Building from a strategy that Freire (1970) used in what he called study circles, during analysis of other data, I develop lists of "generative words," or words that were of great importance or concern to participants. While Freire's purpose was to help participants, through solidarity, gain control over their words so that they could ultimately more appropriately "name" their worlds and themselves (Freire,1970), I used this strategy for a different purpose. Keeping in mind Derrida's (1994) consideration that, in language, meanings are always deferred since multiple readings are always possible, I intended to use this process to complicate data. I believe this sort of complication is necessary to make visible ways of speaking and thinking that may have been taken for granted.

The focus groups took place in August, 2010. I invited all participants to attend the focus groups, but due to scheduling constraints and last minute personal conflicts, it ended up that only four participants could participate. Interestingly, the same four attended both. By that time, one participant had already graduated and had been teaching middle school for one week. The first focus group was an invitation for participants to talk about love in relation to their mission work (which as mentioned above spanned the space of "everywhere"). The second was built from a comment one participant made in the first focus group related to how talking about the Christian lifestyle in relation to mission work would be "opening up a whole can of worms" (Personal communication, August 14, 2010). I invited them to open that can of worms in the second.

[69] See Dinner Conversations, Dinner, Uninvited Guest 10 for further exploration of nutshells

[70] While I have provided elsewhere in this Apéritif/Digestif a description and theorization of the interview methods used in this study, in this note I address the interviews with professors and graduate students who worked in the teacher preparation program where preservice participants were being trained. These interviews, which I amended my IRB part-way through the study to include, were intended to help me situate the site of the research as one where

Christianity was prevalent and relevant to the lives of preservice teachers. I discuss this decision in more detail as well as provide descriptions of recruitment and interview methods and information about the kinds of topics discussed.

Necessity for Additional Interviews

Part way through the study and as I was writing my dissertation proposal, continuing to collect/analyze literature in teacher education and religious education related to Christianity and social justice, I continuously had trouble writing specially about a conversation in which to situate this study (see Dinner Conversations, Uninvited Guest 2). As described elsewhere (Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 19), not many people were writing about the preservice teacher in relation to religion. While spirituality was much more prevalent (e.g. Palmer, 2003; Whitcomb, Liston, & Borko, 2008a, 2008b), it was religion that seemed important for this study although I was not exactly sure why. The discussions of spirituality I had read in teacher education often situated the preservice teacher as a humanist subject who was in the process of negotiating her core self in relation to society. While religion, like spirituality, was often taken as a way to look a person's highest commitments (Marsden, 1998) or even as part of one's personality (Fowler, 1981), I believed that religion would allow me to situate the study outside of the teachers' heads and in the social world in a way that spirituality might. Apple (2001) stated, for instance, that with religion also comes individual and collective power that is used for positive and negative in society since organized religion had customs, norms, and doctrines which were continuously being created and recreated by those who claim allegiance.

Additionally, Kimberly White (2007, 2009), in her dissertation work and subsequent writing on teacher identity in relation to religion, had noted a shift in American society from discussions of the spiritual to religious. This conclusion was based on her literature review of three news magazines *Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News &World Report*, which she chose because of their great national and global exposure, in which White read articles which included the term *religion* during two time spans (August of 2004 until June of 2006 and August of 1994 until June of 1996). She counted fifty-four articles which contained a reference to religion during the earlier time span while 171 articles included a reference to religion during the latter. Amongst her findings, she (2009) noted that churches and organizations were much more likely to be involved in politics and also recent that recent events, such as 9/11 and the election of President Barack Obama, put religion on the forefront.

I had been collecting/analyzing data in my dissertation log on religion in the media and had noticed that religion was also quite prominent in the news especially related to politics. One example was an article (Shafer, 2010) in Slate online magazine posted August 19, 2010 entitled, *Greetings, 18 percenters*!. The 18% referred to the percentage of, as Shafer said, the "knucklehead Americans who think Barack Obama is a Muslim." The statistic was based on data from the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life which traces shifts in public religious life such as how 47% of Americans thought Obama was a Christian in 2008 and only 34% did in the summer of 2010. Shafer concluded that thoughts about Obama's religious affiliation closely related to the political assessment of him, with two-thirds of those who think he is a Muslim disapproving of how he is doing as president, while two-thirds of those who think he is Christian approve. There were 485 online comments attached to the article, many of which I read during the one hour time slot I allowed myself after initially reading the article on August 20, 2010 and during the 30 minutes I allowed myself during the "cleaning up" phase of writing in April, 2010. These comments ranged from discussions of the importance of the religious affiliations of presidents throughout the years (some checking on George W. Bush's church going record to determine if he really were a Christian), whether or not this country was based upon religious principles and whether a Muslim should be allowed as president, whether or not Obama ever actually claimed to be a Muslim, whether or not Muslim terrorists would attack the US again (after 9/11), whether or not Christianity and Islam were compatible. This article and the numerous comments contributed to my idea that religion, not spirituality, might be a fruitful space for exploration.

White (2007) situated her inquiry about religion in the field of teacher education by asking, "Why aren't teachers included in this group of American citizens who are using religion to find meaning in their daily lives?" (p.

13). While my questions were different (see Apéritif/Digestif,Citing God, Citing Theorists, Citing Selves), focusing more on available storylines for preservice teachers to take up and the effects of doing so, I wanted to get a glimpse of what those who taught preservice teachers who may or may not openly express religious, or in this case Christian beliefs, might say. After receiving IRB approval for these interviews, I sent out an email to all of the professors and graduate assistants who worked in the programs these women attended in order to try to schedule a short 10 to 15 minute interview with them. In August and September, 2010, I conducted these interviews. Based on email responses and scheduling, I interviewed two graduate students and four professors. These interviews took place in a variety of places. The two graduate student interviews took place outside of the college participants attended, both in different coffee shops. The professors were interviewed at the college due to convenience for them. Two were interviewed in their respective offices and another two were interviewed together in a conference room. I had scheduled individual interviews with each of these professors, but both happened to be in the same space when I came to meet one for an interview. The interview protocol I used is as follows:

Thank you for agreeing to talk with me. I am wondering if we might talk in general about how, if at all, religion is or has been a part of your day-to-day work with pre-service teachers.

How often, if at all, do your students talk with you about their religious affiliations and experiences (in email, assignments, class conversations, or informal conversations)? If there are any, tell me about a time when religion came up in conversation or coursework unexpectedly.

How have you reacted to these conversations?

CHAPTER 2

TELEPHONE ONE: TIME LAPSE

This conversation takes place between Responsibility, a teacher educator who yearns for social justice although she often sees it with a poststructural twist—as an open construct which cannot be tied down. Responsibility is on the telephone with an unknown other who is marked by an ellipses. The author does not have access to the thoughts, feelings, and identities of the unknown character. Responsibility and the unknown other are discussing an event that took place earlier that morning and that has, in part, sparked Responsibility's decision to plan a dinner in which she aimed to invite quite a few guests. An invitation to the dinner follows the conversation.

Responsibility:

That's what I said. I am planning a dinner.

…[1]

I am *not* crazy. I gotta do something.

…

Well, *what can I do?*[2]

…

Yeah I know I can't. That's why I am *only* planning a dinner not trying to *solve* the problem.

…

NO, I haven't exactly figured out what the problem *is* yet. I just know I gotta do something.

…

Well, I am thinking I'll just invite people who give a shit about other people.[3]

…

I'm not sure about that yet. Maybe I'll just keep it general on the invitation. Something like "You are invited for an evening of food, wine, and conversation."

…

Will there be wine? Ha. Of course!

…

Or *maybe* the wine will just be a good conversation starter. I'm not only inviting Christians and anyway, some *do* drink wine you know.[4]

…

Yes, I was thinking about inviting her.

…

I know I just met her this morning but she was the impetus for this whole event now wasn't she.[5]

…

I didn't tell you the whole story yet? I thought I had. Are you sure you just weren't listening?[6]

…

Fine. Briefly. But I don't really have time for this.[7]

…

I am too busy. Anyway, that's not the point. If you want to hear the story then shut it, will you?

…

Alright, so it was a typical Sunday morning. You know, not really much that you can do.[8]

…

Yup. Gym closed. And the student learning center too.

...

Yeah, that's where I ended up going.

…

Well, actually, this morning, I thought I got lucky. I found a table in the back corner pretty far away from that Bible group.[9]

…

Yeah, she was in the group and I guess she must have seen me pass by.

…

I know, right? Today I was holding Caputo's book, *What would Jesus deconstruct: The good news of postmodernism for the church*[10] and Michael Apple's *Educating the "Right" Way: Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality*.[11] .

…

That's what I was thinking. I could have totally passed as a believer.[12] But then again, when she came up to my table I was reading that new Noddings article, *The new outspoken atheism and education* so who knows?[13]

…

Right. Let's hope not. I mean, we all know claiming a belief in social justice these days isn't exactly kosher in some communities. [14]

…

No she didn't tell me that Jesus Christ was the original social justice educator who she modeled all of her teaching after. Be nice. [15]

…

I wasn't pissed actually. It was a nice break from reading the Noddings article.

…

Totally, I had just spent like 20 minutes stuck in her abstract for the article yet again. You know it gets me every time when Noddings writes about that stinking problem of communicating "across the chasm", so she says, "between belief and unbelief" in public education.

…

No I was *not* just using air quotes. And no, I am pretty sure Noddings was *not* talking about the chasm of belief and unbelief in social justice.

…

Well some people are talking about social justice *as* a religious dogma but she was talking mostly about Christianity, you know, since that's the religion of choice around this country.[16]

…

No I do *not* think that my little "dinner party" can solve Noddings's problem of communicating across the chasm.

…

I didn't mean it was *her* problem. Just that she is freaking writing about it, okay?

…

Yeah, I am getting frustrated. I mean, she's not even writing about it on a practical level. "Too dangerous," she says. Keep the critical religious talk just "theoretically practical" [17]

…

Well, yeah, that's part of it. She is worried that religion can't be talked about critically because it will probably be presented dogmatically. But she also said that in today's educational climate where "fundamentalists insist that their religious perspectives are under attack by liberal secularists"[18] it is just not practical.

…

Who, Noddings or Love?

…

That's the girl's name, Love. You know, the one I met this morning? The one we've been talking about this whole conversation??? Are you sure you are listening?

…

Yes, she saw me reading Noddings, and to answer your question, no, *Love* didn't ask me if I was a liberal secularist. She didn't even ask about what I was reading.

…

Yeah I told her I was a teacher educator.

…

What do you mean what did she do when she found out I was all *posty*?

…

I know what you mean by posty. And no, poststructural theories didn't *tell* me that the chasm between belief and unbelief wasn't real.[19]

…

No shit. That's why I am inviting Love to dinner. It *feels* real.

You have been cordially invited to participate in an evening of food, wine, and conversation.

Who? A bunch of people who care deeply about others[20]

What? A progressive (moving) dinner. This type of dinner moves from house to house with different hosts taking responsibility for a portion of the meal.[21]

When? May 12, 2011

Where?

Appetizers: Responsibility's house (5:30 pm-6:30 pm)

Dinner: Love's house (7:00 pm-8:00 pm)

Dessert: Foucault's house (8:30 pm-9:30 pm)

Endnotes

[1] When I began to write this chapter, I intended it to function as an introduction of sorts to the conversations that would follow. It began, in fact, as a more conventional dissertation introduction which included parts such as background of the problem, research questions, and so on in the logical, sequential order so common in many dissertations. As I tried to write that introduction though, the more conventional introduction seemed to necessitate a break from the conversation format so that it could do the job that introductions by definition must do, the impossible task of presenting some *other* (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 3 for discussion of Derrida's 1967/1976 critique of *presence*). Even though I decided to go ahead and make the break, when I began writing (and continued writing and writing) I did not write what I had planned. Instead, the conversation above began to appear—a conversation between Responsibility, a teacher educator who yearned for a socially just world, and an unknown other marked by an ellipses, whose words only Responsibility could hear. In this note, I explore the stuck place that arose as I had to decide how to proceed with an introduction that not only did not look conventional but included a character that would remain unknown to the reader and myself. From there, I describe the data collection/analysis that happened in this process, finally, I discuss the movement in thought that occurred and is still occurring.

Aporia

After many failed attempts at the conventional introduction that I had planned (and outlined), I opened a new document and started to write. As I did, I found myself feeling quite freed up, from what I was not sure. At first, it seemed as if the weight of the fact/fiction binary (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 4 for a discussion of this binary in relation to Arts Based Research and this dissertation) temporarily shift as I found myself typing out Responsibility's name and taking up the familiar conversation format that in the rest of the text I have called fiction. As I continued to write though, I began to feel strange that although I had called this a telephone conversation in the chapter's title, I only seemed to be concerned with Responsibility's side of the conversation. Not only did I have no access to the words or intentions of the unknown character who presumably hid behind the ellipses, but they seemed unimportant. As I wrote Responsibility's part, for instance, I did not consider what the character marked by the ellipses said but only what Responsibility would say in response. Furthermore, I found myself referring to an earlier vignette I had written about a conversation Responsibility had with herself as my guide for crafting what Responsibility would say to the unknown other. This move felt irresponsible to the reader if I was going to call this chapter an introduction. I had learned, for instance, that an introduction, whether it be a stand-alone document or not, would be a place to "get right at the substantive matter of the text" (Wolcott, 2001, p. 145). Furthermore, to make a claim to "get right at" anything would be counter to the poststructural work I aimed to undertake in the dissertation (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 1 for brief description of poststructuralism). How would I proceed?

As a means of thinking more about this, I took a moment to attend to the ellipses by theorizing how it might be functioning in the text. I turned to Derrida's chapter in *Of Grammatology* (1967) entitled *...the dangerous supplement...*, since I remembered reading that the translator, Gayatri Spivak, had inserted the ellipses as a example of the topic Derrida addressed in the chapter, the supplement. According to Spivak (1974), the ellipses is said to signify that which has been purposely omitted by the author and which is unnecessary for understanding. Like other signs, it must do the work of conveying a message that can be repeated by others without needing to refer to an author who gives it meaning. As a signifier, then, an ellipses must *mean* on its own. As mentioned elsewhere (Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 3), Derrida pointed out though that all signifiers fail to fully represent the thing which they mean to represent. An ellipses, as a supplement, is stuck within a play of meanings of the word supplement, which as Derrida points out can mean both an addition or a completion. A supplementary character in this introduction, for instance, could mean something added on to an already complete text. It could also refer to an addition that was necessary in order to complete the text. The former would presume that this text, which includes only Responsibility's side of the conversation, in its nature, is an already complete text and the supplementary character merely adds on to that which is complete. The latter meaning, though, would presume a conversation that was lacking in its nature and in need of a supplement for its completion. This dual function of the supplement, for Derrida, marks the undecidability of language (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 68 for further description; See also Davies, 2003, pp. 144-148 for discussion of undecidability in relation to her study of gender construction in preschool children). Such tendency to not to neatly conform to

either side of binary of presence/absence throws the reader and author into spaces of negotiation where they must contend with the impossible possibilities of meaning.

With this theorization, I began to see the ellipses as an interesting way to trouble the responsibility of the writer in producing the text since the supplement would add complexity to the idea that there is a *thereness* of voice behind the ellipses. I was reminded of the readings on voice that I had done throughout my doctoral work, which questioned the privileging of voice in qualitative work, or as Lincoln (2005) said, the idea that a voice can speak the truth of consciousness. Here, the ellipses was marking an absence of the possibility of access to the intentions of the unknown character by omitting the words altogether. In their edited text critiquing notions of voice in qualitative research Mazzei and Youngblood (2009) called for more explicit attention to efforts that "seek the voice that escapes easy classification and that does not make easy sense" (p. 4). As discussed elsewhere (Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 4), their concern was that researchers' continuous attempts to access authentic voices "fails to consider how as researchers we are always already shaping these 'exact words' through the unequal power relationships present and by our own exploitative research agendas and timelines" (p. 2). As a presumed omission the ellipses invited me to think about what might be shaping what was not being said and also what was being said although not in *exact words*.

With all this in mind though, I began to think that this ellipses might be an important way for me to be responsible to the poststructural theories I had committed to and to the hope that the use (including my part in their continued construction) of such theories would produce spaces that would allow me to explore how research was produced in the process. This did not erase my feelings of irresponsibility which somehow related to the need to present to the reader a way of reading the dissertation text appropriately. As Derrida (1989/1992) has said though, responsibility is never finished. I would have to make a decision without still being able to call myself responsible.

As a means of continuing to trouble this decision while not being paralyzed, I decided to offer up the first page of the above conversation to a reader, one whose opinion mattered to me greatly, to see what would happen. Quickly I became aware of a different way the ellipses was functioning. It seemed to be drawing into doubt a reader's ability to know how to respond appropriately to the text. After a short second with the text, for instance, the reader, a fellow doctoral student Hilary (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 58 for discussion of her role as a writing partner; See also Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 14 for work we have undertake together) eagerly asked me, "This is what the person on the phone said, right?," following the question with a phrase signifying a guess at the unseen words. I did not know the answer to her questions, and as the author, I could not shake the felling that I should. The poststructural theories that popped into my head were coaxing me to relish in the reader's discomfort and my own. This was the sort of uncomfortable reading that Lather (1997) wrote of, where the reader would have to determine for herself what was going on in the text. The same concerns persisted as I wondered the risk of what this responsibility to poststructural theories would do to other responsibilities. Specifically, while I had many potential readers of this dissertation in mind , the readers who seemed most important now were my committee members who would have to respond to this text in a way that would entice them to literally sign off on the appropriateness of this text in partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree I hoped for. Could I cast such doubt, especially if I were to continue to call this chapter an introduction which was to help the reader know how to respond to the text, and in this case, know something about this ellipses? I noted the ellipses for further consideration at a different time. I provide some of that consideration below.

Data Collection/Analysis

After having written all of the conversations, I returned to the notes to continue the work of data collection/analysis that would allow me to do the poststructural work of continuing to draw into question the presumed completeness of the conversations and also as a means of ensuring that I was responsible to the conventions of a dissertation. In order to elicit data production/analysis in this case, I decided that doing some imaginative work around the voice presumably behind the ellipses might allow me to work the boundaries of the aporia that had left me stumped as to whether or not I should provide more information for the reader about how to read the ellipses appropriately or whether I should invite the ellipses to function in the way I had theorized above. This work of pushing seemed similar to work that Lisbeth Berbary (2011) had done in her creative analytical practice in which she invited readers to become involved in the continuous recreation of the screenplays she had written about how sorority women learn gendered experiences (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Aporia 3). Drawing upon the work of Barthes (1974 as cited in Berbary, 2011, p. 187) who theorized screenplays as open

text which invited rewriting, Berbary claimed that since the discourses she was trying to represent were always open for rewriting, such a format kept ideas of Truth in play. Additionally, I was reminded of a chapter written by Bronwyn Davies in Mazzai and Youngblood (2009) text on voice mentioned above and discussed earlier in the Dinner Conversations, Telephone One (see introduction to Dinner Conversations, Telephone One) in which she wrote a play based in her observations and experiences in a certain place she frequented. Drawing upon the work of Deleuze (1990/1995, 1997) and Cixous (1993), Davies theorized her characters and the authorial subject as spaces for thoughts to happen. Writing the play opened her to the unknown in that it allowed her a space to experiment with the "sticky surface of familiar language" that had sedimented as perceptions of others in need of breaking down (p. 200). Such an act allowed her to greet what had been previously constituted as abject could now be "greeted with love" (p. 200).

Like Davies, I hoped this work would be a space to think differently as the ellipses became a space for data to play out. Having earlier theorized the ellipses as a sign that seemed to highlight the uncertainty and ambiguity of all signs, I anticipated that this space might invite a focus on the contingencies of categories I used to describe the ellipses and and the character's thoughts. In this type of work I was not aiming to attribute specific intentions to the ellipses character. Instead, this work was a focus on the intersecting storylines that were available for characters that necessarily involved evershifting power relations. This type of work relies on a conception of power that is not merely a repressive force which only acts upon others (as in prohibits another from saying certain things in certain spaces), but it is productive, inciting an "ensemble of rules according to which we distinguish true from the false" (Foucault, 1980, p. 317). To return to the Davies (2000) example, in her writing, Davies was not concerned with how one character acted upon another, directing his or her actions, for instance. Instead, she focused on how these characters worked in relation to one another in ways that they could be taken up and known as coherent participants in storylines. Similarly, as I reread the conversation, I tried to focus on the relations between Responsibility and the ellipses as they unfolded as a part of larger storylines through which Responsibility and the ellipses were invited to participate in certain ways. Such a practice seemed as if it might allow me to do the work of answering the ongoing call of the other, what Derrida (1989/1992) had described as a work of love, that I aimed to undertake in this dissertation.

I began by focusing on the ellipses to which this note is attached. It falls in between Responsibility's declaration that she is planning a dinner and a statement in which she claims, "I am *not* crazy. I gotta do something." Here, the conversation, as written, seemed to necessitate that the ellipses character accuse Responsibility for being crazy because she was planning a dinner. Perhaps her words were something like, "You're just crazy. What's planning a dinner going to do?," thus inviting Responsibility to take up a role in opposition to the ellipses' assertion that she was not crazy. It would also invite an understanding of Responsibility's phrase "I gotta do something" to mean that she was not asserting *the* answer to whatever problem they spoke of, but just providing *an* action in response to the problem they presumably both shared a knowledge of. I heard the ellipses character quipping back something like, "You just *have* to *make a difference* don't you?! Like your stupid dinner will matter." Responsibility's response, "Well, what can I do?" became not just a question anymore but a taking up of the position of one who felt called to make a difference as if it were a *given* and not in need of response. Suddenly, this ellipses character as a marker of the supplement was even more evident because it seemed as if it did not matter who Responsibility was responding to. Responsibility's position as responsive (i.e. the one available in the storyline and how Responsibility was narrating herself) seemed complete without the other on the telephone. The respondent would merely add on. Yet, at the same time, for the possibility of Responsibility claim as having a desire or capability to *make a difference* to come true, she would have to interact with others—respond with others. The other on the phone, in this sense, would be necessary.

I began to wonder about how Responsibly, a teacher educator, was positioned and recognized as a responsive *being*. While the object of knowledge in this study was not the subject position of teacher educator per se, the poststructural theories which I had been thinking with in this study invited me *not* to think the subject position of preservice teacher as necessarily separate from other subject positions. As Davies (2000) described, learning the available "category memberships" through which subjects make sense of themselves and others implies a focus on the implied opposites of such categories (p. 23). In this study, for instance, a focus on the preservice teacher as a student learning to teach for social justice would also imply a focus on its presumed opposite, the teacher educator teaching for social justice. Not only did both positions require a responsiveness, which was often theorized as a process involving critically examining one's own beliefs and background experiences as well as the

needs and characteristics of others, (e.g.Villegas & Lucas, 2002; See also Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 31 for discussion), but a teacher educator's ability to enact a cultural responsiveness is often considered a necessity for upholding social justice missions. In fact, Zeichner (2009) has said that increasing the focus on the teacher educator who must model the practices that are desirable in preservice teachers is quite possibly the most important thing for social justice educators to do to promote social justice. In particular, such work has been cited as essential for addressing the demographic imperative that plagues US education which connects the increasing educational and economic inequities in society, in part, to a lack of fit between an increasingly diverse Pre-K-12 student population an increasingly homogeneous teaching population (see Cochran-Smith, 2004 for discussion). *Being* responsive to preservice teacher students was a particularly desirable position for teacher educators to take up.

In addition, being responsive to the mission of social justice was also desirable. In response to critiques that social justice teacher education had ambiguous and contradictory definitions of social justice, McDonald and Zeichner (2008) had called upon institutions to be clear about their missions. They pointed out that anyone and everyone can claim a mission toward social justice, including Christian schools and public schools, and the enacting of these can look very different. This situating of teacher educators within an institutional space where missions were being claimed positioned them as responsive to a mission that was explicitly declared by the institution which quite often did not offer much coherence on how to enact said mission (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, 31). Thus a teacher educator must contend with what might be discontinuities between the call of the mission and of the other.

Movement in Thought

Such data produced through collection/analysis allowed me to think the ellipses as both a representative of the mission (i.e., social justice) and of innumerable others (who may or may not be preservice teachers, other teacher educators, etc.). Responsibility, then, was answering the call of the mission and the other, at the same time. As a marker of the supplement, then, Responsibility's position as responsive was completed by the mission and the others. It was also, though, incomplete without them. This positioning of Responsibility as such complicated her ability to call herself responsive. For one, the requirements to continuously be clear about one's mission, (i.e. not be ambiguous about social justice) required that Responsibility be on top of the mission, so-to-speak, to tie it down. When theorized poststructurally, this was an impossible task since the language used to represent the mission was already marked by absence and was already to come. Caputo (2007), for instance, provided an example with vocation, which he said means to follow a call that guides one's spiritual journey. I provide a lengthy excerpt below because, despite numerous attempts to reword, I just like how Caputo said it better:

> A vocation means to be 'called,' to live 'under' a call—but suppose we are not sure who the caller of the call is? Is the voice that calls to us in conscience the call of God? Or is it perhaps a kind of evolutionary device implanted by the process of natural selection? You can see how much being called, living *unde*r a call, or being called or summoned to follow a call is affected by 'identifying' who the caller is…But to the extent that one knows or can identify the caller, the sender of this mail, one gets *on top of* the call and can judge *for oneself* about the validity of what is called for. And to that extent one is less under the call and more in possession of one's own faculties, more autonomous. One is acting on one's own—not under the call…the spiritual journey we launch under the impetus of a calling or vocation (the path) actually depends on *not* knowing whence this call arises, on not knowing who has sent this mail, and thus on not entirely understanding what is being called for. . . we have a sense, a faith, a hope in something, a love of something we know not what, something that calls on us. (pp. 49-50)

To claim a responsiveness to the mission, an answer to the call, in this sense would annul the call at the moment it was spoken of. Such is a tension where one must act without knowing.

Additionally, being responsive to individual preservice teachers required that a teacher educator be responsive to the cultural characteristics of the other, whether they be theorized in the humanist sense of being a part of the core of each individual or enacted and rewritten in discourse. Hughes (2010) for instance, in her discussion of her struggle to be responsive to students in the middle grades methods course she taught, wrote of how she had to be open to students who as professing conservative Christians, felt different from her. Similarly, Conklin (2008) described how she had to model compassion to students who may very well hold racists beliefs that were a part of

their cultural upbringing. While both of these authors worked against constituting the preservice teacher as a problem, writing oneself into the role of responsive instead, similar to Caputo's discussion of vocation above, once you know for sure that you are responsive to other or that you are *on top of* the cultural characteristics so-to-speak, the other ceases to be other. Instead the other becomes that which is known. Furthermore, to respond to the call of a particular other requires one to *not* respond to other *others* and thus go against any rule of calling oneself responsive (not that Hughes or Conklin necessarily made that claim). To *be* culturally responsive or enact culturally responsive practices, would at the same time be to be unresponsive in the face of the other.

This has interesting implications for the preservice teacher in that she must enter a field where she is expected to be responsive to innumerable others and missions and who elicits a response from the teacher educator. Such a positioning can require her to make innumerable decisions which might not be readily addressed by basing training in fixed notion of ethics of responsiveness or best practices aimed at justice. Edgoose (2001) advised that a focus on moments of hesitations and on moments of the unknown might be a fruitful way to open up unforeseeable spaces of responsive to the other. I wonder if this focus on hesitation might also allow for teacher educators to respond to the preservice teacher in ways that might allow for discussions of shifting commitments that a focus on general principles of socially just teaching practices, for instance, might not allow. Similarly, for me as an author, a general principle to be responsible to poststructural theories as I understand them might require an irresponsibly to the introduction and the readers of the introduction. As a researcher, I must contend with the unknown and jump. Such jumping might be a bit less frightening if discussions abounded about uncertainty.

[2] I use this note to discuss data collection/analysis that seemed to just happen upon this noted text. I do this because, one, the type of data collection/analysis deviated from the many of the other types discussed in notes in that its content does not delineate from the particular stuck point I thought of when I had noted it (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 1). Instead, I returned to this note with the intention to use it as a place to insert something that I knew had to be inserted in the dissertation—a clear statement of the problem and purpose of the study. While it does not necessarily provide information about how the question *What can I do?* became thinkable as something Responsibility, a teacher educator who yearned for social justice, might say, the note does relate to how such questions function in relation to a study. I believe addressing this is important in relation to a study situated in part in reform oriented teacher education. Questions such as "What can I do?" are constantly being answered by institutions who require a direction for teacher education programs, such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Data Collection/Analysis

When I noted this particular question, *What can I do?*, I wrote a brief reminder note to myself about a conversation I had with my writing partner, Jessica, about language while writing the first draft of this conversation (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 58 for discussion of writing partners). I had interrupted Jessica's work by declaring out loud that I did not know whether the question I wanted to write was *What can I do?* or *What should I do?* In response, Jessica just stared at me, probably because I kept interrupting her work with my talking aloud. Nevertheless, I decided to keep interrupting by telling her how I had no idea what I meant by writing this question. I did not know what problem the question was referring to. I also did not know what I wanted this *I* to actually do about the problem, and nor did I know how this statement might be taken by a reader. Jessica had commented back something to the effect of, "Sarah, that is what happens with language," meaning, I am guessing that such difficulties with language are quite common if one is guided by a belief, like she and I were, that language cannot tie down what it claims to. And I had thought back something like, "So not helpful." (sorry Jessica) With this story in mind, I had tried to write about this sentence in multiple ways focusing on my ongoing stuck points with language. Despite these attempts, I never felt like I was getting anywhere. Instead, I just seemed to be using the sentence to "tell" about poststructural theories and language, which did not seem to be providing space for movement in thought. I abandoned it and decided to return to it at a later date.

One morning, I was doing some organizational work for Dinner Conversations, Telephone One with the intention to create a massive list of what had to be included in the dissertation so that I could check off as I wrote. I found myself pulling together note about the expected function of a dissertation to add to the section I had started on conventional dissertations and research reports (Augusto, 2009; Badley, 2009; Lovitts, 2008 and also various notes taken in coursework over the years). All of the texts referred to some request that a researcher report out on the purpose and problem of the research study. From much of my reading in qualitative work, it seemed like this work

should have been done long ago and I should easily be able to report out what I already knew. Determining the purpose of a study, for instance, according to Patton (2002), was the first task a researcher must do. Furthermore, I had been required to write of the problem, and all that it entailed, numerous times in consent forms and IRBs. I also had research questions that were supposed to guide the study, although I often found myself forgetting to ask exactly what those research questions were (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Aporia 2 for further discussion of research question).

Making a plan to at least start with what I had already written, I turned to the task of deciding where to put the information. When I found myself opening up this chapter's document and jumping to the note on this question, *What can I do?,* the choice felt odd especially considering I had already started writing a note about poststructuralism and language attached to this question. But as I thought the question seemed not just appropriate but *the* question of the study even though I had no idea what data I would produce to inform Responsibility's asking it. Yet, there was something to this idea that Responsibility, this teacher educator, was seeking an appropriate action presumably in some field whose description would fall in the unwritten part of the question, What can I do *about…?*. How could I write about this *about* in a way that would address Patton (2002) and others' necessity to tell the purpose?

I remembered meeting with a professor once who told me to think about my work as being a part of conversations that were ongoing in the field. I had to situate my work within that conversation and extend it in some way. While this seemed easy enough to grasp, I still found that I began almost every paper, book chapter, and so on with a vignette from my own experience and more often than not, I had absolutely no idea where that vignette would take me, including which conversations I might be inviting myself into. I knew, though, from reading academic journals that beginning with clear problems and purposes was not only a part of the work of the abstract but was often in the first sentence. To begin with a vignette was something that often seemed to necessitate qualification. Hilary Conklin (2008), for instance, began her article with "Let me begin with a story of my own" (p. 652). Similarly, Kimberly White (2009) said "Please allow me to begin with a story that illustrates the overarching purpose of this discussion" (p. 857). Yet, at the same time, Laurel Richardson was often in my mind as I wrote and as one who talked of yawning her way through research reports and as one who provided example after example of beginning with her own stories (e.g. 1990; 1994; 2001). In *Getting personal: Writing stories,* Richardson (2001) began with "Halloween, 1972" (p. 33) and followed it with a tale of breaking her face as well as discussions about how "People who write are always writing about their lives" (p. 34).

Additionally, I had an arsenal of poststructural scholars who seemed to be agreeing with Richardson (2001). I comforted myself often with Foucault's (1981, p. 173) quote, excerpted below, which told me that all work was in part autobiographical:

"Every time I have tried to do a piece of theoretical work it has been on the basis of elements of my own experience: always in connection with processes I saw unfolding around me. It was always because I thought I identified cracks, silent tremors, and dysfunctions in things I saw, institutions I was dealing with, or my relations with others, that I set out to do a piece of work, and each time was partly a fragment of autobiography"

I had begun my dissertation proposal with that exact quote as a means of trying to make some sense of what felt like a mess of personal experiences and a whole slew of cracks and tremors. Furthermore, since poststructural work was often being attacked for being nihilistic and relativistic (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 3), I knew I needed to situate this work within a larger context.

Throughout the dissertation process I had done quite a few searches, often with the help of university reference librarians, to see if other educational researchers had similar problems as I had about being clear about the purpose or even defining the research question. Searching various databases with terms like (look at list) was not easy considering these were the givens in most research reports. Not finding anything useful, I remembered that McWilliams (2003) had written of mentoring doctoral students who came to her with the problem they wanted to solve and the great disappointment they often expressed when she said that this was not the goal. She talked of the difficulty that doctoral students had in hesitating the tendency to solve the world's problem and the shift to thinking about how this problem became thinkable. I decided to go to her text to read around the quotes I had found in one of my dictionaries. In trying to determine the location of the article (i.e. in computer or paper file) which I had not read for quite some time though, like a nomad, I found myself in an unintended space (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, introduction).

As I thought of where the article might be, I was reminded of a word, *hesitate*, that I thought McWilliams had used and that might be useful for my computer "find" function. As I searched though, an image of the word came into my head in relation to somebody else's discussion of research problems. Thinking it was Derrida, I returned to the Dinner Conversations, Telephone One document I had done some organization work in earlier that day and used the *find* function to locate the word *hesitate*. No such luck. I opened Google, hoping I had just read it online and it would come in my Google search bar and when it did not I Googled *Derrida* and *hesitate* just to see what would come up. What I noticed were multiple books on Derrida and religion. While I had known for quite some time that Derrida had written about religion, as I looked at these lists, one of my ongoing discomforts in this study, that I had not read many of these works, resurfaced. I had experienced similar feelings when I had not read what Foucault (1988) had written about Christianity and norms with as much dedication as I would have liked. Something else always seemed more important, which struck me as strange because often the *What can I do* question in my head and in my writing ended with something like *about religion and education*? When I wrote my dissertation proposal, for instance, I had situated the planned study in a long time split between critical and religious education (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 73). But that simultaneously felt too broad and not broad enough, perhaps because Caputo (2001) had deemed religion as too multiplicitous to tie down or perhaps because Nel Noddings (2009) had suggested that approaching religion in a critical way might be too dangerous (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 13).

At any rate, I wondered what might happen if I pretended that McWilliams (2003) was advising me to shift my focus away from trying to solve my problem of determining what this study was about and to think instead about how this question might be functioning at present and historically and necessarily had to become thinkable at some point. I began by returning to my dissertation log to come up with any writings about how I had described my study to others in elevator conversations, so-to-speak. I found multiples entries and I will discuss two here.

The first is related to a discussion that occurred one Friday evening in a situation where I was new to a group of people, and while not being able to discuss all of the details here, this newness designated me to a rank of lower than the others in multiples ways. While of course, power was shifting and sometimes I felt myself exercising power by way of calling upon my education which sometimes surpassed others or aligning myself momentarily with those who were often shunned in the group for their "deviant" behavior, the positioning of myself as being at a lower status in the group often felt very evident. This status was marked especially by money, time, and age in the group such as when one woman, for instance, commented that one day I might have the types of jewelry that she did. At some point in the midst of mingling around amongst group members, I was asked by one of the longest standing members to talk about my dissertation study. Not wanting to say too much since I felt that this was more of a courtesy asking rather than a curiosity one, I said something to the effect of, "Well, I am looking at mission work in public education, specifically that which relates to Christianity and social justice." I was met with an elated face and a subsequent telling by this woman of a tale of her days as an elementary principal in which she and teachers talked outright about how much the students in her school needed to hear talk of Christ and that they could feel free to do so, hush hush, of course.

The second related to a similar situation of meeting new people, but this time the situation was more informal. One Sunday, mid-morning I was introduced to a woman who I would be spending quite a bit of time with in the near future in a variety of settings for reasons I do not wish to disclose here. We were similar in age, financial situation, and were both mothers. She had asked me if I drink and I had told her that I drank quite often especially after a long day of writing my dissertation. She expressed her satisfaction and preceded to tell me about how often the Christian women she came into contact with did not drink and even frowned upon those who did, following it up with a "Oh by the way, what is your dissertation about?" I gave her a similar answer to what I had given before but this time the answer was met with a series of stories in which she had been witnessed to by Christians in an unfriendly way (see Uninvited Guest 5, Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Section Three for discussion).

Movement in Thought

While I am not sure what to make of this data collection/analysis at the moment , I am wondering about how the sharing of problems, purposes, research questions, and even the "elevator talk" about one's study might be included as data in one's study. I also wonder how encouraging an awareness about how one might differently construct such statements in different locations might offer spaces to discuss how knowledge of one's goodness or ability to be responsive or just might be complicated

[3] When writing this line in which Responsibility claimed to invite people who "give a shit" to dinner, I had quite a few problems. One was related to the researcher role and a questioning of the appropriateness of cursing, not only in the dissertation but in a dissertation which invites thinking about a religion which often frowns upon cursing. A Google search of the terms *Christian* and *curse*, for instance, produced 2,470,000 results many with the question of "Should Christians curse?" in the title (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 4). Another discomfort related to whether or not Responsibility should say she is inviting those who "give a shit" or those who "*claim* to give a shit." This second concern is the focus of this note because it positions Responsibility as one who has privileged information about the intentions of others. This privileged information about *giving a shit* about others has been an interest throughout this study.

Data Collection/Analysis

I decided to look into others' definitions of *give a shit* by consulting the urban dictionary, an online dictionary in which anyone over 18 years of age can contribute definitions to slang expressions and agree or disagree on the proposed definitions of others. A total of 249 people gave the thumbs up (and 25 gave the thumbs down) to "give a shit" signifying that someone cares about something or someone (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 9 for discussion of Nel Noddings in relation to distinctions between *caring* and *caring about*). This was in line with how I was thinking about the phrase. What got my mind moving , though, was an example sentence offered by one contributor, "Does Dubya give a shit about anything other than Iraqi oil? I doubt it." I was struck by how in these sentences, "give a shit," was functioning as a tool to question not only the intentions of George W. Bush, the president who was presumably referred to in the first sentence, but also those in any of the categories I associated with him (i.e., Republican, white, male, Christian). When I read of the author's doubt as to whether or not Bush "gave a shit," for instance, I caught myself saying, "Bush sure does think a lot about what benefits him, doesn't he." I remembered a quote from atheist Richard Dawkins (2006) that Noddings (2008) had written about in her text , *The new outspoken atheism in education,* about Bush answering a question about the status of atheists in the US by saying: "No, I don't know that atheists should be considered as citizens, nor should they be considered patriots. This is one nation under God" (Dawkins, 2006, p. 43 cited in Noddings, 2008, p. 371). Then, I followed it with something like "Republicans, ugh, I am glad I am not *one of them*" (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Aporia 1).

Movement in Thought

This positioning of Bush as problematic and also those in the categories I associated with him reminded me of the Dinner Conversations, Dinner dinner conversation in which Love discussed the wrong kind of Christian. I invite the reader (and the author) to think these two spaces in relation to one another.

[4] In writing the above statement in which Responsibility and the unknown character on the telephone are talking back and forth about wine in relation to Christianity, I have identified two discomforts, both related to wine consumption that I will address in this note. I do not take the time to go into great detail about these discomforts or the time to explore the movement in thought that occurred as a part of the decision making process to include Responsibility as a willing consumer of wine. Instead, I invite the reader explore this note in relation to Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 3 as well as in relation to Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Section Six and the impossibility understanding of oneself that Responsibility encounters.

Aporias

The first stuck place related to the role of a researcher in qualitative work and the potential invalidating effect of wine drinking on the *findings* of a study. Hilary Hughes-Decatur and I have written of this elsewhere in relation to data analysis (Bridges-Rhoads & Hughes-Decatur, 2010), but here, I focus more explicitly on the researcher role. The researcher role in a qualitative research has been described in a variety of ways, such as an instrument (Patton, 2002), a learner (Glesne, 2006), and a bricoleur (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, 2005b). While these characterizations generally assume that a researcher is responsible for what she brings to the study in terms of her prior beliefs and experiences, they position the researcher as one who can stand separate from the work she produces, as one who *does* research on participants. Poststructural theories position a researcher as one who acts, but also focus on how the research *does* the researcher. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982), for instance, described Foucault's

statement that, since a researcher is "produced by what he is studying; consequently he can never stand outside it" (pp. 124-125). This does not mean that a researcher can know nothing, or aim to know nothing about what she studies (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005). It situates this knowing in relation to power rather than truth (Foucault, 1980).

This particular wine issue became a way to explore how the research does the researcher. As described elsewhere (Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Aporia 2; Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 31), the construction of the character Responsibility was informed in many ways by data from my experiences, beliefs, and practices. In earlier drafts, as mentioned, Responsibility *was* Sarah in the sense that while writing I envisioned my*self*, with my body, my experiences, and even my ongoing thoughts, conversing with the various others in these conversations. But, as also mentioned, as I wrote the character Sarah, I became increasingly aware of both my attempts to tie her down, so to speak, and write her as "the real Sarah" who was consistent with some core and also the impossibility of such a task since I could not separate Sarah from the multiple other data sources informing (consciously and unconsciously) the character construction. In renaming and rewriting Responsibility, Sarah (this *me* as researcher, teacher educator, preservice teacher, etc.) still haunts (Derrida, 1994) Responsibility, as she does all of the characters since I must claim authorship of this text in which these characters come to play their parts in relation to one another. Like the undecidable presence of a ghost, Responsibility is marked by both the presence and absence of Sarah. With this said, Responsibility's alluding to her own wine drinking conjures up an image of Sarah, the researcher, as a wine drinker who, perhaps, drunkenly and irresponsibly conducts various research acts. This image can invoke quite a problem considering that much of conventional research is based on ideas of researcher acting with their full wits about them!

The second relates to the usage of the term Christianity in this dissertation as a tool for exploring the possibilities for and effects of positioning Love and other characters in relation to *it* in multiple ways. I use the term *it* to refer to Christianity, here, in that like any other proper noun intended to name a one-of-a-kind being, it is theorized as a nutshell in poststructural thought, always already cracking under our noses (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 3; Caputo, 1997; Derrida, 1967/1976). Like with other nutshells, certain images and storylines become available which have become sedimented in certain ways, gaining a material force. For example, Karen Spector (2007), in her article about teaching the Holocaust described orthodox meanings of Christianity are often associated with beliefs such "God exists, there is life after death, the Bible is the actual word of God and should be taken literally, hell and Satan exist, and heaven and religious miracles are real" (p. 11). These beliefs have been repeated over and over in communities in ways that make them *the* key ideas of Christianity whereas others have dropped out of site. Similarly, the name Jesus Christ is often referred to as the central figure of the Christianity who most Christian denominations believe is also God the son incarnated who rose from the dead after crucifixion. As a participant in this study said:

I do believe that they are going to hell if they don't believe that Jesus came to earth, died on the cross, and then rose, because that specifically is as far as Christians, because we talk about how, if they ever prove that Jesus did not rise from the dead then our whole Christian faith would be fake (Personal communication, April 14, 2010).

Statements such as these continue to produce an idea that Christianity is just *one* thing which encompasses people who have experienced a change in their hearts despite that there might be much disagreement about what it means to be a Christian. Take a comment made by another interview participant, for instance, who said, "I don't believe that as long as you pray to God you are ok, I don't believe that any religion gets you to heaven. You know, but I also know people that call themselves Christians that do believe that" (personal communication, January 23, 2010) or an article I read in the Week (August 20, 2010) which referred to a pop singer, Katy Perry's reference to herself as Christian. Perry, who is known for her overtly sexual content in her music videos, talked of her evangelical upbringing in the "strictest of families" where she was taught that "dances, movies, and pop culture were the work of Satan" (p. 10). She says that she thinks of herself as Christian but it is more complicated than heaven and hell.

In this situation, wine drinking became a space to look what practices or persons were excluded in the use of the term Christian. Here, Responsibility's statement about Christians in relation to drinking begins to provide such a using and erasing. She does not only refer to Christians as a cohesive group whose members do *not* drink but also as a group which contains diversity, i.e. members who *do* drink. Such a statement invites a positioning of Christians who might drink as in the category and out. Davies and Harre (2000) discussed how in conversations

speakers can position themselves and others by adopting storylines that include cultural stereotypes to which individuals are 'invited to conform, indeed required to conform, if they are to continue to converse with the first speaker in such a way as to contribute to the storylines the person has opened up'' (p. 93). In this instance, Responsibility must simultaneously use the term *Christian* as *one-of-a-kind* while also recognizing its inability to capture and tie down the *one* thing it claims to tie down. Such a double move is a way of putting Christianity "under erasure," (Derrida, 1974), a type of reading that Derrida has said requires a "letting go of each concept at the very moment that I needed to use it." (Derrida in Spivak, 1974, p.xviii). As described elsewhere (Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Aporia 3), I believe that this sort of using and erasing of Christianity, as an identity category, can open up fruitful spaces to explore the possible ways of thinking, speaking, and acting within certain contexts.

[5] See Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Section One, Uninvited Guest 2

[6] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guests 3, 4

[7] I noted this because I have been yearning to explore time in relation to this dissertation work. In particular, I plan to spend time in the future thinking Derrida's (1989/1992) text *Given Time: Counterfeit Money* as it relates to ideas of the gift, love, and hospitality. See Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Section Three, Uninvited Guest 13 for discussion of hospitality.

[8] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 2 for discussion of answering the question *What can I do?*

[9] While I have discussed the site of the research and participants in more detail elsewhere (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Aporias 1, 2, 3), in this note, I provide some data I have collected/analyzed in my dissertation log that I believe invites further consideration about the ever-shifting boundaries of qualitative research and questions such as where is the field, who are the participants, and where do researcher's responsibilities lie in terms of ongoing reflexivity.

> *I cannot go to a coffee shop without having someone sit near me who is talking about glorifying God. Right now, a guy and girl are talking about how to best spend their time in God's service. Did this always happen or am I just particularly tuned into words like God, Jesus, love, and mission? (Dissertation log, 9-28-10)*
>
> *Holy shit, every single day someone is reading their Bible next to me at a coffee shop. I can't get away from it. Today it is a couple with their baby of 5 months I am guessing. She has her petite Bible open and his is closed next to him while he writes about something-- maybe which person in the coffee shop has a heart which needs to be saved today. Okay, that was wrong. (dissertation log, 10-2-10)*

[10] Caputo (2007); In this note I briefly describe how I came to find the citation for the text to which this note is attached. I first heard Caputo's name uttered as an answer to a question a fellow student asked during a doctoral seminar entitled The Postmodern Turn. The question went something like, "How can I make sense of postmodernism and religion?" and an answer, offered by the professor was something along the lines of "John Caputo writes about that." Soon after, I began to notice his name popping up in articles about Jacques Derrida and deconstruction, cited I have always presumed because Caputo's almost conversational way of writing about Derrida's works and thoughts almost begged a reader to believe that she were overhearing a particularly engaging dinner conversation between the two scholars in which she was privy to the type of elevator talk of deconstruction, religion, or love that Derrida might have used with his parents and not to the rooms full of philosophers he so often spoke to (see Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Section One, Uninvited Guest 1 for an excerpt from Caputo). Quickly, Caputo's texts filled their own shelf in my bookcase, and his quotes were carefully typed into my dictionary I use to help me think and write. I hear his words often in my head, sprinkled amongst the others I can't seem to help but categorize as poststructural their probable resistance.

[11] Apple (2006); This note is a brief data trail which describes how I came to find Apple or not find Apple soon enough, as appeared to be the case. My failure to know the name, Michael Apple, and other similar stories have come to mind often throughout this study. Early in my doctoral program, a professor mentioned his name while describing the "hidden curriculum," one of Apple's key ideas (Apple, 2004). I had said something to the professor

that must have obviously demonstrated my lack of understanding about Apple's idea that students are taught norms, values, and dispositions just by living and interacting with the routines and expectations circulating in schools and institutions. She told me to think about what Michael Apple would say. After telling her that I did not know who that was, she shockingly stated that this was impossible. How could I not know who Michael Apple was having already earned a Master's in education? (And now I ask myself the same question) While I went home and devoured Apple's text for quite some time, I have not read Apple often after those first years. Thus, I have no idea how I happened upon this particular Apple (2006), only that I had checked it out of the library long before I started my dissertation proposal and have been reading it off and on since. I bring this *not reading Apple up* here though, because in a way, the assertion that I had done something wrong because I did not *know* Apple has informed my data collection/analysis in this study in multiple ways. One of those ways is that I have been mindful of the using of theory and theorists *on* participants, and thus I have been mindful of those spaces when I seem to be unable to think without a certain theorist. I have provided examples of this throughout as it occurred in writing and interviews (Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Section Two, Uninvited Guest 26; Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1)

[12] See this chapter, Uninvited Guest 3

[13] Noddings (2008); This note is a brief description of how I came to find Noddings. Interestingly, Nel Noddings has been the bane of my existence and one whose call I am actively taking up during this dissertation process. I first heard Noddings name during a research presentation given by a candidate for a position in some department in the college of education where I study. I do not remember the department, the candidate, or even the topic of the presentation. All I can remember is a professor, standing up in the back of the room during the time for questions, stating that the candidate must read the work of Nel Noddings if s/he were to say anything at all about whatever it is s/he was talking about. Hence, Noddings has become someone to be read in education.

Since, I have read some of her books (Noddings, 1995, 2004), including articles she has written and of articles by others who address critiques (Hoagland, 1990; Wiedman, 2002). As much as I have tried to give her the time I thought she deserved, as did this professor whose image stuck with me, I have had much difficulty reading her texts. In other words, while I am embarrassed to write this, her books especially were often the ones where I would read an entire page and have no idea that I had actually been reading since my mind had been elsewhere. With that said, much of what I understand about Noddings' ideas about an ethics of care comes from the educational scholars who have taken her up (e.g., Holbrook, 2010) and critiqued it (see above). I continued an ongoing reading of these works throughout this study, since, as described elsewhere, love (and care, which is often interchangeable with love) was an important concept in this study since it was prominent in relation to both Christian and social justice missions.

It was not until I came across Noddings's (2008) essay *The New Outspoken Atheism and Education*, that I found myself reading and rereading one of her works. In it, she expressed a concern about the necessity but perhaps impossibility of dealing with religion and public education in a critical way. She called upon educators to stop fearing separations between church and state, which she has long identified as a key reason why teachers fail to address religion in schools (Noddings, 2008), and instead to teach *about* religion in schools. While she detailed a religious literacy including ideas such as vocabulary, beliefs, aesthetics, as a necessary means for understanding other cultures and oneself, she admitted this literacy could most likely only remain a theoretical idea. Considering the current climate where conservatives believe they are being attacked by liberal ideas and considering a time when religious beliefs are likely too strong for information to be presented in any way other than dogmatically, she doubted the practicality of this new critical literacy.

While I agree with Noddings and many others in education (e.g., Boston, 2005; Cooper & Randell, 2008; Lewy & Betty, 2007; Noddings, 2008; Palmer, 2003; Passe & Willox, 2009, Whitcomb et al., 2008), that there is a necessity to keep the boundaries between religion and education as distinct as possible, practically, I have long since worried about the blurring that is already occurring. In the area where this study took place, Christianity is very prevalent. I heard my students, for instance, talk often of their deep involvement with Christian organizations and short-term mission trips which allowed them to interact with cultural others. I have overheard principals admit those "federal regulations" that separate church and state do not apply to their Christian communities. I have passed by Gideon Bibles placed neatly in glass cases in the entry ways of schools. Thus, practically, a theoretical discussion doesn't get me very far. What discussions might occur, for instance, if almost an entire room full of teachers

informed me that their mission was in fact to change students' hearts for Jesus? Would a desire to prevent them from doing so be a move against religion? Could I even check myself in relation to religion out in the open if I needed to? Thus I find myself here, in part due to Noddings's (2008) article, searching for spaces where theoretical and practical can work together and inform one another.

[14] As described in the Dinner Conversations, Telephone One (Uninvited Guest, 30; aporia 1), throughout this study, I was on the lookout for multiple terms including Christianity and social justice. On one occasion, I did a Google search of the terms, including the words "teacher education" and amassed quite a wide range of articles, blogs, and other pages. Many of these related to a decision made in 2006 by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in relation to the phrase "social justice" and the removal of the term from its list of potential dispositions, or professional attitudes, values, and beliefs, that teacher preparation programs might wish to see in the teachers it prepares. After almost a year of fighting charges from various conservative groups that NCATE was aiding in the indoctrination of teacher education students by including a term "necessarily fraught with contested ideological significance" (NAS, 2005, pp. 1-2; Will, 2006), NCATE's president, Arthur Wise, denied the assertion but dropped the term anyway, citing a recognition that social justice was "susceptible to a variety of definitions" (p. 255). What I find interesting and relevant about this dispositions debate is how it became a space where questions of not only whose version of social justice was welcomed and required but also whether or not such versions conflicted with a combination of economically conservative politics and Christian beliefs. One of 40 to post comments under an article entitled *A spirited disposition debate* (Powers, 2006), said: "Two mantras of the education left: 'Believers need not apply!' and 'Shut up and sign the check!' Social Justice? Whose version? Yours or mine. And, who gets to decide." (posted by donallover on October 13, 2007).

[15] I have yet to come up with any good reason why Responsibility or the ellipses would have jokingly referred to Jesus as the original social justice educator or if I have heard someone say this before. I think maybe Caputo (2007) referred to Jesus as such. I am also unsure of why I noted this section, but for some reason I did. Hence, I treat it as another example of how subjects are made in writing but also another invitation for the reader and writer to revisit this space later with additional data.

[16] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One Uninvited Guest 70 for discussion of Christianity and the site of research

[17] Noddings, 2008, p. 386

[18] Noddings, 2008, p. 387; see Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Section Two, Uninvited Guest 4

[19] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Introduction

[20] See Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Section One, Uninvited Guest 3 for a discussion of the phrase "give a shit" that in earlier drafts replaced the phrase "care deeply about others."

[21] When deciding whether or not to write these conversations in the format of the progressive dinner, I became stumped as to whether or not I wanted to make a move as an author in which the structure of the dinner would necessitate a progression from one beginning point to the next. Poststructural theories, according to Peters & Burbules (2004), aim to question the very metanarratives of sustained progress through time that are available for making sense of our lives. But, like any of the concepts of metaphysics, we cannot escape *time* nor the various ways in which time is useful for making sense of our lives and the lives of others. I use *progress* and the *progressive dinner* as a way to pay attention to how time affects this study in multiple ways and how characters (including the researcher, participants, theorists, writing partners, readers, and so on) must make sense of themselves in relation to it. Hence, the dinner progresses in three planned stages (appetizers, dinner, and dessert), but there are also what I call "Time Lapses" which were unplanned events in the sequence of the dinner. The endnotes function, in part, to complicate the story of progress as I use them to pull in data from various moments in time as well as to refer the reader to spaces that arrive later in the text. I considered using hypertext to easily link these referred spaces together for the reader and I might have done so if I had time. I must admit though, I like the idea of forcing the reader to make a choice as to whether or not they are going to take the time to scroll through the document or flip to the text in a paper copy. I like the idea that they might happen upon other notes or texts that might be read differently the second time around.

CHAPTER 3

APPETIZERS

This conversation takes place at the home of Responsibility, a teacher education who yearns for social justice although she often sees it with a poststructural twist as an open construct which cannot be tied down. Responsibility has invited a number of people to attend a progressive dinner, which she has designed to be a meal that takes place in three courses, each taking place at a different person's house. Since Responsibility was a little over-zealous and invited numerous guests, at each house seating charts were necessary but designated as the responsibility of the host. In this scene, Responsibility has placed herself at a table with two much esteemed scholars, Paulo Freire and Jacques Derrida. The former has been widely taken up in social justice teacher education, a field from which Responsibility drew much guidance for her teaching and research practices. The latter has been read and cited widely in qualitative educational research, a field from which Responsibility also drew much guidance about her teaching and research practices. The three know each other through telephone conversations, but Responsibility has and found useful many of Freire (e.g., 1970, 1998) and Derrida's (e.g., 1974/1967, 1992) texts.

Since Responsibility has planned the progressive dinner and has access to the guest list, she has forgotten that neither Freire nor Derrida are aware that she has invited a guest who she met just the other day, Love. Responsibility refers to Love throughout the conversation while Freire and Derrida are not aware that she is talking of an actual person, a preservice teacher who is learning to teach for social justice in a different institution than Responsibility teaches. As a

professing Christian who believes her mission field is everywhere, Love approached Responsibility in a coffee shop and proceeded to talk with her about her mission to love others while glorifying God. Responsibility did not disclose her religious affiliation, if there is one, with Love (or Freire or Derrida for that matter although Responsibility knew quite well that was a professing Catholic (see Stenberg, 2006) and Derrida (1993) could "pass as an atheist" (p. 154).

Responsibility:

I would like to welcome you, Freire and Derrida, and thank you for agreeing to join me for appetizers and for allowing me to pick your brains about this pesky little thing that has been on my mind lately –Love.[1] As I told you both before when I called you about the seating arrangements, I've been having a huge problem with Love in my life lately. I feel almost sick with Love, and since I've heard through the grapevine that your words have helped others with their own queries in multiple ways,[2] I just thought you two might be just what the doctor ordered. I am not quite sure what sort of cure I desire though.

Derrida:

Let's not worry about the cure, as you say, and just begin. Actually, on second thought, perhaps we should begin with just that—the presumed cure for your love sickness. The word cure is quite a tricky one, you know. Well, its Greek translation, pharmakon, is at any rate. It's what I call an undecidable because it can't seem to conform to either side of the binary to which it's said to belong, which is in this case cure/poison. Perhaps you've heard that I have had the pleasure of tracing how Plato used the term in his dialogues and I have noted how the possibilities of meaning for this word were quite contradictory. For instance, its definition was both a cure and a poison and Plato used it in both these contexts as well as in many others.[3]

Responsibility:

Oh yes. I have heard mention of this before, but I am not quite sure how you mentioning it here relates to my Love quandary. I was just using sickness as a metaphor, really. I did not mean that I was actually *sick* with Love or that I was intending to find a cure.[4] And to be honest, I hope you won't spend the entirety of this conversation noting all of the contradictory possibilities in the words I use. That seems quite exhausting and not very nice. And frankly, it makes me feel like your aim is to liberate me simplicity and into some realm of contradictory thoughts or something.

Freire:

Must we start out so combative? Tisk, tisk. I must say that I was hoping we'd all think of this conversation as a dialogue of sorts, where we all come to the table ready to rethink this object of knowledge, love, that you have so kindly brought forth.[5] As you have noted, we all have some things to say about love, and of course, like all words we use to describe ourselves, our worlds, and others, it should be rethought in a space where we can stimulate one another to think and re-think the former's thoughts and re-word the world[6] I don't want to speak for you Derrida, but if I am not mistaken, no one here is claiming to have received a mandate from God to save the other, with the undiscussed truth in hand to be inserted into another's head.[7]

Derrida:

Yes, thank you for the intervention, Freire. I find my work is often taken up in ways I had not intended.[8] Nevertheless, I do believe that we can all claim to be here under a pretence of openness to the other, even if you and I have very different ideas about this truth you speak of . At any rate, if I may offer a little precautionary advice on the matter before we proceed though—

language does have a way of allowing us, how can I say this, to say "more, less, or something other than what [we] *would mean.*"[9]

Freire:

Derrida, if I may intervene again. I must beg you to explain what you are trying to do with all this talk of language? Scare her into saying nothing? With these precautions, should we not proceed then? Should we just call off the conversation all together? Of course it is important to recognize that language is never neutral, but we cannot fail to realize that it is through language that we make sense of the world. And it is through a focus on language that we can come to know our place in the world and our true humanity.[10] I am sure we can return to this point in a bit. First, though, let's get back to Responsibility's concerns. Before you speak again, I'd like to thank you, Responsibility, for your hospitality. I am glad that you have invited us here to help you think. I am sure there are many others who you could have invited to converse with you today about love. I remember you telling me on the telephone, for instance, that you have found that many of your undergraduate students often talk of love along with references to a Christian God, which you often see referred to, for instance, in email signatures which state "With love in Christ" or "Jesus is love" and so on. You have invited us here today, instead of, for example, Jesus, so I hope that in time you will share with us your reasons for bringing us here instead of others.[11]

Derrida:

I second that—not the part about language allowing us to know our true humanity or you telling us exactly *why* you have invited us and not others. I mean the part about the thanks for the hospitality. Hospitality is quite connected to love, you know. Each relates to the problem with language I mentioned just a moment ago as it relates to Plato's writings—with

deconstruction. I'm sure I don't have time to explain; perhaps if I were more responsible I would refuse altogether (Derrida, 1994/1997). As I have said before "I use this word for the sake of a rapid convenience, though it is a word I have never liked and one whose fortune has disagreeably surprised me" (Derrida, 1983, p. 44).[1] At any rate, you must understand that regardless of my attention to these aporias of language, I am not an advocate for quietism as Freire has just implied. Urgency is what decisions, such as what to say next, are all about.[12] While I have a feeling you, Responsibility, have a bit more to say about love before we continue on, might I trample on your hospitality, if such things as hospitality exist, for one moment longer and ask that you allow me to make a brief comment about this attention to language that you and Freire seem to be so concerned about?[13]

Responsibility:

Sure, go ahead, but I must say that I am having a hard time not taking offense to you doubting my hospitality. At any rate, please remember that our time here is limited. We are scheduled to leave for the next house at 6:30.

Derrida:

Yes, I know we have a schedule to follow. Isn't our present always already marked with schedule and timetables intended to move us into the future—the foreseeable future that is, the stuff of plans and calculation. As my friend Jack Caputo says, I like to think with the idea of the absolute future, though, the unforeseeable future where the stuff of justice, democracy, hospitality, and perhaps this love you talk of exist, if they exist at all that is. It's what I hope and pray for-- that which has not yet arrived--the *to come.*[14] And it is why I say that the task of

[1] I have inserted the citation in the text in those instances when I added the reference after I had already completed and organized the notes. To add an additional note would disrupt the entire chain of references throughout the text.

reading another—in writing, in speech, in gestures, and so on—is always *in front of us*; before us.[15]

Freire:

But we are right in front of you now, Derrida. Sitting around a table already talking. What do you mean that the task is in front of and to come?

Derrida:

Well, this has to do with the idea of the present, really, the idea that actually being there in the present allows us to know the whole identity of something or someone. I have written of this heavily in my texts, and one in particular on Plato, which I understand you just recently read.[16] With Plato, for instance, I was able to question this *being there* that he said made writing merely a representation of speech. What I did was look into his text through the more orthodox accounts of his work which privileged the talking over writing, and found the contradictory logic that was already there, within the text, like, for instance, what I mentioned earlier, how pharmakon could be made to mean all these different things that in many ways had nothing to do with Plato's intentions.

So this is what I mean by reading being in front of us. I want to be open to being surprised by what is going on behind the other's back, so-to-speak, in the language of texts. So I must start again and again and again each time I read another. Or else we might get caught up into thinking that the orthodox meanings of things are the only possible readings. It is in the possibility to read otherwise, other than we have already read, that understanding might be possible, this impossibility is what I hope for and what I love.[17]

Responsibility:

I think I know what you mean actually about the reading being in front of us—never finished. Just the other day I was thinking about this conversation I had with a woman in my school's locker room and I swear, I was remembering it totally differently. While I am pretty sure I remembered the words accurately, all the meanings I was attributing to each of us had changed completely.[18]

Derrida:

Interesting. What had you been doing just before you were rethinking this conversation?

Responsibility:

I was watching television, actually, this movie called *Saved* that I've seen at least eight times since it was released in 2004. I am going to go ahead and guess neither of you have seen it. The pop singer Mandy Moore is in it and so is that kid, Macaulay Culkin, from *Home Alone*. Anyway, it's a teen comedy that takes the form of a religious satire—hitting on topics like teen pregnancy, homophobia, and divorce all within the context of a Christian private high school. So, yeah, I know, those topics don't seem too satirical especially considering the US contexts, where constitutional amendments have been proposed to legislate who can and cannot legally marry based in what are widely considered religious definitions of marriage[19] but the film pretty much tried to hit this stuff head on.

The main character, for instance, a girl who deeply believes in Jesus Christ, has premarital sex with her boyfriend in order to try to save him from his sinful ways. He had just told her that he believed himself to be gay and as we all know, homosexuality is often frowned upon in Christian communities.[20] She becomes pregnant and is quickly ostracized by many members of the school community, including her previous best friend, the pop singer character,

who scolded her for her sinful ways, all in the name of love. She, of course, the pop singer that is, has her own sin struggles and not so ironically ends up ramming her car into an enormous effigy of Christ in a fit of anger near the end of the movie. It was all pretty funny and the pop singer does a great job or portraying a stereotypical hypocrite who speaks one thing and does another.

So, anyway, while I was watching this web of judgment related to each character's beliefs about what a loving Christian should or should not do for herself, her friends, and her family, the image of the girl I saw in the locker room the other day kept popping into my head, and I started replaying the conversation I was telling you about.

Derrida:

Share more please. I am intrigued.

Freire:

Me as well.

Responsibility:

Okay, just as a little background, so conversations with this girl are usually pretty general—a how's it going kind of thing. But on this day, she cornered me over near the hair drying station with an excited declaration that she had found her calling in life. I replied that I wanted to hear more about it, obviously, since that was the appropriate thing to do when someone appears to be chomping at the bit to share something. I figured if I was a second late getting home, the baby sitter would understand. Ten minutes later, though, after I had grown pretty weary of her spiel about taking up God's mission to love others by working with the homeless, I had to stop her mid-sentence, wish her well, and scoot out the door.

That's how I remembered it happening the first time, along with all of her talk in the middle about the one particular homeless woman who amazingly "used her *own* money" to help reunite a boy with his missing backpack. "Can you believe it?" she was telling me. "That woman who had *nothing* used her *own* money to help another person! And she is *homeless*!" I remembered the words exactly as well as the feelings of shock and disgust that accompanied her query as to how a woman who was "way behind" in more ways than one could possibly do something that was so "loving." And on my way home I remember questioning how the girl could be so blind—how she could not see how terribly unloving these streams of judgments can be?[21] Who did she think she was anyway, some person so privileged enough to go around doling out love without any concern as to whether this particular woman wanted or needed her love? [22] And furthermore, what did being homeless have to do with one's ability or desire to love another person?

Derrida:

So how did you see it differently with the movie in mind?[23]

Responsibility:

Well, that's the thing. I am not quite sure really. When the pop star character would come on the screen, you know the one who was positioned as this super hypocrite, well, I would often see the locker room girl instead. It was like they were the same person. So in this one scene, for instance, where the pop star character decides to confront the pregnant girl directly about her wayward paths, she ends up getting very angry when the pregnant girl doesn't readily accept the prayer she offers her. Of course she had just forcibly tossed the pregnant girl into her van and then preceded to lay her hands on her in prayer and demand the exorcism of the demons inside her, but that is beside the point. So the pop star character gets so pissed that she ends up

throwing her Bible at the pregnant girl and screaming "I'm filled with Christ Love" to which the pregnant girl responds with something like "The Bible is not a weapon."[24]

So I know this story is getting really long and I promise it's almost over, but I realized that this scene that I used to find hysterical didn't feel funny anymore. It felt too real. And I suddenly imagined my locker room friend launching her Bible at homeless people everywhere, not necessarily physically like the pop star character had just done, but through this facade of love. I don't know if I am explaining myself here, but it was like Love became this really dangerous weapon. And I didn't know what I understood anymore. I didn't know who this girl was anymore. I feared that my reading of her was totally wrong—unethical even—like how could I possibly claim that she was hoisting Love about as a weapon?[25] So I figured I'd better reread, so-to-speak, and get away from myself a bit.

Derrida:

Ah ha. A classic aporia.[26] A stopping point where you aren't quite sure which way is right, or what is just, yet you know you must act. This is what deconstruction has to do with love, and I might add with justice, if such things exist. Both entail the relation to the other that we cannot reach and therefore cannot know even if we appear to be acting with justice in mind.[27] To be responsible to the infinite distance between you and your locker room friend, for instance, you would have to act without ever knowing whether or not you have gotten her "right" or if she gets you "right" or even if there is a "right." You see, in order do the work of justice, to do the work of love, per se, in order to open up words to a future that is unexpected, unforeseeable, to come[28], you would have to be responsible to what isn't "there" in the sense of what is not readily perceptible.[29]

Freire:

What isn't there? What about what is there? Like a girl who cannot see that she is using love as a tool for the oppressor—reproducing this idea that this homeless woman is somehow less than she is.[2]

Responsibility:

What do you mean a tool for the oppressor? Anyway, can we just stop for a second? I am way overwhelmed right now and have no idea what we are talking about. Plus I am still trying to make sense of how Derrida's work is not relativistic and how either of your work is even remotely practical for public schools. Whether we think it's loving or not or driven by love or whatever, it isn't like we are going to go around taking Jesus Christ as our object of knowledge or encouraging preservice teachers that the task of reading Jesus is always in front of them.

Freire:

Who said anything about public schools? And what's all this about Jesus Christ as our object of knowledge?

Derrida:

Did you hear that alarm? Must be time to head to dinner.

[2] In Freire & Macedo (1995), they talk of determining the oppressor and oppressed in detail. See Apéritif/Digestif , Citing Theorists

Endnotes

[1] In the revision process which transformed this conversation from its previous form in my comprehensive exams, I found myself capitalizing the word *love*, converting it to a proper noun, at various points in the conversation while leaving it in its common form in others. With each capitalization came feelings of discomfort. Since an aim in this dissertation is to be responsible to complexities, employing what Foucault (1997) has called an "ethics of discomfort," I decided to explore this discomfort in the writing of this conversation and in its final form because I believed it had direct relevance to the inquiry I undertook in this study related to the production of the preservice teacher in relation to mission work. This note is about that writing experience as well as an analysis of how the capitalization might function in the reading of this conversation in a way that informs the possible ways for a preservice teacher to be positioned in relation to mission work and how that mission work can be positioned in relation to the preservice teacher.

Aporia

The first capitalization occurred in the sentence to which this note is attached, in which Responsibility refers to Love as a "pesky little thing" that has been on Responsibility's mind as of late. As described elsewhere (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Selves; Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 4), I had constructed a character, Love, which was informed by a multiplicity of data sources. Having been writing this character often, I was not surprised when I caught myself inserting the character's proper name in the place of the common form that had been in previous drafts. What did surprise me though is what this insertion seemed to *do* to the meaning of the text and the possibilities for understanding between the characters in the text. For starters, in the sentence in question, Responsibility was now referring to an embodied character as a "pesky little thing," and since neither the character Freire nor Derrida had met Love and perhaps had no knowledge of her existence, suddenly a new element of confusion entered the conversation. I began to wonder what might happen if some characters were speaking of a *person*, a supposed not-thing, while others were presumably speaking of a *thing*. And more importantly, I began to question why it felt so wrong to place *person* and *thing* in the same category even though my poststructural theories were not necessarily encouraging me otherwise.

While these questions, at first, seemed tangential to the larger project at hand, as I continued to experiment with the capitalization of *love* throughout the conversation, I began to see this writing as a way to examine the possibilities for interaction between Love and Responsibility in ways I had not before. In the words of Bronwyn Davies (2000), who will be a prominent character in this note, I began to "to see what 'I' [was] capable of. That 'I' I [was] trying, at least momentarily, to extract from the sticky discursive web[s]" (p. 16). The *I*s in my case became Love, a preservice teacher, and Responsibility, a teacher educator who referred to her. To keep going, to keep writing, I had to explicitly think one of these *I*'s (Love) as just a thing to be chatted about since the *love* Derrida and Freire spoke of was not in reference to an embodied character. This, of course, became all the more interesting (and difficult) in a conversation which questioned the possibilities of accessing the meaning of any *thing*, whether it be a person (a subject who makes sense) or a thing (an object to be made sense of). This subject/object binary began to have new importance in my analysis, where like other binaries, its unraveling threatened to overturn whole systems of sense making, and in this case, the sense that could be made of teaching selves in relation to love.

Poststructural thought invites a view of the subject/object binary which disrupts the supposed tranquility of each term as a knowable entity in that it makes the *being* of the subject problematic (Derrida, 1989/1992; Foucault, 1983). Davies (2000), for instance, discussed how the subject is viewed not as a noun, but as a verb, always in process of being spoken and re-spoken into existence (p. 137). A writer runs into a problem though, when the grammar used to produce a text that can be read and understood echoes the more humanist version of a self as a unified sense-maker who has consistence throughout time. Pronouns, for instance, provide a structure for speaking the subject in ways which signal a supposed unified identity that is similar to itself despite its continual becoming within different discursive spaces. An *I* presumably refers to a one-of-a-kind being named so by a proper noun, but like all words defined within poststructural thought, the *I* is a nutshell, a conceptual placeholder, that is always already cracking under our noses (Caputo, 1997; See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 4 for discussion as relates to researcher and Christianity; See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 4 as relates to voice). The task of the subject (or a writer like me), as Davies (2000) suggested is to "read the texts of their 'selving'' (p. 137) or in the

words of Richardson (1997), to see the self as both "product and producer, object and subject" (p. 2) while at the same time doing so within the grammar that limits such thought. It is a way of putting love "under erasure," (Derrida, 1974), a type of reading that can defamiliarize love from its more conventional contexts in teacher education.

Data Collection/Analysis

As described elsewhere, I had begun collecting/analyzing data in relation to the preservice teacher and love before the official start of this study (IRB approval; see timeline) in multiple ways that would not conflict with human subjects review requirements (Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 28; Dinner Conversations, Dinner, Uninvited Guest 1 for examples; Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30 for further description and theorization). For example, during my comprehensive exams, I had read widely about Foucault's analytic approach, genealogy (see Foucault, 1978 for example). I had experimented with what I called "genelogical moves" as a part of that project by collecting/analyzing data about the use of love throughout various time periods in the *Journal of Teacher Education* and *The Elementary School Journal.* In this way, I had been interested in love, if such a thing exists, for quite some time.

With the capitalization of Love, though, a new sort of thinking also seemed possible. As mentioned above, I developed a character, Love, as a tool for exploring how a subject, a self, with a mission to *be* loving or to *give* love might be positioned and position herself and others in various ways. I did this as a means of writing "under erasure" (Derrida, 1974). Derrida said in a discussion following a lecture he gave in 1968 that such work requires a "letting go of each concept at the very moment that [he] needed to use it" (quoted in Spivak, 1974, p. xviii). Such a writing required me to write Love as a one-of-a-kind being while simultaneously inviting an investigation of this proper noun's inability to capture and tie down the *one* thing it's name (or its mission) claims to tie down (love).This Love-as-analytic-tool was *not* some composite that revealed something about the personality (the feelings, intentions, desires, etc.) of the data sources that informed its construction, but was useful for exploring the possibilities for sense making available within certain contexts. As such Love was not a personification of love, as some *thing* which could be wielded , owned, or discarded, but instead was a conceptual placeholder (Davies, 2004), a space where thoughts could happen in writing (Davies, 2008). In this way, Love became both an *object* (who was produced through her relations with others and the storylines available to her through which she recognized herself as belonging to certain categories and not others) and also a *subject* (a producer, who through her actions could amongst other things repeat, resist, or alter the practices through which she was recognizable as a subject). Love as both object and subject was made to mean in relation to missions as she, in turn, made the missions. With this in mind, I began to think Love in relation to the term *missionary* as well.

Preservice Teacher as Missionary

This thinking of Love, who was a preservice teacher, in relation to the term *missionary* was not new for me. I had heard participants talk of missionary work and missionary lifestyles before often sprinkled in with talk of the mission field being everywhere and their work in teaching (xee Dinner Conversations, Preparations). As an example, an excerpt from an individual interview is below. The participant and I had just been talking of her mission experiences out of the country and she was discussing her plans for the future when she said:

> . . . well I definitely think that, you know that everywhere is a mission field and you know it doesn't matter whether you are here. I think that a lot of people have this idea that you know, you have to go international or you have to go somewhere, for that to be your mission field and I definitely think that if we're living, you know, according to the word, you know, you should be living that quote missionary lifestyle everywhere, making that a part of your life. (Personal communication, January 23, 2010)

She continued on to say that teaching was a part of that lifestyle and she was definitely called to teach. As described elsewhere (Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God), all participants had described their *mission field as everywhere*, and I had even presented a paper with the phrase that participants exact quote in the title (Bridges-Rhoads, 2011). While this participant did not refer to herself directly as a missionary, it seemed that if the field was everywhere, it might

not be far off to think those who work there as missionaries. Other interview participants had during similar discussions of their mission work. One participant said:

> If you are living like Christ, then you are always supposedly showing Him all the time because you are to be His lamp and be projecting His light. So if you are doing that and really living in Christ then you are going to be a missionary all the time. (Personal communication, January 21, 2010)

Another discussed how being a Christian and doing mission work should be in line with her everyday life, saying for instance, that she was "not supposed to view [her] life being a missionary as different than being a teacher" (Personal communication, May 7, 2010).

There were obvious problems that came to mind with this idea of teachers going into the field, which is what the classroom is often called in teacher education (e.g., field experiences). There was a "separation of church and state" to contend with (see Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1). There were also questions as to whether or not a teacher would be able to teach and respect students who were religiously diverse (e.g., Baurain, 2007). Sometimes participants echoed that sentiment, one saying, for instance that she was unsure how she would handle it if a Muslim student were in her class (Personal communication, August 8, 2010). Another described how there is only "one way" and that is "through Jesus" (Personal communication, August 21, 2010). She continued on to say, "[I]t seems very intolerant but I mean, it is what it is, it is what I believe and that's truth and so there aren't multiple truths with that" (Personal communication, August 21, 2010). Knowing that I was not interested in determining whether or not such statements or behaviors by participants were actually tolerant or intolerant (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God) and instead I was more interested in the effects of statements such as calling oneself a missionary, I continued to ponder these statements and think them in relation to other data.

The first moment that came to mind was a discussion I had with someone who knew vaguely about my study, enough to connect the terms *Christianity* and *mission* to it. I ran into her one day and she suggested that I should watch a video she has recently seen, *Our Spirits Don't Speak English: Indian Boarding Schools* (2008). I watched the documentary later that week and wrote about it while I watched, describing, for instance, the images from US government run schools in the late 1800s that were designed to "kill the Indian and save the man." Christian missions were talked of throughout, such as references to manifest destiny and bible training in the schools. I described a scene in my log with a character portraying the voice of Richard Pratt, a founder and superintendent of one of the Pennsylvania schools, who used the analogy of "Christian baptism" to describe the process of soaking children through with more civilized ways of living. The image on the screen was a photo of three young boys in large barrels with bare chests and short hair, due to the stripping of all "native" clothes and hair.

While these images were certainly disturbing, and not so unlike many of the other images I had read about in early coursework in Tataki's (1993) *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*. I had even written my course paper describing the Christian references that were throughout the text and their relation to the horrific violence and oppression of various marginalized groups throughout history. I wrote then of being unsure of how or if describing the various oppressive actions of certain persons, who were often Christian or Christian missionaries, would open up (or close down) conversations in teacher education classrooms—even if these discussions of individuals were not aimed at locating the evil doers but instead situating these persons within larger hegemonic relations at play in society and its structures. And again, when I watched the film, the same sentiments arose. I wrote in my log, for instance, **"**I keep thinking that this isn't the way to get Christians to think about their work since my participants seem to see their work as something very different" (dissertation log, May 27, 2010). Statements like these, which continuously blurred my want for immediate action as a teacher educator and my want to be open to the unforeseeable as a researcher.

Movement in Thought

While it pains me to write this sentence right now, time does not permit me to further explore this positioning of preservice teacher as missionary here in the way that I had planned. In order to continue thinking about the positioning of the preservice teacher as missionary, I did spend much time with my interview transcripts, reading and rereading, writing and rewriting, on this image of missionaries in schools. I also did a variety of searches for the term *missionary* and found a wide variety of uses, most in negative way as an undesirable position, but due to a computer crash in the late days of the study, I cannot locate the document in which I described this

literature review or the descriptions of the articles I read since I did these searches after I had closed down the dissertation log (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 14 for discussion). Pulling from those articles I had printed and the notes I do have access to, I offer a few examples as well as an excerpt from a discussion with some participants without discussion. I end with an excerpt from my dissertation log in which I wrote through various images of missionaries including Native American boarding schools and a preservice teacher. Interestingly, I situated this story, in part, in my own home, where a child waits patiently for his mother on the green chair that sits in my nursery. I invite the reader to think this blurring while reading the excerpt as well. In addition, I invite the reader to continue to think these examples and this note in relation other parts of the dissertation (e.g., Dinner Conversations, Dinner) as well as the specific capitalization of Love in this chapter and others. I also invite a pondering of questions related to what discussions might be possible or impossible when thinking and talking religion in relation to discussions of culture or culturally responsive practices (e.g., Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a; See also Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 31; Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 4).

- Weah, Simmons, McClellan (2000) worried that service learning was often a "white-dominated movement, driven by a missionary zeal" (p. 673).
- Labaree (2010) described Teach for America's approach to teacher preparation as a "form of slumming, a missionary effort by the White middle class to elevate minorities and the lower classes through the medium of education" (p. 52).
- Nieto described the "good" teachers in her study as *not* seeing their work as "missionary work" which she described as having a sense of saving students in ways that "inevitably doomed good intentions" (Nieto, 2005a, p. 205).
- Four participants, too, echoed this sentiment in a focus group discussion when I asked them to directly discuss their missionary work in relation to historical images of US missionaries:

Participant 1: I think one of the most beautiful things about the God that we believe in is the fact that He came to us. And the instance with the mission that you were talking about. they made them. They took them and made them like themselves instead of going to them and meeting them where they are.

Participant 2 (P2): it is just like if you look at the ministry of Jesus. He traveled around and He would sit down and eat with tax collectors and sinners, you know, the people that the Pharisees and others righteous, righteous people viewed as, you know, disgusting,

Participant 3: trash

All: Yeah

P2: hmmm, so, like if you just look at the ministry of Jesus and how He meets everyone where they are, hmmm, and no matter like what their baggage is, hmmm, that should be the Christian lifestyle. That should be the way, like missions work. like going to them and like, to their culture, not trying to conform them or change the way they look or do things but just sharing with them

All: Right, yes

P2: The truth, which is the gospel and the good news of Jesus Christ (Personal communication, August 29, 2010)

- I have excerpted the following data collection/analysis example from my log, July 29, 2010:

I see a multi-story wooden house. One that looks like it might be made from Lincoln Logs. Only bigger and filled with little Indian children in pristine uniforms to make them appear as one. One and the same, away from homes, and perhaps parents who thought their little ones would have a better life if they learned to work, think, and live the ways of the white man. The Christian white man. Who would tell them about Jesus being the way to something better. At least in the afterlife.

The house shifts to a brick duplex with clothes hanging on lines out front. Shoes hang too with tiny yards neatly kept. The duplexes are many. Government owned. With little windows and little brown faces looking out

waiting for the white girls to come pick them up for milkshakes or maybe a Bible story and games out in the yard. They'll bring popsicles too. And love of course.

The school house is still bare. Mostly. Except for walls with lists on them. Numbers, words, or some other knowledge to be picked up and housed inside little brown bodies. The student teacher stands by the door with a smile, hiding her disappointment that she isn't allowed to spend more time loving on the kids. Getting to know them. Letting that love poke some holes in hearts. To make room for Jesus one day. And a better life. At least in the afterlife.

Another different house I see is tall. With shutters just painted. An attempt to control the holes the carpenter bees drilled. They like to fly around her son's ears buzzing him into hysterics. Inside he sits in a big green chair waiting to hear his favorite book. Nothing better than mom squeezing into the space he left. Bodies nuzzled against each other as the words fill the air with fantasies to be realized one day, perhaps. He waits a while though. No time for books today.

Mom is busy reading in a different school house adorned with her equally white classmates. Trying to figure out what she is supposed to see when she "reads" this video her own teacher told her to watch today. The one about the Indian children and those bad "Christians" from back in the day. At least that is what they called themselves. Not like her. Not like her.

[2] I came to think Derrida and Freire might help me think about love by word-of-mouth. The first, Derrida, was actually an overheard conversation which happened during my early coursework in which a professor directed a student to read Caputo (2001) to help her with her queries as to how religion and poststructural theories might mesh (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 10). I listened, and found Caputo seemingly enamored with deconstruction as a loving practice. After spending some time browsing the articles on Caputo's vitae, I came across an article, *Love among the deconstructables: A response to Gregg Lambert* (2004) that was instrumental in helping me come to know Derrida as one who wrote of love. Following Caputo's citation trail in this text and others, I began to read about Derrida's love and Caputo's usage of Derrida's words to help him think through love in relation to religion. In a similar way, I was directed toward Freire's interest in love by another person, this time a fellow doctoral student who told me that Freire had a lot to say about love (see Dinner Conversations, Dessert, Uninvited Guest 1 for further discussion of Freire in relation to critical pedagogy).

While I have written this data trail in order to continuously be mindful of my citational practices, which also, incidentally is my ongoing recruitment of participants to help inform this study (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God), I also wonder what discussions of our "experts," so-to-speak, who help us make sense of our lives, research, and teaching, might look like in work with preservice teachers. More specifically, in addition to the discussions that often look at who has access to certain experts or dominant practices (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 38), I wonder how more situated conversations of our own "experts" might be fruitful. These conversations might include discussions of not only how we chose, happened upon, or perhaps were directed by God toward certain persons and communities but also who is explicitly and actively worked at being excluded and implicitly excluded. Interview participants, for instance, discussed a variety of these experts—persons in the Bible, family members, leaders at their church, friends, and authors. They also discussed those who were not included in this list such as those who subscribed to the world's view who were sometimes called American Christians (see Dinner Conversations, Preparations). One participant, for instance, worried that the teachers who taught at the Christian private where she went to school as a child were not really Christians but perhaps showed that they "knew the answers" in order to get a job (Personal communication, May 24, 2010). She, on the other hand, turned to biblical figures like, Paul, who she said encouraged her to be more like the "aroma of Christ."

[3] When I returned to this conversation post comprehensive exams, I had just been re-reading Hilary Conklin's (2008) article entitled *Modeling compassion in critical social justice oriented teacher education* in preparation for a research presentation I was giving for a job interview. In her introductory vignette, she wrote of feeling "unsettled" (p. 652) and "deeply upset" (p. 653) after observing a preservice teacher's lesson in which her student had not built upon students' knowledge and experiences, a widely agreed upon strategy for promoting social justice. Conklin used the remainder of the article to re-think this experience in light of what she asserted was a necessity to model compassion in teacher education. As I re-wrote the introductory scene, I inserted the phrase of "almost sick with Love" with the image of Conklin in mind—temporarily positioning its Responsibility in a category of want-to-be-

compassionate-social-justice-teacher- educator as Conklin seemed to have done in her article and Love as a problematic subject.

While I did not think much of this positioning at the time, other than that I was thankful that age old metaphorical sickness provided a way for me to play with the terms doctor and cure in the following sentence, as I continued writing, I found myself inserting Derrida into the conversation pages earlier than in the previous drafts. Here, he was taking the opportunity to comment upon the term *cure*, a word I knew he had written of before in his writing on Plato. Quickly, I Googled *pharmakon*, the Greek word that I came across many times before in the secondary sources I have read as an explanatory tool of his critique of logocentrism (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 3). I was pleased to find that I owned the text where Derrida had written of this, *Plato's Pharmacy* (1972) as a part of a collection of essays translated by Barbara Johnson (1981). Feeling enormously guilty for not having read the actual text because good citational practices require one to read that which we cite (although it does not dictate what the outcome of this reading should be), I ran to my bookshelf to locate the text to dedicate at least a walk-around-the-block reading. After not finding the text anywhere and Googling the image of the book's cover to make sure I remembered what it looked like, I settled on finding an entry in my Derrida/Freire dictionary on *pharmakon* with information cited from the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, a peer reviewed resource by Jack Reynolds (2002) from La Trobe University in Australia and Nicholas Royle's (2003) text entitled *Jacques Derrida*. I cringed again, knowing that I should not be citing an encyclopedia or a Derrida reader, but it will have to do for now. I made a note on my To Do list to find Plato's Pharmacy and read it.

What interests me about writing the character Derrida, here, is that I had to make a decision about how Derrida would cite himself, so to speak, in a situation where I had not actually read what it was that Derrida was citing. As mentioned above, Derrida's self-citing was actually a citing of another's understanding of his work and not actually something he said. As author this seemed to render any claims he might make of citing his own words inaccurate. In the eyes of Responsibility, who did not necessarily know this, this move temporarily positioned Derrida as devious, perhaps telling white lies to make a point. While this point might seem trivial, especially considering a reader of the conversation would not be privy to the information I have just divulged, this line of thinking became important when I realized that I had made the character Derrida describe his previous work (i.e. cite himself) in similar ways that I have made Responsibility cite herself and her previous experiences with Love sickness. This realization invited me to focus on how Responsibility's citing (and understanding) of her previous experiences with Love and sickness was also mediated by others.

Positive Manipulation

I returned to Conklin's (2008) writing, for instance, with an eye toward examining how her claims at ownership over her experiences worked to render her credible or truthful in ways that Derrida's had positioned him as false. I noticed for instance, that she began her article with the statement "Let me begin with a story of my own" (p. 652), continuing on by situating herself within a university program with a mission toward social justice that was in line with the commitments and inspirations she expressed. By claiming ownership over her story and following that claim with a description about her situated position as a storyteller, Conklin was able to position herself as a person who had (good) intentions that did not play out as desired in this one event that happened to her. In a sense, the reader could focus on the happenings of the story and not on Conklin since it was already known that she meant no harm. Furthermore, as she reflected on her story, describing how troubled she was by how uncompassionate her practices as a teacher educator were during the story, Conklin was able to position herself in the same category as the social justice teacher educators she aimed to critique (see Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 4 for further discussion). She said for instance,

> As I continue to develop an awareness of my own practice as a teacher educator, I have become increasingly aware of and troubled by the seeming pervasiveness of teacher educators' tendency to treat prospective teachers with little respect and compassion—the same tendency I found myself in (pp. 653-654).

This positioning acted as an invitation to readers to join her in checking their own practices in a way that did not mean to threaten who they believe themselves to be as a person.

For quite some time now, Hilary Hughes-Decatur and I have been calling this sort of move *positive manipulation*. I have written about this elsewhere in my comprehensive exams in relation to a practice of a teacher describing her "love" of an action or object to get others to do or think in certain ways (i.e., I love the way that Sarah is sitting nicely in her seat.). There I talked about it more as an intentional act, where a teacher deployed the word with a specific purpose in mind, one she believed to be in the best interests of the child. Here though, as it worked in Conklin's case, the intentions of the Responsibility were not what mattered. Instead, the effect was that a position became available for the reader to act *with* Conklin (and for me, who knows Conklin just a bit, this is a particularly pleasant availability), who had already claimed to be on the side of social justice. Conklin did not have to intentionally invent this position on the side of social justice (i.e. a social justice missionary) since, as Davies and Harré (2000) described, in the telling of stories, certain familiar subject positions become available to which we bring our own histories along with its metaphors, characters, and plots (p. 95). As described elsewhere (e.g., Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 38) positioning oneself as being on the side of social justice is up for grabs depending on one's discursive location. In the present educational climate where justice oriented reform movements are often tied to liberal agendas, such a positioning is often attacked as being both ideological and wrongfully suited for education (Apple, 2006; Zeichner, 2009). Yet, as Villegas and Lucas (2002a, 2002b) wrote that culturally responsive teachers must "see themselves as both responsible for and capable of bringing about educational change that will make schools responsive to all students" (p. 20). Conklin's ability to anticipate all of the possible responses to this available subject position and her attempts to render herself as one with good intentions might be taken as just another example of another liberal educator catching themselves pushing their agendas on innocent students. It could also be taken as an example of an educator working to be culturally responsive.

Movement in Thought

This focus on positioning in this note has brought up a number of questions related to Responsibility as well as reminded me of other data I have encountered elsewhere in this study. Since addressing all of these is beyond the scope of this note, I have chosen to focus here on what I refer to as the *Make a Difference* storyline as it relates to this study. Throughout this study, I have written often in my dissertation log of the call for teachers to *make a difference*, or what I have come to refer to as the MAD call. I wrote of it in one of the earliest vignettes I had written as a means of helping me think through interview data in which participant after participant described a desire to really make a difference in the lives of not only the children and adults they interacted with during the various mission trips they undertook (), but also in their work in the public school classroom. Often talked of in terms of letting students know they were there for them in any way, and not about "just academics" as one participant said (personal communication, April 14, 2010) , I wrote of how familiar this MAD call felt to my experiences as a teacher educator. In fact, although the MAD call that participants talked of was situated in larger conversations about their missions to glorify God and witness to others, the story was not so unlike the one I had written about in the vignette in which a past student of mine, a preservice teacher, begged me to allow her to show a movie (which was really a slide show set to music) to the introductory education methods class in which she was a student and I was teaching. *The Make a Difference Movie-The Teddy Stallworth Story* (Reynolds & Ballard, 2008) was the typical teacher-saves-the-world-one-child-at-a-time narrative that is portrayed in many movies like *Dangerous Minds* (1995). It was the one I heard my husband's past elementary school teacher tell me when I listened to her story that even before she started teaching (over forty years earlier) she always knew she wanted to change lives and see lights go on. Furthermore, some remnant of this story seemed to pop up during the first moments of meeting almost any preservice teacher I had ever been in contact with as she told me why she wanted to teach.

Catherine Carter (2009), in her article *Priest, Prostitute, Plumber? The Construction of Teachers as Saints*, described how the "make a difference" narratives that are often cited amongst teachers as reasons to enter or stay in teaching are saturated with religious references. She called for teacher educators to challenge this religious language that surrounds teaching and to define what differences are wanted, what resources are available to make those differences, and how a pedagogy of love (one she claimed was often tied to this narrative), for instance, can devalue a teacher's work (p. 86). With the data collection/analysis above in mind, I wondered if I adding discussion of how claims to *want* to make a difference function in different instances. In other words, how do these claims position one as being for or against others and position others as for or against the goodness of the claim?

Noddings's (2003) ethic of care, might be a starting point for this type of work since she asserts that care is not actualized until it is received by the *carer* (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 13 for additional discussion of an ethics of care and how it has often been taken up by social justice teacher educators as a necessary part of teaching for social justice). But I wonder how this demand to know if care was received might work for and against other claims at ethics. In particular, I am reminded of Duanne Elmer (2006)'s text *Cross-cultural servanthood: Serving the world in Christlike humility.* In it, he claimed that Christians should go out into the world with humility, stating, for instance, that "it's not our words that count but the perceptions of the local people who watch our lives and sense our attitudes" (p. 17). I wonder, though, if this does not take into account the unintended consequences of such caring and the continuous process of reading and reading that is ongoing. Could Conklin claim to care for her student, now, after she had reflected upon her interactions with the student and how might Conklin's writing of that experience be taken up at a later date as uncaring?

I am also reminded of numerous times in conversations with interview participants and one conversation with my writing partner, Missy, in which we discussed the work of love and making a difference as a work of "planting seeds" that may or may not be sprouted (dissertation log, October 24, 2010). I provide a few excerpts from individual and focus group interviews below. I place these excerpts below, not to highlight what it might mean to plant seeds. Instead, thought with the discussion above, these have already brought about questions for me related to time, love, and care, which as described elsewhere (I cannot seem to find where) is work I would like to pursue further in the future. The first two are from individual interviews and the latter from focus group.

- ". . . it's like we plant the seeds meaning we talk about it and then through the holy spirit your conviction or whatever is god actually doing the work (Personal communication, May 7, 2010)
- ". . . if they have those seeds planted there then that'll maybe become something later" (Personal communication, May 21, 2010).
- "The whole idea of like planting seeds is big for me and not necessarily like seeing the actual growth or whatever. But just, like for instance, like working with children and like youth, like doing youth ministry, things like that. You may not see the fruit of what you are doing until and honestly like the fruit of what you are doing, like you can't, it's not, it may not be evident until like 10 years later, like, only 10 years later will you be able to see well maybe, hmm, my time that I spent with this kid, you know like, sharing the word and showing him like what's most important in life or showing him or her like what is most important is like maybe that actually had an effect so like 10 years later, like maybe, he or she remembers something from years ago and may turn to the Lord or something. So the whole idea of like planting seeds is huge and like I love it when you can actually see the fruit because it is like Yes God you are working and like in a lot of ways I think that is like how like God produces hope and just like encouragement to like keep going is when he shows you like what you are doing is actually good" (Personal communication, August 14, 2010).
- "You do have to be very intentional and sort of pick and choose and rest in God's sovereignty that ok, if God led me to this person, then that is the person, possibly the only one or the five or the ten people that I am supposed to disciple this year and that's ok. It's not my job to be everybody" (August 14, 2010).

[4] This note relates to Responsibility's denial at wanting to find a *cure* to her dealings with Love. In thinking this data trail, I was reminded of a sentence I had written in my dissertation log for some other context about the ongoing expectation for teacher educators to be mindful of and open about their assumptions, beliefs and practices in relation to the preservice teachers they taught. I use it below as the start of the exploration I undertake in this note related to the positioning of preservice teachers as those who are in need of a cure, especially as it relates to social justice teacher education (SJTE).

Problematic Preservice Teachers

The call to have teacher educators and preservice teachers learn to check themselves, so-to-speak, in relation to their own linguistic, cultural, and historical background is heard throughout SJTE (Ladson-Billings, 1999; Lucas & Grinberg, 2009; McDonald & Zeichner, 2009; McIntosh, 1990; Sleeter, 2008; Richert, Donahue, & LaBoskey, 2009), especially at a time when effective teachers are seen as key ingredients in making *the* difference

that seems to matter the most at present—alleviating the increasingly inequitable opportunities and outcomes that plague our society and schools (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; McDonald & Zeichner, 2009). Zeichner (2009) noted that if teacher educators want to successfully prepare teachers to teach for social justice, among other things, they must be willing to model the social-oriented practices, such as culturally responsive teaching (Cochran-Smith, 1999; Gay, 2000, Ladson-Billings, 1995, Irvine, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, 2002b) that they advocate for. In fact, he said that adopting the "same-critical inquiry stance" on their own work that they expect of their students is probably "the most important" thing that can be done to strengthen work in SJTE (p. 43).

In light of this data, writing Responsibility as being *not* sick in relation to Love positions her in line with those kinds of teacher educators that Zeichner advocated for—those who would be aware of their own attempts to cure the white, middle-class, female pre-service teacher such as teacher educators like Allen & Hermann-Wilmarth (2004), Conklin (2008), Hughes (2010). But since Love claims a Christian identity and desires to live and work with a mission to love others through Christ, I also meant to position Responsibility as one who included religious identity in her definition of culture and who aimed to take a critical stance on religion in relation to power as she does with race, class, gender, or sexuality. Such a move is uncommon in education (see White, 2009 for discussion in the context of teacher education; see Marshall & Ward, 2004 for discussion related to educational policy) despite) despite that the US is recognized as increasingly diverse religiously (Cochran-Smith, 2004). Religious educators sense that addressing religious identities matters greatly (Baurain, 2007; Brady, 2008; Marsden, 1998; Stenberg, 2006). Barrett (in Stenberg, 2006)[4], for instance, has described a sense of "trauma" often associated with coming out as Christian in the university classroom. Perkins (2001) noted that due to a sense of "intellectual distrust" (p. 586) that pervades academia, conservative Christians in particular are one of the only cultural groups openly belittled by teachers who might otherwise be sensitive.

Baurain (2007) expressed concern that religious preservice teachers are becoming an easily dismissed group in language education. He stated that "Christian English teachers have to some degree been caricatured as pompous fundamentalists who will do whatever it takes to trick, shove, or drag people into 'faith'" due to a commonly held belief that Christian witness is incompatible with respect for persons (p. 203). Religious historian George Marsdens (1998), for instance, described how faith and persons of faith have been historically relegated to the private sphere whereas science and rationalism make it into education where freedom from the appeals of the supernatural are sought. Stenberg elaborated by saying that, since critical thought is the "reigning religion" in universities, faith is often taken as "a false consciousness through which critical thought should cut, not something it should work alongside" (Stenberg, 2006, p. 277). As Anderson (2008) asserted, "Education is about critical thinking and not faith" (p. 76).

As described elsewhere (e.g., Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God), to address religion or religious identity critically is considered quite dangerous (Noddings, 2009) especially in light of data which claims the United States as a Christian nation (see for example reference to George W. Bush, Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 3). With these data in mind, these conversations become interesting spaces to watch as Responsibility and Love both took up and resisted positions as oppressed and oppressor and how others advocate for them in various ways. In this chapter, Uninvited Guest 6, for instance, I endnoted an instance where Freire discussed *love* in the context of something that must be rethought and rethought again. He did not capitalize it, a move I made to indicate that he was not talking about Love, a person, but love as a concept. Such a move, though, invites questioning on what can and cannot be thought and rethought in relation to conceptions of who is and who is not oppressed. I wonder, for instance, what might be added to these conversations that take place in teacher education where one examines the roles of structural inequities and systematic oppression. These conversations act, in part, as a way to explore that.

[5] (Freire & Macedo, 1995; See also Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 7)

[6] (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 3; Freire & Macedo, 1995, pp. 377-379; Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 90, p. 181; See Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 4)

[7] (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 81)

[8] See Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists for further discussion of this section of the converation

[9] (Derrida, 1967/1976, p. 158)

[10] (Freire, 1994, pp. 7-10); As discussed in this chapter, Uninvited Guest 4, who is and who is not oppressed is often contested in discussion of Christianity in education. In the noted text above, I found myself omitting the term "power" from earlier drafts in which Freire described that it is through a focus on language that we come to know our place in the world. Despite the omission of the word, power is still implied here as a constitutive force. Yet omitting it, seemed to provide a space for him to be positioned on the same side as Derrida, in a way coaxing Responsibility to join him. I invite the reader (and writer at a later time) to think this omission with other portions of this dissertation (e.g., Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1; Dinner Conversations, Preparations, Uninvited Guest 5).

[11] I have written elsewhere (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists) about how in writing the conversation with Freire, I was surprised that the Freire I was writing kept mentioning inviting Jesus to the table since I had not planned or intended to address Jesus in the conversation. Despite that the conversation has changed drastically from earlier forms, I left in Freire's query about inviting Jesus for quite a few reasons. One, it is well known that Freire was a Catholic and drew heavily upon Catholicism as have others who have thought with Freire's words in the field of liberation theology, for instance (Stenberg, 2006). Two, it has brought up important questions related to this study in relation to the common educational phrase "teacher as facilitator" (see Freire & Macedo, 1995) and specifically how one determines who is and who is not invited to the table, so-to-speak to rethink their ideas. Time does not permit further exploration here, but I return to this idea briefly in Dinner Conversations, Dessert, Uninvited Guest 2.

[12] (Derrida, 1992)

[13] See Derrida, 1995, 2000, 2001 for discussions of gift and hospitality as impossible-possible aporias

[14] Caputo (1997) described the Derridian notion of *to come* as being messianic. This is different than the various messianisms of some religious beliefs which determine who or what the Messiah is. He said of these:

> The several messianisms always take themselves to have an identifiable 'mission,' a missionary identity, a mission to establish the rule of their messianic vision in a foreseeable and foregraspable future, and they have rarely lacked the nerve to seize the opportunity to give their destiny a little boost wherever the occasion presented itself. That is when the blood begins to flow (p. 161).

Instead, the messianic is marked by the unforeseeable and the indeterminate that is always to come. The messicanic is what "keep things on the move" (Caputo, 1997, pp. 161-163)

[15] Derrida, 1994, p. 9

[16] This passage refers to a discussion in this chapter, Uninvited Guest 3 at having not read a text by Derrida, *Plato's Pharmacy*. As I write this note though, I have read it, having located it in a Derrida reader by Peggy Kamuf and having returned to descriptions in (Biesta, 2001, p. 40; Peters, 2004, p. 70). Yet, like in reading most of Derrida's text (or most texts for that matter), I find that the task of reading it has only just begun. I note this here to continuously situate this text as one which not only persistently deconstructs itself but recognized such deconstruction of the texts that it claims to be informed by.

[17] Derrida (1994/1997) talked at length about responsibility in relation to reading. Also Biesta (2001) has been influential in my understanding of Derrida's ideas of reading the other, including understanding and misunderstanding

[18] See Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God for discussions of reading the body, including memories

[19]

[20] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30 for discussion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transsexual diversity in relation to Christianity and education

[21] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 4 for discussion of "being there" as it relates to knowledge

[22]See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 9 for discussion of this type of question in relation to the work of Nel Noddings

[23] Derrida (1994/1997) said, "I love institutions and I spent a lot of time participating in new institutions, which sometimes do not work. At the same time, I try to dismantle not institutions but some structures in given institutions which are too rigid or are dogmatic or which work as an obstacle to future research" (p. 8).

[24] As organized as I tried to be during this study, occasionally articles I read would slip out of my grasp (i.e., I would lose them). When I wrote the text to which this note is attached, I was thinking about an article I have found in a mission magazine, somewhere in the depths of the university library, about militant language that was often related to mission work. The author was calling for missionaries and mission trip organizers to stop using the language of battle to discuss their work. I do not remember all of the terms used but I remembered things such as spiritual warfare and soul winning as being amongst the few. I also do not remember the author's reasoning for calling for this. At any rate, I remembered this article specifically in relation to the movie scene which preceded the scene described in this conversation. In it, the principal at the school, who is also the pastor of the church, cornered the pop star character and her friends in the hallway and said that he needed some help from someone who was "spiritually armed." The conversation went like this:

> **Pastor**: I'm concerned about Mary. Something's going on.
> **Pop star character**: yeah, me too,
> **Pastor:** Well, she's a part of your posse and I think that you could help her.
>
> Pop star character nods
>
> **Pastor:** I am going to need you to be a warrier out the on the front lines for Jesus.
> **Pop star character's friend:** you mean like shoot her?
> **Pastor:** (laughs) no, no, no, I was thinking of something a little less gangsta. I need someone who is spiritually armed to help guide her back to her faith with the love and care that only Jesus can supply.

[25] Although I do not really think it makes sense in the context of the conversation to capitalize *love* in the sentence to which this note is attached, I did so to encourage a thinking of Love as a weapon. I am referring here to the taking of the subject position of loving preservice teacher—one who openly claims herself to *be* loving. While I intended to explore this here, time does not permit. Until another day. . .

[26] In earlier drafts of this conversation, Derrida did not speak here. Instead, I brought in Foucault (1978) to give a little chat about power-knowledge (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7) in relation to Responsibility's thinking about power as being wielded. The move felt like a smack in Responsibility's face though as Foucault (1978) said things about the necessity to think power in a more complex way, always circulating, for instance, and shifting from moment to moment and relation to relation. The move felt like I had closed a door with Responsibility no longer able to discuss her ideas. While I would like to discuss this further here, I invite the reader (and the author) to think this in relation to other places in the dissertation (Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 24; Dinner Conversations, Omitted; Dinner Conversations, Preparations, Uninvited Guest 5).

[27] Derrida, 1999, pp. 16-18

[28] Dick & Kofman, 2005, p. 53

[29] Caputo, 1997, p. 77

CHAPTER 4

PREPARATION: TIME LAPSE

This section is a conversation between Love and Impossible, two preservice teachers who are learning to teach in a teacher preparation program which identifies teaching for social justice amongst its missions (e.g., Cochran-Smith, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, 2002b; Zeichner, 2008). Both young women openly speak of themselves as Christians and identify their mission field as everywhere. Thus they see themselves as called by God to actively work to love others and glorify their God in all aspects of their lives. The scene takes place in the kitchen at Love's house in the moments before the guests arrive for a dinner she is hosting as a part of a progressive dinner planned by a woman she had just met a few weeks earlier in a coffee shop named Responsibility. Love has just come from Responsibility's house for Appetizers but the two sat at different tables and did not interact.

Impossible:

Are you going to stay or go?[1]

Love:

I don't know. It's not like I really have *time.*[2] I feel this burden for them, you know,[3] and I think God is calling me to show them love, but I already agreed to host all of these people for appetizers. I don't feel like I should just leave. I've been preparing to have *these* people over for days.[4]

Impossible:

I can totally tell. You seem well-prepared. It must have taken hours for you to cut all of that fruit into neat squares and you must have cleaned for hours. The house does look immaculate.

Love:

It did take a long while, but how can I complain? God has just blessed me so much. Don't you remember that time when I didn't even know if I would ever be able to afford such a place?

Impossible:

Oh my gosh, I totally remember that. You were flipping out about having to rely on your family for help.[5]

Love:

I know. I had such a hard time just resting in God's sovereignty and His plan for us. But He never ceases to amaze me, just how He knew, for example, that I could really *use* this house to answer His call to love others[6]. I can use it to make Him *known.*[7]

Impossible:

He did give you such a gift for hospitality. This isn't your first time having people over though, is it?

Love:

Of course not. What do you think I am? A hypocrite. It's not like I am going to claim to be blessed with such a house and not use it for His glory.[8] Not that I am perfect by any means.[9] I fail all the time and catch myself doing stuff without my heart being in it. Like just the other day, I was trying to listen to these kids I was tutoring and I was just *not*. I mean, I looked like I

was listening. Doing all the nodding and good stuff like that, but I was really thinking about the fact that I was hungry and that I wish I could go on a run and stuff like that. *Not* at all what they were saying. And then when I started to *try* to listen, I had to pray the whole time for God to please give me the patience to focus on *them* for even just a second.

So I know that might sound pretty hypocritical, but I try to uphold our mission. Like with the house, I make it a priority to have people over for supper or coffee or just a chat if they need it. I want people to know the invitation is always there. I know it is time consuming but I really believe that it is one of the ways I am supposed to show love to others.[10] I think that is one of the reasons that I am so stressed out about this decision. *Should* I leave now I mean?

Impossible:

I can't answer that for you. I mean, I know you have already invited these people over for dinner and I know you want to develop a relationship with them, especially Responsibility, so that they'll know that they're free to call you for whatever they need. But you've been talking about the burden you've been feeling for this particular neighbor you might go see for quite some time. And earlier tonight, with your neighbor actually coming over like that and asking for your help with her homework--maybe that was God opening a door for the start of a different relationship. I mean, not the relationships you had planned to start with that girl you met in that coffee shop the other day, but with your neighbor who needs help with her homework. Maybe God is pointing you toward a greater need.[11]

Love:

True. God does have a way of changing things around when I least expect it. He did with me when He gave me all that free time so that I could go out into the field in Mexico even though it seemed impossible that He was calling *me* at a time when I was really not living a

Christian lifestyle.[12] He gave me that burden for the Mexican people though and made all of the doors open so that I could go.

Impossible:

Yes! He totally made that happen. Didn't you say you raised something like $3,000 in a little over 2 weeks? That could only be the work of God. And this little girl, this family, would God give you a burden for them if He didn't want you to act on it?

Love:

But I don't even like that little girl. That is terrible to say, I know, but she is just so annoying. My friend, who has been spending time with her each week , you know, just loving on her and just letting her know that she is there to chat if she needs to. She was telling me how she just calls and calls and calls her, asking for help with homework, to go out to dinner or chat or whatever. My friend was so close to snapping at her and being like "Call me back another time." But she kept reminding herself that she needed to be patient and needed to love her as frustrating as it is and as much as she wanted to, you know, delete her number from her phone or at least pick up and say something like, "You just called me 8 times in a row and I thought you were dying but you just wanted to go get dinner???"

Impossible:

That must have been hard for your friend. But that is pretty amazing that your friend can do such a good job of reminding her to stay focused on God's call for us to love others. I bet she has to ask God for A LOT of help in remaining calm and patient. You know, I was just thinking, I don't know if you and your friend have talked about this and actually I know we shouldn't be asking this question because God has a plan for everything, but don't you just want to know why she keeps calling your friend? [13]

Love:

I mean, my friend said that her home life is just really unstable and everything. Like when my friend met her a couple years back, the girl's teacher had told her that her whole family was living in public housing and their financial problems were just blatantly obvious. And the more she got to know the girl, the more she learned about the problems she was having, like how her parents just got divorced and she just moved in with her dad who she really can't rely on because he is working all the time. So my friend was saying that she knows that she just wants somebody to love her and take time to chat with her and stuff, but sometimes she is just really busy and can't give her any of her time, but the girl doesn't get it. She just keeps calling, like I said.

So I know that girl probably sees *me* as one of those people she knows will give her a hug and spend time with her too. She's seen me around the rec center and how the other kids, half of them I don't even know, just come up to me and give me a hug because, you know, they are excited to see somebody that they know has been there and will hopefully be there for them in[14] I mean she must have known that I would be there if she needed me. Which reminds me, the clock is ticking. I have to decide whether or not to go soon. It's just not practical though. I have already committed to be here.

Impossible:

Whoever said that living the Christian lifestyle was practical? You and I both know that living out God's call is the opposite of practical most of the time. Especially if you have developed this idea that your mission field is everywhere, like we have. It'd be a lot easier if we could read people's hearts. You know, see if they were believers or non believers, but it's not like that. You never know who you are going to come into contact with, whether it's walking the

dog or in the classroom. We have to live it where ever we are, all the time, in our classrooms or whatever.

Love:

I guess the "whatever" probably includes my current predicament too then. I do feel drawn to that family who lives next door and especially the girl who called. It's like God is telling me to go and serve them right now. But all this planning. What a waste of time and money. Fruit isn't cheap you know.

Impossible:

Listen to yourself, will you? Complaining about wasting your money and time? You are so blessed. I know you see that. Didn't you tell me that one of the ways you pray is to thank God for your blessings before you ask for anything else? Think about how lucky we all are that Jesus loves us and died for us. What an amazing gift. It may not be easy living the Christian lifestyle, but that is what we are called to do and we are lucky to do it.[15]

Love:

I know. I struggle though. I am constantly wondering what purpose I am really living for. I mean, on mission trips and stuff it is so much easier. You are one in spirit there. Everybody has the same purpose and everybody is there to lift you up and glorify God, but here, you don't know what to expect. And I catch myself feeling selfish and worrying about my own comfort and my own plan all the time.

Impossible:

The way I see it is that we are all selfish to the core. But we just have to realize that there's more than just our happiness or comfort or whatever and really *be* selfless. You know, you are a believer and you are called to love people and that's not easy. And so sacrificing your

time and your money and your effort and just energy to serve people in a variety of ways whether it's like physically building someone a house like you did in Mexico or just like hanging out with some annoying middle schooler that you don't want to hang out with you know. You have to be willing to, you know, sacrifice for them. I am not saying that *I* am good at it. It's not easy. But I think that it's just constantly reminding yourself that just like Christ—like how Christ was my servant and he gave up His life on the cross. Like that's the ultimate sacrifice and that sacrifice was made for *me*. So I, through him, can make some small sacrifices that are *nothing* compared to giving up your life. It's just an hour in the afternoon or whatever. Just like realizing that my personal comfort and happiness is not my goal.

Love:

I know. It's hard though when I feel like God is calling me to sacrifice differently today than I had planned. I know it sounds silly and all that I am saying that helping some girl with her homework a sacrifice, but I want to be elsewhere. And up until just a couple of hours ago, I thought God was calling me to be here for this dinner. But I am not sure. How do *you* know where to go or who to go to?[16]

Impossible:

The church always helps me out and other Christian organizations. So like on my mission trips, they'd already identified the needs of the people,[17] I think by like building relationships with them earlier. I am not sure how exactly. I mean, you can't read people's hearts. You don't know exactly what they believe or where they stand. It's not like the church surveyed the people or anything. I think maybe they went to areas where there were lots of people who were unchurched or where there were lots of kids who were, you know, in need of child-care or I don't know, in need of love.[18] Like with this missions focused camp I worked with, we were really

focused on the Roma people, you know, just getting the word out that they needed to know Jesus. I had learned about them when I was in high school when I saw a short video clip about their lives and about some missionaries who were building churches for them. We talked a little about how they were different than us and how they were the same, and I saw that they were really in need. And like the same with people in Canada, did you know they have more churches in TN than they do in Canada?

Love:

Wow. That is pretty amazing. But it makes sense. I mean, around here, everybody knows about Christ. Especially in the south, the Bible belt you know. I mean they may not *know* Christ, but they have heard the good news. But I still feel like the American people are in such need though. You know, we are supposedly a Christian nation, but it is here where there is so much need. The American Christian is just so lackadaisical. In some ways that seems worse than not knowing about Christ. I have such a heart for the American people, but it is overwhelming sometimes. It is like you said, I can never know who I am going to come into contact with whether I'm in school, or playing sports somewhere or even whether I'm walking the dog. Which brings me back to my current problem. Ahhhh! I don't know if I am supposed to leave now.

Impossible:

YOU CAN'T JUST WAIT AROUND TO KNOW FOR SURE!!! That is why Christianity is about faith! You can calculate all you want but at some point you just have to act. He's going to lead you to different places, to different fields, but you can't expect to b*e sure* about your calling if you don't really know what is going to happen next week. You just have to be confident in the calling that Christ gives you to glorify Him and to live for Him.

Love:

Dang, getting a little worked up aren't you?

Impossible:

Sorry. I kind of have a strong opinion about the word calling. It's like how I never say that I know for sure that I am definitely called to teach. If I try to define my calling in it I feel uncomfortable because like I can't find my identity in some kind of calling except the calling that Jesus Christ has given me for my life.

Love:

Well, I do feel called to teach. But I see what you are saying. I have to be ready to drop everything-sell everything like the Bible says, if need be. I have this friend who just did that. He was planning and planning to be a teacher, doing all the coursework, and then he just realized that God wasn't calling him to teach but to be a pastor. So he just shifted. Didn't do his student teaching or anything and just graduated without being certified.

Impossible:

I'm not so sure that God is really calling us to sell everything but for your friend, it sounds like his field shifted for him. He was still living the missionary lifestyle-so-to-speak, just in a different place and for a different people.

Love:

Yes. To totally new people. I mean, still elementary aged kids, but these kids were at the church where he would work. These were rich, white kids actually. He had been working with them and just saw how much *these* kids needed to be ministered to. These were kids who were churched, who like knew the story of Christ and everything, but who just weren't living Christ. You know. They were all about themselves and were totally sheltered. Going to this private

school where everyone was exactly like they were. So he started working with them and took them out into the field in their own home town. Showing them places they had never been before, like to the poor areas that were just around the corner. These kids were talking with black kids for the first times in their lives and really seeing that they could serve those kids in their day-to-day lives. And he was just there for them to talk to as they were realizing how sheltered they had been.

Impossible:

That is pretty amazing. And I guess he couldn't do that as a teacher. I mean, teaching is so much about academics. I want to be that kind of teacher who can really show love to my students and not make it just about academics. I want to be that teacher who they know they can count on. That is what I love about mission trips, I guess. You get to be so open about your purpose.

Love:

Did you know I am planning my own mission trip?

Impossible:

What you need to be doing is planning what you are doing right now.

Love:

Fine. Let's go**.**

Endnotes

[1] The English punk band, The Clash, released a chart topping song in 1981 entitled *Should I stay or should I go?* which has great relevance to the work I undertake in this note. While the musicians sang about the decision to stay or go in a relationship that was filled with indecision, noting, for instance, that "if I go there will be trouble an' if I stay there will be double," I use it here to explore the possible positioning of a preservice teacher, and particularly one who claims to be a Christian, in relation to *staying* or *going* in a relationship with a public school and particularly one that has been identified as "high needs" (see Freedman & Appleman, 2009 for discussion of teacher retention in high poverty, urban areas). I do this by exploring a data trail for the noted question, "Are you going to stay or go?, asked by a character Impossible. I write this data trail because I believe it provides the reader an example of the complexities and interweavings of data collection and analysis when writing is used as a method of inquiry (see Richardson, 1994 and Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005 for descriptions; see also Berbary, 2011; Davies, 2009; Holbrook, 2010; Richardson, 1997 for example works). I also include it because it has direct relevance to the object of knowledge of in my ongoing dissertation study (i.e. the production of the preservice teacher in relation to mission work, see Bridges-Rhoads, 2011, in process). Below, I provide a brief discussion of writing as a method of inquiry more broadly and then in relation to my study. Then I provide an example data trail which was produced/analyzed through writing and end with a discussion of movement in thought produced through this process.

Data Collection/Analysis

When I set aside the time for data collection/analysis in relation to the question to which this note is attached, *Are you going to stay or go?*, I recalled no specific interview participant who had ever asked this question. I also had not asked this question in any interview. In fact, I had not written this question in my dissertation log, a place where I collected/analyzed multiple other sources of data. The first image that came to mind was a memory of me sitting in the lifeguard stand at the pool I managed during high school summers singing The Clash's song mentioned above with a fellow lifeguard as we decided whether or not we should quit our jobs. Pushing that memory aside for fear that writing more about that would take me off on a tangent from which I might never return, I continued writing, recalling a series of posters I had seen in the hallway of the university where interview participants attended which called for participants to do various things during Spring Break or the summer. More specifically, one poster came to mind which pictured a drawing of Uncle Sam in a rendition of his famous "We want you" stance used to recruit soldiers during World Wars I and II. When I returned to the photos of the posters I had taken at the university as well as used the "find" function in my dissertation log to look for terms like "photo," "poster," or "hallways" to find either the photo or any writing related to it, I could not find it. I began to wonder if I had imagined this data or if I had produced it in my head. While this notion frustrated me because I thought I remembered the poster being in that batch of photos, it also seemed to complicate the boundaries between imagination and reality which begged me to ask if I should write about the posters I actually saw in the photos or the one I potentially remembered. Deciding that time would be better spent not theorizing potentially imagined data, I spent some time looking over the photos and the writing in my log I had done about them.

I happened upon quite a few posters which beckoned preservice teachers to *go* to various places where they might learn about other cultures, tutor children, or learn a language with statements like "Leave this summer" or "When the world calls roll, answer 'present'" (posters from anonymous organizations, retrieved May 15, 2010). Phrases such as these reminded me of the data collection/analysis I had done on the organization and church websites that interview participants had identified as either having organized specific mission trips they attended or pointing them to opportunities for mission trips. Selection criteria for this study, in part, invited participants who had undertaken at least one short term mission trip, which are discussed widely in religious literature as meaningful ways for college students to challenge their assumptions about cultural others and gain access to new experiences (Crouch, 2007; Jeffrey, 2001; Schroeder, 1995; Walling et al., 2006; Van Engen, 2000). One organization, for instance, who orchestrated mission trips for thousands of people each year, including one participant, said "The needs of a lost world are waiting! Is God calling you to meet one of them?"as a means to recruit participants for a variety of trips to other countries (Christian organization, retrieved November 1, 2010). Another organization, whose website I frequented, called upon participants who would leave for Spring Break to "love on" kids (Christian organization website, retrieved March 5, 2011; I have chosen to keep the organizations and churches anonymous for reasons described in (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 17). Another website offered a number of ways for

volunteers to go and spend time with children and "make a real difference in a child's life" (Christian organization website, retrieved November 1, 2010).

I had been struck often by the number of opportunities available for preservice teachers (both Christian and non) to spend their time especially during interviews with preservice participants . They often echoed the language I had seen in these posters and organization websites as they talked of "giving up time," "loving on" children, and answering God's call. While I had often theorized such gifts of time as privileges attributed to both monetary status and educational status drawing on the works of Paulo Freire (1998) for instance, all participants talked of these as opportunities made available by God's grace and God's will. Two participants, for instance, described how while neither had anticipated having a significant chunk of time off of school, they both knew that God had made shifts in their schedules so that they could undertake work within a specific mission field. Another talked of how she was miraculously able to raise a large sum of money in a short amount of time because God placed it on the hearts of those she solicited for money and prayers to contribute. These discussions, which took place within larger discussions of the happenings of specific trips and mission experiences, often revolved around ideas of trusting in God's sovereignty and plan for your life—a task which participants designated as not so easy in that it required a move in relation to a burden (also designated as a "love") that God had placed on one's heart. Below, for example, I have excerpted an example from the first focus group in which four participants discussed such efforts to rest in God's sovereignty:

Participant one (P1): I was just going to say that there's a Bible verse I've been taking comfort in lately and I feel like it is kind of a seniorish verse (*Everyone laughs including me).* You probably (*looks around the table*) I don't know if you've read it. It is Jeremiah 29:11

Participant two (P2): Yes!

P1: Which basically, I mean I can't say it verbatim but it says like, I know the plans I have for you, (*All participants begin to talk, apparently mumbling different versions of the verse; I transcribe only the words of P1 whose voice was the loudest and easiest to decipher, yet still not very easy)*

P1: Declarest the Lord plans to prosper you (*I hear quite a few "yeahs"*) For welfare or not for evil, something like that. And basically to give you a future and hope. (*Again, I hear "yeahs" and the talking dies down).*

P1: And that is just like really comforting because we often are like just consumed with the what ifs. What if this doesn't work out. What if this is gonna happen?

Participant three (P3): Proverbs 20:24 is "so God directs your ways so why try to understand everything along the way."

P1: yeah

P2: Proverbs 16:9 says "The man directs his path"

P3: "the ways of the"

P2: yeah, "The man plans his steps, the man plans his path, but the Lord directs his steps."

Participant four (P4): yes.

P2: It is like it doesn't matter what your path is. God is going to direct your steps.

P3: There's one, there's one. Maybe like in 19 or something. About how God's plan is the one that stands.(*all say "yeah"*). The plans of the man are many but God's plan stands

P4: Oh yeah

P3: It says so plenty of times so why is it so hard (loud voice)

(*all say "Yeah!!!" loudly with enthusiasm)*

P1: He tells us not to be anxious like so many times

P3: yeah

P4: But it is like, we want to feel comfortable. We want to have a backup plan and be ensured.

P3: Which is kind of where I am personally right now. Which is why I said earlier I don't know if I am going to be teaching. Because God has been working other things in my heart. I haven't seen the other opportunities yet, but there are other things working.

P1: Same with me

P3: Awesome (*said with a tone of sarcasm since she had talked earlier about how frustrating this had been*)

Movement in Thought

As I thought this data in relation to the question to which this note is attached, *Are you going to stay or go?*, I began to think it with new complexity especially considering how decisions to *stay* and *go* as well as opportunities for *staying* and *going* were described as being mediated by a third party, a sovereign God. In the context of the above conversation, Love, a Christian preservice teacher, is trying to decide if she should *stay* and host a dinner that had been planned and prepared for quite some time or if she should *go* (i.e. leave the dinner she was hosting) so that she could help a young neighbor, who had just called her, with her homework. While this decision seemed small and perhaps unrelated to public education, the depicting of it as a decision felt familiar and I was reminded of the work I undertook during my comprehensive exams in which I explored how some of Foucault's (e.g., 1978) discussions and examples of his genealogical work might be useful for a dissertation study which would somehow address subjectivity, the preservice teacher, and love. During the analysis of texts for this project in which I was trying to address how the preservice teacher became thinkable as a subject position that must be seen in relation to love in various often contradictory ways, I wrote about historical moments when talk of love was prominent in the writings in the two journals I analyzed, *The Elementary School Journal* and *Journal of Teacher Education.*

One of the historical patterns I wrote about was tendency for authors to discuss love in relation to the preservice teacher at times when there was a shortage of teachers in the United States such as following a mid-century population boom (Bancroft, 1952; Beaty, 1969; Edwards, 1950; Stout, 1952; Symonds, 1964; Theophane, 1958). This work also drew attention to the present teacher shortage which is often talked of as a failure to retain teachers in the schools where they are most needed, i.e. urban, high poverty schools (Bondy & McKenzie, 1999; Cochran-Smith, 2003, 2004, 2006; Henke, Chen, & Geis, 2000; Ingersoll, 2003, 2004; Johnson & Kardos, 2009; Liston, 2000; Nieto, 2003, 2005; Palmer, 2003; Quartz et al, 2004; Zumwalt & Craig, 2009). It has been highly documented, for instance, that teachers are much more likely to leave within the first five years in high poverty, urban areas (Ingersoll, 2003).

When I thought this data along with The Clash's song which required a decision despite complexities (i.e., "If I go there will be trouble, if I stay there will be double"), this seemed similar to these decisions teachers must make to *stay* or *go* in urban classroom, for instance. While I was thinking about this decision to *stay* or *go* as relatively straightforward, I knew that it was already being complicated in teacher education by Freedman and Appleman (2009) and Cochran-Smith (2006), for instance, who have called for a re-thinking of *staying* to also include those who move about from one place to another. Additionally, Teach for America, and other alternative programs, have re-cast staying as a temporary thing, capitalizing on the high levels of altruism attributed to the decision to go into teaching and also the idea that serving others, for short periods of time, can look good on one's resume (see Labaree, 2010 for discussion). I decided to continue with this line of thinking, though, given that the storyline of *staying* and *going* in public education was quite prevalent. Furthermore, in the religious literature I had read an article by Hartnett and Kline (2005), addressing the shame and guilt that Christian teachers often felt when they left the classroom despite having felt that God was calling them elsewhere. In the words of Hartnett and Kline (2005):

> When they [teachers] make the decision to leave or someone makes the decision for them, they are terrified at the idea of having misread the will of God, disillusioned with faith, and shocked and depressed by the conditions they experienced in the classroom. (p. 10)

With this in mind, exploring this binary felt particularly important.

In the situation depicted in the above scene, *staying* would require Love to neglect the expressed needs of her neighbor. In teacher education, a teacher's decision to stay in high poverty, urban schools has been discussed as her neglecting her*self*. These positions, for instance, usually require teachers to work in what are often talked of as undesirable conditions often marked by low pay, little support, and emotionally taxing work (Whitcomb, Liston, & Borko, 2008). In my dissertation log in October, 2010, I wrote of an interview with Bill Ayers that I had read on a blog I frequented, Engaged Intellectuals, (Jones, 2010) in which he talked of how in the present context where school systems are made to fight for federal monies as a part of Race to the Top initiative, teachers and schools must struggle on their own so as not to lose any footing in the race. In the interview, he elaborated by saying:

"I speak to young teacher groups all the time, and I often start by asking, 'Are any of you going into teaching because you think you'll get rich?' And they laugh. And then I say, 'Are any of you thinking you'll have the overwhelming respect of your community?' They laugh again. And then they tell me, 'My parents, my brother, my sister, my partner all told me not to teach.' So I say, 'Why are you gonna do it? What's wrong with you?' And what's 'wrong' with them is a desire to do moral work in an immoral world. Yet, we're putting a stake in their hearts." Descriptions such as these position preservice teachers as entering a profession where the decision to *stay* is necessarily wrought with distress.

Going, on the other hand, would require Love to neglect not only her guests but seemingly nullify her hours of planning. Since teacher preparation requires much time and energy (Labaree, 2010) *going* would nullify the hours of planning and training the teacher educators and the preservice teacher put into the teacher preparation program. Additionally, *going* is often discussed as working against the needs of the students and families who are most likely to populate these "high needs" schools often populated by Black and Latino students (e.g. Ingersoll, 2003; Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2002). Since much research in teacher education says that experience matters in learning to teach (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Rosaen & Florio-Ruane, 2008; Villegas and Lucas, 2002) and teachers with at least three years of experience are often deemed more successful (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005). As such, teacher educators have often expressed a belief that staying around for the "long haul" is a good thing for working to counter inequities in education (Freedman & Appleman, 2009; see also Cochran-Smith, 2006; Nieto, 2003, 2005a, 2005b, for examples). Furthermore, studies of teachers' reasons for staying in teaching often depict teaching as a matter of the heart (Nieto, 2003, 2005a, 2005b) or as a personal calling (Serow, 1994) and thus *going* would be working against some spiritual or religious being outside oneself. Thus, the option of *going* might position the preservice teacher as going against the best interests of not only individual children and families, but also a higher power as well.

The data trail above though seemed to complicate the idea that *going* would necessarily be a move against a higher power or the heart. In fact, *going* seemed to be a complicated decision that was based attempts to be particularly in tuned with one's God, placing the preservice teacher, for instance, in a state of being *on call*, ready to move. In earlier drafts of this conversation which I thought would be more like an academic article, I often found myself starting writing with a specific comment that a participant had said during a focus group interview in mind. The participant described how she could not find her calling in anything other than the calling that Jesus laid before her. She said, for example, "He's going to lead me to different places, but how can I know my calling if I don't really know what is going to happen next week" (personal communication). The conversation continued with other participants clarifying in various ways as well as with my attempts to collect some in-process response data from participants about my understandings:

Sarah: So you are like doing the prep work for the calling that you think is the calling right now, but then you are also doing the prep work for flexibility in the sense of ,I am going to go and sell this at the consignment shop kind of thing.

Participant: yeah, it's like not finding your identity in it. It is like doing all the prep work but not making it your identity. You know.

I began to see that while I had written the question above as being a decision between two binary opposites, perhaps this decision involved much more complexity. Another quote a participant said during a focus group interview came to mind:

> You know, there are so many times in life because people are like, I can't move because God hasn't spoken to me about this yet. Like I don't know what to do because God hasn't told me yet. But God, again, I believe in a very sovereign God who calls us to salvation and everything but again, I don't believe that we are supposed to be just sitting here and waiting for God to tell us our every move (Personal communication, August, 29, 2010).

While I am not sure what to make of these quotes and this movement in thought, this note seems to have relevance to ongoing efforts to retain teachers in certain locations. With vocation as being on the move—both a physical movement and a movement of the heart—this seems to have important implications for work with aims to retain teachers "for the long haul" (Freedman & Appleman, 2009). Perhaps a shift away from retention might allow for conversations. This shift would not be one where a focus on knowledge of the calling. It would not ask questions such as how one knows one is really called elsewhere. Instead, it might be a shift toward talking with preservice teachers about how they might go about making a decision that involves a leap of faith into an unknown space. This might involve teacher educators and preservice teachers exploring the effects of staying and going in certain communities. It could also involve shared readings of research and commentary related to vocation

[2] Yet again, I have lost the note where I address my desire to focus future work on time in relation to Derrida's (1993a, 1993b) work related to time and the gift. If only there was enough time to do so now.

[3] See Apéritif/Digestif, Aporias 1 and 2 for further explorations of love

[4] See Chapter 3, Uninvited Guest 1

[5] When writing this line where Impossible commiserates with Love, stating that it must have been terrible to have to rely on her family when times were tough, I felt particularly uneasy. This statement, along with many of the others that Impossible asks and says in relation to Love's descriptions of her experiences, beliefs, and feelings was informed by my words and feelings during the individual and group interviews with participants (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 71; See also Chapter 3, Uninvited Guests 13, 15, 17). In this instance, for example, a participant was describing an experience when she moved to a new city and did not have a job or a house to live in, but due to God's sovereignty, she was able to make way. While, in the interview, I might have appeared very supportive, nodding and giving looks that I thought suggested sympathy, I was thinking and feeling things that were very different—that were more along the lines of "Are you kidding me? Don't you see how privileged you are?" Like the doctoral students who Erica McWilliam (2003) talked of mentoring who always came to her willing to solve the world's problem (see Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 2), I had trouble thinking in ways that poststructural theories invited. While time does not permit me to go into as much detail in this note as I would have liked, I briefly explore this discomfort below.

Data Collection/Analysis

I start this data trail with the present, where I sit, in a hotel room in New Orleans, at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (2011). It is only moments away from a session I am itching to go to about Christian privilege in education. I cannot go though. One, I must sit here and finish cleaning up these endnotes that were noted ages ago and have exploded into multiple pages and then been filed back again and again (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 14 on writing/real writing). Two, and perhaps more importantly for this note, going to the session might entice me to write about Christian privilege (Blumenfeld, 2006; Fairchild, 2009; Schlossher, 2003) or about the ways that Christian privilege intersects with other privileges such as white privilege (McIntosh, 1990). While I have described elsewhere (Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 19), it is not my goal in this dissertation to make claims about the privilege of individuals or groups, I have certainly not shied from asking related questions in interviews. I asked every participant how income and poverty related their mission work, for instance. I even tied such inquiries to the location where participants lived which had a high amount of poverty compared to surrounding areas.

These questions felt like attempts to get at the sense maker, to define *her* in a certain way, or to at least determine how class was the defining factor in her sense making. For instance, in one individual interview I asked a participant to tell me what she thought about why some believers were in poverty while others were not. This was following a long discussion of experiences in her life when she had been particularly blessed by God. After asking the question I followed it up with, "So how does that work? I mean, I guess if we are attributing everything to God, I don't know. Does that make sense what my question is?" I also asked later in the interview for more clarification related to her understandings of being blessed, saying "So are you also assessing how people are blessed? Do you see what I am saying?" (ersonal communication, January 21, 2010).

Movement in Thought

Two wonderings come to mind as I think about these questions I asked. First, I noticed how I said "we" in the question related to attributing everything to God. This move makes me wonder about my relation to participants and their perceptions of my status as a participant (see Chapter 3, Uninvited Guest 16). Second, these questions remind me of how blessings and privilege almost seemed to intertwine. I am not sure if I was the one doing this, but I can recall other such moments throughout interviews. While I am not going to explore these now, I would like to return to them and think more about how the term *privilege* might be a term does not necessarily make sense in a context where God is sovereign.

[6] See Apéritif/Digestif, Aporias 1 and 2

[7] See Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1

[8] See Dinner Conversations, Dinner

[9] See Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Selves for further discussion of sin

[10] I am uncertain why I noted this.

[11] See Chapter 3, Uninvited Guest 5

[12] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 68 for discussion of focus groups and the Christian lifestyle

[13] While I did not ask this question as worded, I often tried to "get at" participants' ideas of assessing needs and blessings despite my best intentions (see Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1).

[14] When I wrote this section, I marked a specific page of a particular transcript that I had been thinking with. When I returned to it again to explore it further, I had no idea of what connection I could have been making. Instead, when I reread the text attached to this note, I could not stop thinking about a preservice intern I had years ago when I taught elementary school. I do not remember this intern having any particular religious affiliation and if she did, she I do not recall her openly expressing it. What I remember about her though is a story she told me about how she knew that some kids had particularly troubled home lives because they always asked her for a dollar when she saw them in the hallway. I asked the students in my class about this one day when she was not there and many laughed, saying that of course they would ask the white girls for money because they would always give it to them. While I am not sure what to make of this right now, I note it here for further consideration later.

[15] See Chapter 3, Uninvited Guest 13

[16] In Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 2, I wrote of getting advice from knowledgeable others. Here, Love is asking Impossibility for her advice in relation to determining a call. I have often wondered how my claiming myself as a Christian or not affected these interactions. Dinner Conversations, Dessert, in part, deals with this as does Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1. Here, in particular, I was reminded of a conversation I had with a person who knew one of my participants. The participant had told the person about her participation in my study and how the interviews were some of the best conversations she had ever been a part of. The participant, then, asked the person if I was a Christian. The person replied that she thought I was not, or actually something more along the lines of that my view of Christianity probably differed greatly from that of the

participant's. I bring this up here to add to my continual pondering and theorization of how interviews function as a space of interminable blurring between participants and myself.

[17] See Chapter 3, Uninvited Guest 13 about my asking questions. No participant actually talked of how the particular communities or locations of their mission trips or regular mission work was determined. I asked.

[18] See Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists

CHAPTER 5

DINNER

This conversation takes place at the house of Love, a preservice teacher, who is learning to teach for social justice. Having accepted the invitation to take part in a progressive dinner planned by a teacher educator called Responsibility who she met just a few week earlier in a coffee shop, Love has arranged the tables at her house so that she and Responsibility could sit together and get to know one another better. Responsibility, as one who yearns for social justice at the same time she questions what social justice is, if such a thing exists at all, has invited a third party to the table, John Caputo, without Love's knowledge. Responsibility had read many of Caputo's texts and felt that he might be a useful and interesting addition to the conversation in that he actively tried to think Derrida (one of Love's other frequent reads) and Christianity together.

Love:

Thank you so much for inviting me to dinner. I am so eager to share with you about how God has been radically changing my life and calling me to love and serve others.[1]

Responsibility:

No, no, thank you for inviting me. I have heard of your open willingness to share about your faith and if I am not mistaken, you see this as part of the Christian mission to witness to others and glorify God. In that way, I think you have invited me. I found you because of the way you live.[2]

Love:

How wonderful. I always hope that people will notice something different about me. The Christian lifestyle is very different from the way the world encourages us to live—all about me, me, me, you know.[3] You do know, right? A friend told me that you said you were a believer when she asked you, and I noticed that you didn't hesitate to bow your head just now as I prayed over our conversation. But, I must admit, I am rather curious about your status as a believer.[4] When I was coming out of the kitchen to set the tables just a moment ago, I overheard some man named Paulo Freire joking around with a Jacques Derrida. He was saying that he hoped you weren't mad at him for kidding you so much over appetizers when he was pointing out that you weren't calling Jesus over to your table to talk with you about love. It did seem quite odd to me that you didn't call on Him. For who can help you think about love if not Jesus? God is love as the scripture tells us. And Jesus as the son of God, is love and lived love.

Responsibility:

Actually, now that you ask, let me introduce you to my good friend Dr. John Caputo.[5]

Love:

Oh I wasn't aware that you had invited anyone else.[6] When I did the seating arrangements for dinner I put the two of us together so that we could talk. I don't have a problem with a third though. Let me go and grab an extra plate.

Caputo:

No, please. I am fine. Thank you for your hospitality but I will just pick off your plate if you don't mind.

Love:

Sure. I guess.[7] How do you know Caputo?

Responsibility:

We share an interest in deconstruction, which Derrida tells me has everything to do with love. And as Caputo tells Derrida, this love can certainly have everything to do with Christ, which I am sure he'll talk about later if the conversation takes us there.[1]

Love:

Or if God takes the conversation there. He does put questions into our hearts. I mean, we can't just sit around and wait for them to pop into our heads or anything. We have to keep living the Christian lifestyle. But He will do it, you know, if you believe He is who He says He is. He *is* sovereign.

Responsibility:

Sure, sure. Perhaps our conversation will touch upon sovereignty later.[8] For now, I'd like to finish the introductions and get to the work of talking about missions, the Christian lifestyle, and love of course, all of which I am coming to understand are all quite interrelated.[9] Caputo, this is Love, a preservice teacher whose resume is saturated with mission work and who has so graciously invited me to talk with her about how she tries to carry out this mission work in all areas of her life including her work in public schools as a preservice teacher. Her mission field is everywhere, as she told me when I met her in a coffee shop the other morning.

Caputo:

Interesting. This talk of mission work fascinates me. Deconstruction has everything to do with missions, you know, and love, and I suspect this Christian lifestyle. That is, if such things exist as deconstruction, missions, love, or Christians exist that is.[10]

---

[1] Caputo, 1997; 2001

Love:

Huh?

Responsibility:

Oh, he is always doing that sort of thing, saying "if such things exist" and things like that. He picked it up from Derrida, I bet. You learn to ignore it after a while so just don't get him started on chatting about that right now or after dinner is long over, he'll still be excitedly telling us about how the good news of postmodernism can help release us from any idols we construct— like when we think we know for sure what love, justice, or even God *is* for instance.[11] So, for time's sake, we cannot get him started!

Caputo:

Ha ha. Luckily I have a great sense of humor. I am quite aware that our time is limited. Isn't it always? I will shut my trap for a bit, so that I can stay and have dinner with you fine people without taking all the time to talk about that which interests me greatly--namely the works of Jacques Derrida and the good news of deconstruction for the church.[12] By the way, where did Derrida go? I thought I saw him just now in the kitchen munching on a fruit plate with Freire.

Responsibility:

If you don't mind, I'd like to keep it just the three of us for dinner. He's been stressing me out too much with his incessant tendency to confuse the hell out of me.

Caputo:

That is fine with me, although, I do hope that you consider being more hospitable to him in the future. As I said, I understand that we are bound by a timeline with this dinner, but as I

like to say "there ought to be something that we do in life that is not for a return. Something a little mad."[13]

Love:

I couldn't agree more. That is totally why I wear this WWJD bracelet to remind me to ask myself What Would Jesus Do? He is totally mad, you know! In a good way of course. I mean, look, He's in there right now talking with Derrida about God knows what. And if listening to Derrida requires the patience that you have such a hard time mustering up sometimes, it's pretty mad that Jesus is giving him His time and energy. Jesus always does the complete opposite of what the world would expect of someone, though, especially where love is concerned. You know, it is easy to love someone who is loving you back, and giving you things and stuff like that, but it is so much harder to do so when you aren't getting anything in return from them.[14] When you are having to sit and listen, for instance, to someone who you might not even like. I am not saying Derrida is unlovable or unlikable or anything like that. But I am just saying that going to the *hard to love* is what Jesus was all about. It may seem impractical, unreasonable, or like it just makes no sense at all. But that is what happens when you try to do what Jesus would do. Isn't that right Dr. Caputo? I see you are wearing a WWJD bracelet as well.

Responsibility:

Are you kidding me? Let me see? It can't possibly *mean* What would Jesus do? Because if I know anything about your work, you are pretty harsh about the whole idea of the church, in particular, running around and presuming to know exactly what Jesus would do in a certain situation. And the whole What Would Jesus Do phenomenon, I think you said the whole bumper sticker, bracelet ordeal was a way for the Religious Right to not ask the question but use it "as a

stick to beat their enemies."[15] It reminds me of that movie *Saved*,[16] where one of the characters, Hilary Faye, you know the one played by that pop star Mandy Moore, commandeers prayer circle after prayer circle to pray for the saving of the soul of her friend Dean whose parents had just shipped him off to a "Mercy House" for calling himself a homosexual—all in the name of what Jesus would do? Sorry, Love, I am not trying to say that you are like Hilary Faye, but this whole business of knowing what Jesus would do is quite frustrating to me. If Jesus is impossible perfection, how could one presume to follow in His footsteps?

Love:

Well He's right over there. We could just ask Him. Or I have my Bible here for us to consult. On second thought, I have a better idea. My youth minister at my church is one of those guys who just exudes Christ love. It is like he is the aroma of Christ or something. I have his number in my cell. I'm sure he'd drop everything and come over.[17]

Responsibility:

I don't think that's necessary since Caputo over here seems to have been asking this question a lot himself. Let's see what answer he has to offer us.

Caputo:

Calm down, Responsibility, I thought you would have remembered that I wrote a book with the same acronym but with a quite different meaning: What would Jesus Deconstruct? In that book, I certainly wanted to ruffle the tail feathers, so-to-speak, of the right wing conservatives who claim a whole lot of stuff in the name of "Jesus" and would be shocked to know that the question was really was more like a radical call for social justice.[18] But as we know, deconstruction, if such a thing exists, is driven by the impossible as well. Of course the

event of deconstruction requires us to tear down any idols we construct in the names of things or persons like Jesus, Justice, or anything else we might presume the need to capitalize.

Love:

I don't have any idea about what you mean by your question *What would Jesus Deconstruct?* but I like the idea of tearing down idols. Not sure how that would work with Jesus though. He is Lord—*the* sovereign being who guides my life and directs my path. Why would you want to break that down?

Caputo:

I am not referring to the breaking down of Jesus, per se. The name of God is undeconstructable, belonging to the vocative order—that which calls us to act and demands our response, that which we love. It is the name we confer upon God that must be kept safe, which we can never reach or ever know for sure if it exists or not as one *thing* or *being* for instance. But actually it is the name of God that already auto-deconstructs without our help.[19] The name is just a nutshell, you see. God, if such a being exists, cannot actually be contained inside any*thing*, as we all know, since He *is* the wholly other. Actually, all names are like that, really, presumably capturing some wholly other which just sits inside in all its tranquility. But deconstruction is driven by the stirring that is inside any name. [20]

Love:

The stirring? The name? I thought we were talking about Jesus. You lost me. I think you might be becoming like Responsibility's Derrida problem. Utter confusion.

Caputo:

Well whoever said understanding was possible? Understanding of course is all contextual, if such things as understanding exist at all. At any rate, I'll go ahead and give you an

example of this stirring I was talking of, as long as you keep in mind that examples are just other nutshells though.[21]

So, Love, you do a lot of mission work, am I right?

Love:

Why yes. I try to live the missionary lifestyle wherever I am, of course, and I like to say that everywhere is my mission field. But I do actually go and *do* mission trips and have set times scheduled for mission work. Like, I go to the projects once a week and love on kids or like I have gone to multiple other countries and built houses and worked in orphanages and stuff like that. Or here in the U.S., this one trip I went on, we did all sorts of things in just one week like we worked in a homeless shelter, volunteered in a school, fixed up houses and stuff like that.[22] I mean I have done the door to door kind of share the gospel thing before but I am not so sure I'd do something else like that again. Don't get me wrong, that was a life changing event and all and I am sure that God called me to do it at the time, but now I am more about mission work where I can build relationships if you know what I mean.

Caputo:

I am not sure that I do, but we can come back to that point later if we have time. I am going to use this idea of scheduled mission work as our example if you are comfortable with that.

Love:

Ish.

Caputo:

Ish?

Love:

Oh sorry. It's means like *kind of/sort of*. So I am comfortable*ish* with the example but then also kind of/sort of not.

Responsibility:

Love, I think I might have a sense of what you mean by this *ish* in relation to feeling comfortable. I don't know if this will help, but from what I hear, this idea of deconstruction is driven by responsibility, if there is such a thing, a responsiveness, really, to that which is kind of going on behind our backs in language.[23] So I don't think Caputo is planning to attack your idea of mission work or anything.

Caputo:

I couldn't agree more with what Responsibility is saying. Deconstruction is driven by love really. I don't have time to go into all that right now since I know we are on a schedule, so you'll just have to trust me on that one. So I'll just press on and offer a few more nutshells. For starters, this thing called mission work you mentioned, Love, well, it's work you do in the name of the mission, right? With the aim to fulfill a mission that you say has been laid before you, that you adopted?

Love:

God has laid the mission on my heart to love others and glorify Him. And I love Him and I want to fulfill His mission.

Caputo:

Yes! I must say that you've got some salt. For only a loveless lout doesn't love God.[24]

Responsibility:

A loveless lout, Caputo? That's quite a nutshell.

Caputo:

Hear me out please. A love of God is a starting point, not the end. It must always be accompanied by the Augustinain question of *What do we love when we say we love our God?* which of course requires us to attend to that which is astir inside the words we claim to know such as love, God, and what I hope to show here, mission. You see, "every time you try to stabilize the meaning of a thing, to fix it in its missionary position, the thing itself, if there is anything at all to it, slips away . A 'meaning' or a 'mission' is a way to contain and compact things, like a nutshell, gathering them into a unity."[25]

Love:

A sort of *ish,* maybe? *A kind of/sort of* attached that can be attached to anything?

Caputo:

Well, perhaps an *ish* that never really reaches the thing it is referring to. As Levinas said, the other, the thing, is a shore you are trying to reach where you never arrive.[26]

Love:

So like Jesus is a shore in a way? I think I have an idea of what you mean. It's like I can't know exactly what Jesus would do. It is something that I am never going to completely grasp because it is not possible while I am here on earth. Granted, anything and everything is possible with Christ. I am not saying that we can become perfect, but we can try to know Him. Like I say often to my friends, "I think there's a never-ending depth to that knowledge because to know ultimate surrender and to know all of those things is to *be* God and it would be absurd for us to ever claim that we are God. Well, I mean, it's not completely absurd, but it would be completely unwise."[27]

Responsibility:

Do you mean it's not absurd because people do it all the time?

Love:

Totally. It's like your frustration with the movie *Saved*. Those are certainly the wrong-kind-of-Christians, if I might say, the kind who are all about pushing their agendas on other people, like they've already decided exactly what is right and wrong. Maybe the loveless louts like Caputo said.

Caputo:

Hmm, the wrong-kind-of-Christian? This takes us away from a love of God and into the realm of religion. Of course, I'd like to make the argument that these two should be one and the same, and are always already shrouded by the question that disturbs the presumed tranquility in each, *What do I love when I love my God*?[28] I am not sure that is what you mean here though.

Responsibility:

What do you mean? How do you know somebody is the wrong kind?[29]

Caputo:

Responsibility, I am not sure that this line of questioning works here. We are talking about matters of faith and I am not sure if we want to set reason as some binary to faith. We aren't talking here about truth and knowledge, but matters of blindness. Deconstruction, for instance, is not a matter of knowing or seeing, but of believing . As soon as I open my mouth, I am asking you to believe me that I am telling you the truth, that I am telling you what I believe to be true This is me going on faith. I like to say that "whenever what we say lacks full

transparency—and when does it not?—we must proceed by faith."[2] Where do you believe yourself to be in relation to the wrong-kind-of-Christian?

Love:

Well, the way I see it is that we are all flawed. We are all sinners. We are all the wrong-kind-of Christian, really. Like I was saying earlier about not being able to really do what Jesus would do because then we would have to *be* Christ, which is just absurd to think. But there are sins, and berating yourself and others for their sins is a sin itself like those extremists and Bible beaters who are trying to bash you and tell you you are going to hell.[30] So like with my mission work in public schools, for instance, I am not going to go in and demand that my students are believers or else, you know, like telling students their sins will send them to hell or something. There is this preacher, for instance, who stands outside of the student center where I go to school and he just condemns everyone. He is just standing there and yelling at people and saying things about how even watching football on a Saturday is of the devil in some way or another. He isn't loving people, like Jesus wants us to do.

Caputo:

So you believe yourself to be certain what love looks like?

Love:

No, I mean, we can't define love, per se. Jesus and the way He lived was the definition of love, but His love was unconditional. And as I said, we can never know for sure if our love is unconditional because we haven't run up against all the possible conditions. That guy though, that preacher at my school, I think he thinks that *he* can actually save other people, like physically change another's heart when that is not what it is. It's not us who, you know, are

[2] This section is informed by Caputo, 2001, pp. 160-162. The quote is from p. 161.

doing it. Only Jesus can do that work. It isn't my job to save others. Only Jesus can invite you to be saved. And to answer his invitation is a choice. That was the problem with those missionaries back in the day who took the Native American children out of their homes and tried to make them like themselves. They totally did not respect them and their culture. Those missionaries didn't go to the people to learn from them, and instead, they were out to save them from their lifestyles. That's not the way to answer God's call to love your neighbor. That was the way to love yourself.

Responsibility:

So those were the wrong-kind-of-missionaries, then? Who's the right kind?

Love:

Well, like, look out the window right now. There's a good example. That's the Sandwich Group. They go out every Sunday and make sandwiches and pass them out to the homeless people who live on the street. But what they do is actually build relationships with them. They talk to them, get to know them, and see what they need. They go to them and respect where they are coming from and their experiences. They try to live how Jesus lived.[31] It's a lifestyle thing. They live the Christian lifestyle, loving everyone, no matter who they are, even if they are just gross, like homeless people, who just smell sometimes or try to take advantage of you. Or like even if they are that annoying kid in class who you have no desire to talk with or the one who calls and wants help with homework that you know just isn't getting the help at home. That's what Jesus did. He loved those who didn't deserve it. Like me. I *am* just as bad as those people. You know?

Responsibility:

No, I don't know. And I am having a really hard time hearing you talk about being just as bad as others, even if you are putting yourself into the same nutshell. I am not sure that saying you are just as bad as someone else erases the fact that you just called them bad. You know, it still has effects.

Love:

What do you mean by effects?

Responsibility:

I mean you just called a whole group of people gross, saying that they were trying to take advantage of people. But you didn't say you were doing the same thing. It'd be like me saying "Hey Love, you are really stupid. But don't worry, I sometimes can't spell words." I'm pretty sure me saying that about myself doesn't cancel out the fact that I just lumped you into a category. Plus, it is not like some categories don't already have some weight behind them. Anyway, I thought your mission field was everywhere anyway. Why are you concerned with calling people bad anyway?

Love:

Well, let me just clarify that I mean we are all bad. Most of us walk through life thinking that we are good people. I would say that everybody does. I mean, you walk up to the normal person and you ask, you know, do you think that mankind is generally good or evil and I would be willing to bet that unless they are a Christian who has this doctrine they're gonna say that people are generally good. You know, we do some bad things, but we are generally good. But until you recognize that you are just as bad as the worst sinner, you won't be able to love others. You have to be able to ask God for that love so that you can give it to others.[32]

Responsibility:

Oh, look at the time. 8:00 already? Time to head to dessert.

Endnotes

[1] This Dinner Conversations, Appetizers stems from a discomfort I felt when I caught myself fluctuating between writing Love as speaking a claim at being eager to share with others or not, erasing the word "eager" multiple times and then re-inserting it again, for instance. Unable to identify any specific image, memory, or desire that would help me make sense of this fluctuations, I decided to Dinner Conversations,Appetizers it. Thus, in this Dinner Conversations,Appetizers, I explore data collection/analysis in relation to eagerness and suggest implications.

Data Collection/Analysis

In order to make some sense out of my hesitancy to write the word eager and also to do the work of trying to make sense of how it might relate to the possible ways of being a preservice teacher might be inventing, taking up, or resisting. I began to search for ways this writing of Love might have become thinkable by looking to my dissertation log. I searched for the term "eager," for instance, to see if and where I or others had used this term. The first result was in early January, 2010 when I wrote in my log about how eager the preservice interview participants seemed as I emailed invitations to them and corresponded about setting up dates and times for interviews. I wrote of how they used many exclamation marks, smiley faces, and statements like "I'd love to help [you] out" both in emails and interviews. As I reread this writing I began to remember other interactions with participants that I interpreted as an eagerness to help me out. One participant, for instance, drove an hour each way to participate in each focus group interview and commented that she was glad to do it so she could help out. Similarly, all participants volunteered before or after each individual and focus group interview to continue to help me in any way I needed. I was grateful for the willingness they expressed to help me out and began to feel comfortable in thinking this data in relation to Love's claim as eager. Since the poststructural theories I was thinking with were not inviting me to think *eagerness* as a characteristic that was rooted in each individual participant's core (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7 for discussion or Dinner Conversations,Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 1 for example), I was not feeling the need to comb through all of my data to find incidences of where participants were not being eager. Instead, I was interested in both the ways in which preservice teachers, including participants, were invited to claim eagerness as well as the effects that such claims produced on my actions as a researcher and in conversations with Responsibility.

When I returned the text to think more, though, I became stuck in the part of the sentence which read, *I am eager*. I could not stop thinking Love *as* eager as if this were a part of her identity that resided in her core as an individual but also in the core of the category Christianity. It was as if this characteristic was the defining factor of her interactions with others in the conversations. I saw her, for instance, sitting at the edge of her chair with an enormous smile on her face, ready to jump up and share loudly so that all could here. Minding the poststructural critique of the subject that the authors I often consulted wrote of (Davies, 2004; Peters & Burblues, 2004; Søndergaard, 2002; St. Pierre, 2000; St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000; Weedon, 1987), I reminded myself again that the interest was not in the *being* but in the *doing* of categories and identities. These were available within certain stories we tell ourselves about ourselves as we become recognizable within the language we speak. Not satisfied with my reminder to myself (since I had not actually gone back at the moment of writing the previous two sentences to the list of authors I cited but instead inserted those later), I searched through my computer for any earlier writing I had done about subjectivity. I happened upon some writing from 2009 that I found helpful in continuing to think about how this claim at eagerness was not only doing the subject Love but also the categories Christianity and preservice teacher.

The 2009 writing was written as I was trying to determine what questions I might ask in my dissertation study. Interestingly, this writing was explicitly informed by my readings of Judith Butler, who, for various reasons, is not a prominent character in this dissertation. At the time of that writing though, I had been reading her works (e.g., Butler, 1995, 2005) in part because the poststructural scholars mentioned above often quoted her but also because I had been reading and providing feedback on a friend's dissertation proposal which heavily featured Butler. Nevertheless, I found my interpretation of her helpful in thinking Love. I wrote:

> As Butler (1990/1999, p. 34) stated, there is no "'doer' behind the deed" because as an effect of discourse, the subject is actually produced and further categorized as a subject by the deed, the act of recognizing (or not) and repeating (or not) the "norms which precede, constrain, and exceed" the *I*. The

> subject never fully *is* whatever the identity category suggests and what seems to be an expression of the self is actually created and can thus be recreated (Butler, 1993, p. 134).

After reading this Butler, I began to envision a different analysis of my writing of Love as eager. This analysis would involve the image of Love as chomping-at-the-bit to share as a jumping off point for some thinking about the norms which preceded, constrained, and exceeded the *I* that was the character Love.

Still not sure that I knew what I was aiming to do though, I returned to writing about Foucault's theorization of power-knowledge to further explore how I might see Love in relation to the norms which are available for sense making. An excerpt is pasted below:

> Here (in Foucault's conceptualization), power is productive, creating subjects through relations of power/ knowledge which create "truths" within certain regimes. As Rabinow and Rose (2003) described, for Foucault, these regimes of truth, are essential to the ways in which human beings have come to govern themselves and others (p. xii) in that they produce, as St. Pierre (2000)

Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, "very real, material, and damaging structures in the world" (p. 481). She described, for instance, how the common gathering of multiple ways of being under the term woman allows for differences to be erased and for those who fall in the category to be slotted into a hierarchy and then "manipulated, dismissed, and oppressed" (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 480). In this way, subjects are "inserted into a history created before [they] were born" (Spivak, 1997, p. 160), but these slots are also continuously defined and re-defined through day-to-day practices in various contexts and historical moments.

Thus, with this writing in mind, I began to think Love as being born into certain slots, or subject positions, where certain ways of being were already acceptable and unacceptable without her intending them as such. Furthermore, I began to wonder how Love's way of claiming an eagerness to share in the conversation was further producing the two categories, pre-service teacher and Christian, that are the focus of this dissertation.

Eager to Share

Not surprisingly, thinking this image of Love as a new starting point for examining the discursive detail—the moments of speaking, thinking, and acting—which continuously produced and are produced in the processes of subjectification, I found myself thinking of my own *self*. Davies (2000), drawing upon Cixous (1993)—another one of those characters who I believe would produce great movement in thought if featured prominently in this dissertation—has said that our own lives and experiences (including our bodies and feelings) can be powerful for understanding the discursive detail from which we are formed. I found this to be the case here as well as I found myself reminded of an image of my own teaching in an elementary school. In particular, I saw myself on any one of the many days I had spent with elementary students during share time of writing workshop, a time where students and teachers came together to share the writing they have been working on during the individual work time that had preceded it (e.g., Ray & Laminack, 2001). Writing workshops are in part built upon the idea that modeling of appropriate and desired practices associated with writing can help children learn to write. This modeling happens as a part of a larger effort to build a community of writers who respect one another and the space where individual voices can be heard. Such practices of sharing have been described as important for creating an environment where students and teachers can engage in teaching for social justice (Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 30) and one that I engaged in heavily during my teaching with such purposes in mind (Bridges, 2003).

In this particular memory, I saw myself sitting on the edge of my chair with an enormous smile on my face, ready to share the portion of the story that I hoped would point my students toward a particular element of writing found in the list of "good writing" we had constructed based on what other authors had identified as exemplary (including the grade level standards, texts students and I brought in and read together). Of course, the chosen text would also, in some way, encourage my students to address some stereotype that had been circulating in the classroom or highlight a perspective that was different than what was often seen as "normal" in this space. I saw myself working hard to show the right amount of eagerness that would not make me seem disingenuous or over-the-top. I was not raising my hand with the annoying enthusiasm of Hermoine Granger, the overachieving student in the Harry Potter books (e.g., Rowling, 1998), for instance. I was also not declaring my eagerness out loud because those

practices of shouting out or saying "Ooo Ooo I want to share" had previously been deemed unacceptable in both this classroom and probably most other U.S. classrooms. While I imagined that these norms of acceptable and unacceptable sharing were quite familiar to Love, a preservice teacher who was a student in a program which aimed to help her learn to teach for social justice (see Cochran-Smith, 2004 for description), they were quite different than the norms that she was encountering in Christian communities.

I began to remember, for instance, how one participant had described moments in which she had specifically responded to another's queries about her eagerness to help others. In an individual interview, she described an experience of service which involved her going with a group of youth at her church to the downtown area of their town where, as she described, the black and poor people lived. The church group, which according to her, was composed of white "sheltered" private school kids with money who lived in a different part of town, would go door-to-door and ask the residents if they needed any help (i.e. lawn cutting). When asked why they were doing such a thing by some residents, the participant described how they would tell the residents things like "We just want to serve you." Similarly in an earlier interview this same participant had also described such a confession to a middle-school aged child who she interacted with during her church's weekly outreach to one of the "housing projects" in the town where she lived. When I returned to transcripts of other interviews as well as descriptions of conversations with others throughout the study, I noticed that this verbal confession of a readiness to share, in this case an eagerness to share what she described as "her time" with others, was quite common, particularly as it related to the Christian mission to witness to others that involved an attempt to direct others toward a believed truth that is believed will benefit others. One participant who worked at a camp that did various mission projects and trips as a part of a week-long experience for campers described giving up her time as follows:

> . . . like maybe there is a kid who seems to ask a lot of questions, I will seek them out and sit with them at lunch and hang out. If they want to talk, let them know that I am there to talk. And uh, so, hmmm, we try to really make the extra effort to catch that child and have one on one time to try to build the relationship to really build it (January 19, 2010).

When I returned to some of the literature I had read (Baurain, 2007; Snow, 2001) that related directly to Christian mission work and education, I saw similar notions of willingness to share in what was described as respectful ways. Baurain (2007), for instance, who explored a perceived incompatibility between Christian witness and the desire for respect for persons that is readily expressed in the field of teaching English to speakers of other languages, said "We witness because we believe people will be better off with than without truth" (p. 217). This does not mean that one is aimlessly preaching about God, but witnessing should be done with clear intentions of respecting the other. In a focus group interview (Personal communication, August 14, 2010), one participant described how witnessing was not driven by the desire to "get people saved" or "count off numbers." Instead, she described, and the other three participants present agreed, that witnessing occurred every day in every moment:

> I mean on a day-to-day basis…like saying, like how can I show you love today, how can I, hmm, build you up today in Christ, even if I don't use the word Christ. Like how can I build you up, how can I point you back to God. How can I be there for you? And show you love even when it's hard on me at that moment. Or, hmm, I don't know, I mean, I think, at least for me personally, more often than not, it is not the direct conversation about the gospel message.

Similarly, quoting Peter, one of Jesus' followers featured prominently in the New Testament, Baurain (2007) described not only this call to share but the description of how such sharing should occur. He said, "As Jesus' disciple, Peter, advised: 'Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience' (1 Peter 3:15–16)" (p. 217).

Movement in Thought

These images of a Christian preservice teacher (and any teacher) as eager to share time, energy, love, the Truth, or whatever else she presumably holds, has brought forth a number of questions related to teacher education. I began this Dinner Conversations,Appetizers fretting over whether or not I should claim Love as eager, but since, I have come to fixate on what I consider to be a more interesting line of thought that has occupied me throughout this study in multiple ways—the potential effects of making such a claim. Here, what I am curious about is not how to calculate such effects (i.e. Are they against the law? Do they continue to marginalize some students over others?) or

even how to work with preservice so that they may do so as well. Although I believe that work is necessary for any attempts at what might be considered responsive and responsible teaching, I find myself wondering less about being sure and more about the unknown. I am reminded of a conversation with a participant (Personal communication, May 18, 2010) that took place during a follow-up interview. I had asked a participant a follow-up question about a lecture she had attended just before the previous interview in which the lecturer discussed defending one's faith. I asked her to elaborate and she described her views on the matter:

> **Participant (P)**: there is a point where giving evidence or defending your faith breaks down because the absolute definition of faith is believing without seeing and trusting. And you are not going to absolutely prove everything.
>
> **S**: uh huh
>
> **P**: so that's the first thing that you have to realize. And then in saying that, yes there's going to be times when you can or should defend [your faith] and times where you shouldn't.

I am not sure what to make of this right now, but what I find interesting is that this faith, this jumping without knowing, feels familiar.

[2] I Dinner Conversations, Appetizers the above text because I wanted to think more about my ongoing discomfort in this study related to inviting participants based on pre-determined sample selection criteria. Despite that I followed an IRB approved protocol for recruiting participants, in this part of the conversation, I found myself having difficulty deciding who was inviting whom to the conversation, Responsibility or Love. While I would like to use the space this Dinner Conversations, Appetizers provides to explore this in more detail, time does not permit such a task. Instead, I invite the reader to consider this recruitment dilemma in light of the discussion in Dinner Conversations, Appetizers 1 on sharing as well as Apéritif/Digestif, Aporia 1 that relates to the blurring of researcher and participants.

[3] See Apéritif/Digestif, Aporia 1 for exploration of self/other binary

[4] See Dinner Conversations, Dessert for exploration of Responsibility's "status as a believer"; See also Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 31 for discussion of belief in social justice

[5] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 10 on how I came to invite Caputo to this table

[6] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, for image of invitation distributed to guests. Hosts were responsible for arranging table assignments.

[7] When I wrote this part of the conversation in which Caputo says that he will just pick off of Responsibility's plate, I was thinking about Derrida's (2000) writing about hospitality and more specifically about a section I had cut from Dinner Conversations, Appetizers in which Derrida was responding to Responsibility's assertion that she did not like it when Derrida questioned her hospitality. I excerpt that omitted part below and invite the reader to think it with the conversation:

Hospitality is like this justice and love we were talking about, like the pharmakon in that it cannot fit easily into the binary of hospitable/in-hospitable. It's very condition of possibility are its conditions of impossibility. To know for sure that you are being hospitable, to actually give that which is yours is also to not be in control enough to be able to give. You see, to be hospitable, you have to set up boundaries, so-to-speak. You have to exclude. Like today, for instance, you have invited only certain ones of us to this table and not others, not Jesus, for instance, as Freire pointed out earlier. To do this, you exerted some sense of ownership over this table which allowed you to exclude others and also set limits to your hospitality, an inhospitable act by definition. You might claim to be welcoming your guests, but at the same time you leave them as others who are only allowed to do certain things. Furthermore, if Freire and I were to take over your table, steal the wine out of your glass, for instance, you could no longer make claims to hospitality because you no longer had any control.

[8] See Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 28 for the use of Foucault as a weapon

[9] See Apéritif/Digestif, Aporia 2 for discussion of the ever-shifting research questions

[10] Caputo, 2001; Caputo, 1997, p. 32:

> "Whenever deconstruction finds a nutshell -- a secure axiom or a pithy maxim -- the very idea is to crack it open and disturb this tranquility. Indeed, that is a good rule of thumb in deconstruction. *That* is what deconstruction is all about, it's very meaning and mission, if it has any. One might even say that cracking nutshells is what deconstruction *is.* In a nutshell. . . Have we not run up against a paradox and an aporia [something impassable]?. . . the paralysis and impossibility of an aporia is just what impels deconstruction, what rouses it out of bed in the morning. . ."

[11] Caputo, 1997, p. 112

[12] The title of Caputo's (2007) text is *What would Jesus deconstruct?: The good news of postmodernism for the church*

[13] Caputo, 2007, p. 73; "There is, there ought to be, something that we do in life that is not for a return but just because what we are doing is life itself, something a little mad. That is the gift."

[14] The following quote was part of a lengthy conversation related to love. The four participants present nodded in agreement and added to this quote:

> God's love is often referred to as an upside down love because it is in complete opposition to the world's perspective of love which is like, you know, like it may be easy to love someone who is loving you back, giving you things like that, but it is so much harder in the world's perspective to love those who you know you aren't getting anything in return from them (Personal communication, focus group, August 14, 2010).

[15] Caputo, 1997, p. 19

[16] Stern, S.; Stipe, M.; Ohoven, M.; & Vince, W. (Producers) & Dannelly, B. (Director) (2004).*Saved* [Motion Picture]. United States: Single Cell Pictures & Infinity Media. Interestingly, the movie's website has a section designed to explain the film to conservative Christians. There, the producers also warn that "This movie will also make people uncomfortable or possibly offend." (www.savedmovie.com)

[17] See Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 2 for discussion of looking up to experts

[18] Caputo, 2007, p. 22

[19] See Caputo, 2004, pp. 11-12:

> Of everything that *is* we would say it is conditioned. Of the *un*conditional we would say, not that it 'is,' which is to say too much, but that it 'comes' or even that it 'calls.' If this is our inescapable condition, it is not our tragic fate, which is a too Greek and fatalistic way to think, while deconstruction is a more upbeat, messianic and Jewish science, or at least a Jewgreek quasi-transcendental slightly messianic unscientific postscript, which is why I myself think it also has a little Danish blood. Hence, in deconstruction we always need good soldiers to stand constant guard, day and night, like Socrates at his post, lest something existent present itself off as unconditional, or lest the unconditional, *s'il y en a*, would claim to have actually come. The unconditional is like good conscience: the one dead give away that it is an imposter is that it claims to be the real thing. "Deconstruction" is, if it "is," *s'il y en a*, precisely a prayer and a tear for the coming of—Derrida has various names—the absolute surprise, hospitality, the gift, forgiveness, the democracy to come, etc. These are all promises for which their empirical and extant counterparts, the things that actually answer to that name at present, are no match."

[20] Caputo, 1997, p. 52 To think more about the stirring and impossible presence of a term, I Google Jesus to see what would happen. Jesus yielded 250,000,000 results and 51,000,000 for Jesus Christ. I am pretty sure they do not all say the same thing. Jesus is even on twitter.

[21] Caputo, 1997; see Biesta, 2001, pp. 35-37 for an accessible description of the deconstruction of the understanding/misunderstanding binary

[22] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 17 for descriptions of the various types of mission work interviews participants participated in. While most of those specific trips or experiences were focused on one location or one need, the trip that Love spoke of in the conversation, was constructed with a particular description of a trip that a young high school aged girl who I know. She described her days being filled on the trip with helping a different group in a different location each day and her nights were filled with her and her youth group returning to a large, luxurious house away from those in need.

[23] Caputo, 1997, p. 51

[24] Caputo, 2001, pp. 3-4

[25] See Dinner Conversations, Dinner; Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 10

[26] Caputo, 2001

[27] personal communication, interview participant, May 18, 2010; I had this phrased a bit differently and when returning to transcripts for various purposes, I ran across this exact quote and thought it fit well.

[28] Caputo, 2001, p. 27

[29] In earlier drafts of this conversation, Foucault entered the conversation here to talk about power/knowledge and also to talk about exclusions. I even toyed with the idea of having Freire come back into the conversation to discuss ideologies. But I did not. This decision does not mean that power is unimportant or that it is even possible to consider knowledge or language without power. Instead, I wanted to see what opportunities for conversation might arise without calling upon descriptions of power explicitly. See Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guests 27, 28

[30] As I look back at this Dinner Conversations, Appetizers I am reminded of something St. Pierre (1997b) wrote in one of her articles. I excerpt it here below for further consideration at a later date.

> "I remember how out of place I felt as I talked with my participants. The language of humanism roiled in our conversations, and I found myself slipping back into the familiar traps of its cadences as I assumed the subject position I was offered as the younger woman come home to gather wisdom from her elders. In order to have a conversation, I almost had to talk the talk of humanism and assume the world its language produces. I found I often wanted to deploy my own descriptions of the world, to stop and explain and theorize and teach. It was very, very difficult sometimes not to give in to this desire and all the arrogance it assumes. It was then that I found myself clinging to the necessary fiction of liberation, which, though suspect, nevertheless persists in my personal narrative, and I wanted to give her new language to understand her life. I wanted desperately to give her feminist theory and poststructural theory, anything, any other way of making sense of what had happened to her. I thought that if she could just see it all differently, maybe it wouldn't be so hard (p. 377-378).

[31] When I returned to this Dinner Conversations, Appetizers and to the particular section of a transcript of an individual interview, I had no idea why I had marked that particular passage. The passage related to the participant raising funds for her trip. Perhaps I wanted to think about this particular section in relation to money or class privilege. If that was the case, I invite the reader and myself to think this section in relation to Dinner Conversations, Preparations, Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 5.

[32] See Chapter 5, Dinner Conversations, Chapter 3 Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 7 for discussion of the gift related to other Derridian impossible-possible aporias.

CHAPTER 6

OMMITTED: TIME LAPSE

After most people had left Love's house already, she and Responsibility chat while cleaning up the tables from dinner and transferring all of the dirty dishes to the sink. Responsibility, who is struck by something that happens in that brief conversation, hitches a ride with Freire over to Michel Foucault's house for the dessert course and with the help of Freire attempts to make some sense of the something that happened. Meanwhile, in a last minute decision, Love decides to go over to her neighbor's house in order to offer her services with the child's homework despite that it makes Love late for her prior commitment taking place at Foucault's house. While working on reading homework with the child, Love must make the decision of how, when, or if to uphold her mission to love others and glorify God.[1]

Endnotes

[1] This note addresses my decision to omit this chapter from the dissertation and instead to provide just a summary.

Aporia

In earlier drafts of this chapter, I had written an actual scene in which Love, before going to the dessert portion of the meal, walked over to her neighbor's house to help a child with her homework. I based this scene in the multiple stories that interview participants had told me about loving others as a part of their mission work. For instance, one participant told a story of a little girl who never wore her glasses to school. Having recognized this, the participant spent time talking with the girl about her glasses and listening to what she had to say about why she was not wearing them. She encouraged the girl to wear them and was happily pleased when, later that semester, the girl wore them—stating that the girl must have known that she was cared for and loved (Personal communication, January 22, 2010). I also based the scene from many examples of attempts to "make a difference" in the lives of communities, families, and social structures depicted in movies mentioned elsewhere (e.g., *Dangerous Minds*,1995*; The Make a Difference Movie-The Teddy Stallworth Story*, 2008), images from teacher education literature (e.g., Carter, 2009), religious education literature (e.g., Baurain, 2007) and my own experiences as a elementary school teacher and teacher educator (e.g. recollections of experiences with past students and student teachers).

In the scene I had written, Love walked into a house that was very different than the one she lived in. The furniture was older than hers, the kitchen cabinets were falling apart, and the carpets were not new. In addition, the child's father answered the door and was, from Love's perspective, noticeably tired and in need of sleep. In fact, he had just woken up when Love rang the doorbell. He was now preparing to go to work doing the night shift at a local factory. Love made small talk with the father and thanked him as he escorted her to the child's room where she was diligently working on her homework. The father thanked her for her help and was off to work.

As I wrote the scene, I caught myself narrating Love's thoughts that were going on behind-the-scene, so-to-speak. When the father opened the door and Love peered inside, for instance, Love found herself disgusted for a moment and then filled with pity for the girl who would have to live in such a place, wondering how she had not realized that her neighbors were living in poverty. While she knew that their home was much smaller than hers, she had not realized the extent of the difference. She felt certain that she was in the right place because this family was obviously in need. These thoughts were not said out loud and instead Love gave the father a great smile as he opened the door wider to let her inside. When the father spoke, she was alarmed that he could speak any English at all, since he clearly looked Mexican—just like those she had helped on her last mission trip, yet she did not say that. Nor did she express her worry that if the father did not have time to help the child with her homework, what else did he not have time to do—give his child the love she needed, perhaps?

This scene, including the narrated thoughts, felt quite familiar to me, especially when I imagined that Love as a preservice teacher who was perhaps going on a home visit to get to know a student's family or gain access to the "funds of knowledge" (Moll et al., 1992) that her teacher educator had probably invited her to do as a means of building from students' cultural practices. In fact, I was immediately reminded of Ruby Payne's (2005) often stereotyped characterizations of families living in poverty in her text *Framework for Understanding Poverty* which fall in line with what Sato & Lensmire (2009) have described as a tendency to label children living in poverty with "grossly overgeneralized, deficit-laden, characteristics that put them at risk of being viewed less cultured, and less worthy as learners" (p. 365; see also Gorski, 2006). Sato and Lensmire provided a list of some of Payne's characterizations of children including that they "cheat or steal because of 'weak support system, weak role models/emotional resources'" and "laugh when disciplined as a 'way to save face in matriarchal poverty'" (p. 366). The preservice teacher I had written fell in line with this image of teacher as savior to those children who were claimed to fall outside of the category of *normal* that Payne perpetuated and others had explored (Carter, 2009; See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 1). I could not help wondering if we needed another example of a savior image, yet I was unsure how to write it in a way that invited a more complex, nuanced reading of how Love was actively taking up, resisting, and producing the position of savior that was readily available for her in multiple storylines. I could not seem to write this story without painting Love as a character who intended to *save* others, and such a depiction was not my interest in this study.

As discussed elsewhere (Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Selves), my work in this study was not to put forth the notion that some persons needed changing while others did not. As Foucault (1980) advised, ask "not why certain people want to dominate, what they seek, what is their overall strategy. Let us ask, instead, how things work at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes which subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviours" (p. 97). I tried to think with Davies (2003) who reminded me that the interest is not in personality but in examining the different positions a subject can take up. But as I returned to the scene I had written over and over again, I could not think that way. I refused the theories and instead *wanted* to provide a story that would show Love as someone who needed to think and be different.

I thought of previous reading I had done in my doctoral coursework that suggested that confronting these inaccurate portrayals of poverty was important if teachers (preservice, inservice, and teacher educators) were to better educate across different values, cultures, and ways of understanding the world (e.g., Compton-Lilly, 2004; Irvine, 2003; Jones, 2006). I had read in Catherine Compton-Lilly (2004), for instance, in her text *Confronting Racism Poverty and Power: Classroom strategies to change the world* how educators must do the necessary work of examining ourselves as cultural and historical beings. She even presented a quiz for teachers to take to assess their knowledge of common myths related to poverty. Sato and Lensmire (2009) suggested doing this type of work in a variety of ways including study groups of texts that counter stereotyped and overgeneralized images (including one that I have not read but am eager to read, Rev. Thandeka (2001) *Learning to Be White: Money, Race, and God in America* in which Thandeka made the case that perhaps social justice agendas fail in part because of a misrepresentation of who white people are and how they got that way). Sato and Lensmire (2009), in part, suggested that teachers work to change their ways of being in the classroom, attending to the specific moments of interactions with students where listening and respect were at the forefront. They advocated that teacher "get to know them as thinkers, as children, and as people" (p. 370). Doing this included "patience and grace in response to uncertainty, in response to the everyday classroom's pervasive demands for wise decisions and action" (p. 370).

As I thought about these suggestions for confronting powerful stereotypes of children in poverty, they all sounded quite inviting. I felt certain that it would benefit Love to come to understand herself as a culturally and historically situated being that would include an examination on how being white, middle-class, and a native English speaker (the characteristics I had imagined as I wrote) influenced her understanding of what was normal and abnormal. I felt certain that it would be much better for Love to open the door to the child's house without being saturated with stereotypes about who this family *was* based on their economic status or their ethic category, although I believed this to be impossible. In other words, I felt certain that Love, in some way, needed to be changed, improved, and made better, and I knew the direction. And I could not seem to write her in this scene without that direction in mind.

As a means of continuing on, I decided to omit the conversation I had written and instead, embark on data collection/analysis that might invite me to explore not the intentions of individual preservice teachers who may or may be out to save others, but the complexities of interacting with one another is spaces where claims at knowledge have effects. To do this data collection/analysis, I found myself, almost frantically, cutting and pasting various excerpts from my dissertation log and earlier drafts. I placed them below for further consideration at a later date. It was a difficult decision not to explore these in this specific excerpts in this dissertation, although writing them and enacting the data collection/analysis in order to do so has certainly altered my writing and influenced my thinking elsewhere (see Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 62; Dinner Conversations, Chapter 1, Uninvited Guest 2; Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guests 27 and 28; Dinner Conversations Preparations, Uninvited Guest 4 and 16; Dinner Conversations, Dessert, Uninvited Guest 2).

Data Collection/Analysis

1. Excerpt from my dissertation log, August 13, 2010:

I can't look at her-my participant who was just describing how people in poverty needed a "better" life that wasn't "crime ridden and drug ridden." Like hers, she was implying, I think. She is the one who wants to "just love those kids" and "show them Christ." I can't stop myself as I quickly make up a story to offer a counter. I can't let her get away with that. I just can't.

I tell her of how a "thought" just "popped into my head" about ?, a wealthy private school in the area. "Apparently" I tell her, "it has like one of the highest drug rates of any" school I was going to say but was interrupted by her "Really?" I keep going about crime perhaps being located "here" and "here" and "here," really having to hold myself back from spouting out the Foucault (1975) that is on the tip of my tongue that I knew would be useful to help her think the very category of "crime" differently—as constituted in certain times and places, constituting certain ways of being as *thinkable* only in certain spaces. I resist and talk my way back into relevance-I am interviewing her I must remember-and tell her "I am just trying to figure out more about *better*."

Maybe it's not a "quote unquote better location" she decides differently. "But just a lifestyle." "A lifestyle that says that you love your God and you love your neighbors." Each time I listen to that interview again, I love her and her lifestyle just about as much as she loves those poor kids she plans to teach whose lifestyles are ridden with crime and drugs.

2. Excerpt from an earlier draft of Chapter 1, note 2:

A few years ago, I went to see someone speak about her research. Her research was on a broad range of topics, but one specific topic she had identified was related to religion and preservice teacher preparation. Citing a study by (Kimball, Mitchell, Thornton, & Young-Demarco, 2009) entitled *Empirics on the Origin of Preferences: The Case of College Major and Religiosity*. She described how the authors had determined that students with high levels of religiosity (a term to include all religions) were more likely to enter college. Once in, they were more likely to enter into education and the humanities. Furthermore, while students majoring in humanities actually showed a decline in religiosity after college, those in education showed an increase. I later read the study and wished I had paid better attention in my statistics courses. At any rate, the woman's concern, based off of an analysis of her own teaching practices, was with how theological certainty interfered with efforts to work toward democracy. These efforts included having students be openly willing to listen to others, a practice she said her theologically certain students were unwilling to do. At one point in the presentation, she laughed saying something to the effect that she did not know if her students were trying to witness to her.

3. Excerpt from an earlier draft of Chapter 5, note 1:

In public education, to talk directly about one's religion is often seen as taboo, not accepted, not tolerated. Although I am not interested in individual's reasons for talking or not about religion in education, others seem to care. Noddings (2008), for instance, attributed this taboo status, in part, to a common perception that the law which separates church and state prevents direct discussion of religion. This law, known as the establishment and free exercise clauses of the first constitutional amendment, prevents the government from both the establishment of a public religion and the prohibition of the free exercise of religion. While the focus in the law is on government, when transferred into practice, public school teachers, as government workers, must abide by its mandates. On numerous occasions, interview participants talked of this separation between church and state as a preventative tool for their missions. One participant, for instance, (Personal communication, January 22, 2010), said:

> I mean, doing missions outside of the school is obviously going to be a lot more open and a lot more, I mean, you have more freedom. . . because in schools you run huge risks of losing your job and blaa blaa blaa. I think, I mean, looking towards teaching, I think that my position is just finding those times and using the discernment and the wisdom that God is giving me to actually use those moments, those teeny tiny moments well.

I am not sure what to make of that or the fact that I am writing about it.

4. Excerpt from my dissertation log, August, 13, 2010:

The patio at the coffee shop was sprinkled with workers. Some tapping away at their laptop computers, some reading books- underlining a sentence here and there- and a few in conversation with tones so low I think for a moment that they must be talking about me behind my back. I sit in a far corner table so that my persnickety recorder picks up only participant's words, but I start to worry that it (and everyone else in the coffee shop) will only pick up the song which has just started blaring from her computer. "Our God is greater," she tells me of the title.

I catch the eyes cutting our direction from the closest key tapper and I respond with a teeth biting frown-like-thing that I hope he knows means sorry. My participant doesn't see me, I don't think. She is focused on the photos of the "Others" from Mexico flashing on her computer screen. I join her focus-not wanting to hear the words of the song or what the low conversers are saying about her God or mine they must presume. I look down at my notepad, scribbling descriptions of the children singing and dancing and the missionaries "loving on" them in between bible stories. I catch myself censoring my notes, not writing about the one brown Mexican after another wrapped in the arms of their white saviors out of fear of offending my participant with my descriptors. What will she think if she knows? Knows *what* I am not quite sure.

Later, my notepad says things like "smiling children" or "kid with blue shirt in lap of college-aged kid." What good is this? I wonder as I look to them to help me know something. I listen to the interview for God knows how many times, this time as I am driving my daughter to daycare. *What do I do now?* I say out loud to my daughter who is chilling in the backseat, wondering what I'd do if this participant was a teacher in my child's classroom. Those lyrics that I did not want to hear before are now so loud I cannot even hear the talk of brown faces anymore. "Our God is for us, then who could ever stop us?"

5. Excerpt from an early draft of my dissertation proposal, January, 2010:

I grew up loving Jesus, who I prayed to with such routine that His name had already entered my telephone conversations by the age of five. Around the dinner table with my mother, father, and older sister, today was my turn to say the blessing for the food we were about to eat. Like the other prayers said aloud by my family and others I'd heard in my church community, I knew that the blessing began with the familiar invocation "Lord Jesus" and was to be followed by a thanking for the food, the day, the family, or whatever else and then a wish that He might bless the food or "nourish our bodies for His service" as my father always said when it was his turn. It wasn't his turn this time as he had just arrived home from work and was looking, what I remember, to be particularly tired that day with, perhaps, a hint of desire to be already finished with the meal my mother had just prepared and allowed to reside?? in his comfy chair for some after dinner TV watching, most likely not in the mood for what was about to transpire. Upon my mother's request, our heads had just been bowed and our eyes closed, and I was preparing to speak, when the phone that hung on the wall just above my head began ringing. Probably proud that I was allowed to finally answer the phone, I picked it up swiftly, just in time for that "Lord Jesus" that had been on the tip of my tongue waiting to head off my blessing to spill into the receiver in place of a "Hello." All I remember next is laughter. . . but I couldn't say a prayer to Lord Jesus for years without bowing my head even lower in embarrassment.

6. Excerpt from my dissertation log, August 23, 2010:

Yet another Chris Tomlin song with lyrics that separate an *us* from *them.* The participant said the song she liked was written while the singer was in a bar in Taiwan amidst the sex trafficking of young girls. She told this story of how she'd heard that Chris Tomlin and his cronies (that is my word, not hers) sat there, in that bar, and sang this song about "Our god." *God of this City* it is called. It was about how no matter what is going on, "God is in control." And as she told me this story, I freaking got the chills. And then, at almost the exact moment I backtracked, wanting to take it back and rub my arms warm, thinking, "What a freaking excuse for inaction."

CHAPTER 7

DESSERT

This section is a conversation between Michel Foucault, a French scholar who has been referred to as a poststructural scholar (e.g., St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000, p. 17), and Responsibility, a teacher educator. Responsibility yearns for social justice although she often sees it with a poststructural twist as that which cannot be tied down. She actively works to prepare teachers to teach for social justice drawing upon the works of many of those who also claim a commitment to social justice teacher education (See Apéritif /Digestif, Uninvited Guest 31). This conversation takes place at Foucault's house as a part of a progressive dinner planned by Responsibility.

In addition, Love, a preservice teacher who is learning to teach for social justice in a different teacher preparation program than where Responsibility teaches, enters the conversation toward the end. Love has identified herself as a Christian in previous conversations with Responsibility and described her mission field as everywhere. She sees herself as called by God to actively work to love others and glorify her God in all aspects of their lives. Responsibility and Foucault have not talked with one another about their religious affiliations before.

Foucault and Responsibility had never met, although Responsibility had read many of Foucault's books, articles, and interviews numerous times over the years. In fact, Responsibility often felt that the two were old friends. Although Responsibility had only just met Love at a coffee shop a few weeks back, they talked on the phone a few times and also just ate the dinner

portion of the meal at the same table. A brief conversation the latter two had after that dinner is currently on Responsibility and Foucault's minds.

Foucault:

Hey Responsibility. I hope you don't mind but I made some last minute table changes so that I could sit with you for dessert. I know that Freire was a little put off by my decision because he wanted to continue the conversation you two were just having in the car on the way over here. I must say that I was quite intrigued by Freire's brief recap of the dinner conversation with Caputo and Love that you told Freire about. Actually, I was most intrigued about your recap of what happened *after* that conversation between you and Love. And, since this is my house and I get to arrange the tables, here we are.

Responsibility:

Thank God. As you can see, I am quite frazzled by the whole snafu.[1] And to be honest, Freire was kind of driving me crazy with his insistence that I not be afraid to "make my beliefs bare." He went on and on about how doing so would not be considered a form of imposition on Love, it'd just be "plain honesty."[2] And as I think you probably gathered from whatever Freire told you, it is the possibility of this "honesty" that has me a little flustered.

Foucault:

Yes, he informed me of such, but that is not why I have invited you here though. It isn't so much the question of asserting an honest statement that interests me tonight. My interest lies in what these acts of honest confession actually *do*.[3] Not that the two can be separated exactly—the truth from the strategies and tactics that enable it and are its effects, that is. But I was just thinking that your predicament seems like just the type to invoke a good problematization of how

we come to think ourselves and others as certain *kinds* of persons.[4] I am quite curious about any type of analysis that might allow us to get free from ourselves.[5]

Responsibility:

Sounds good to me, since as you heard, I am thinking myself as all kinds of persons these days, especially in relation to Love.[6] Now that you are here, I feel pretty sure you are just the person to help me out of this predicament. I don't know if you know this, but I have been reading you for quite a few years now and have found you quite helpful in more ways than I could dream of expressing over such a short dessert. I even pay money to be in your special interest group in the American Educational Research Association, you know. You are quite a highly respected intellectual.

Foucault:

Hopefully not too much money![7] Don't get me wrong, I am pleased that people are finding my work useful. But this whole word 'intellectual' is quite foreign to me. I have never met an intellectual. Sure I've met plenty who talk about intellectuals, so I have an idea of what kind of person this intellectual is. Let me just tell you that I don't love the idea of trying to make one out to be some whole, noncontradictory body of thought, some representative of some theory, for instance, that can just be used to make sense of worlds like "Foucault said this" or something like that. I mean, do you think I've been working like a dog for so many years to not have changed my thinking one bit? [8]

Responsibility:

I know, I know. I've read enough of your work to *try* to mind your many precautions at least.[9] I just got a little excited about the prospect of the different kind of thinking that a talk with you might enable. As you can probably tell by my frazzled appearance, I *am* desperate to think

differently about this particular quandary that I was talking of with Freire. It's only been like twenty minutes since the incident happened but I feel like I've spent days fretting over its significance to practically everything in my life. It's like the whole autobiographical thing you've talked about before. Like how you said that all your theoretical work is always intertwined with the dysfunctions and cracks you saw in your life. So there I was, feeling those cracks when I spouted out that answer--that *yes* I am sure Freire told you I feel uncertain really was a *truthful* yes. I mean, do I really have to think of myself as a liar these days? [10]

Foucault:

Ah! The *truth* of your answer "yes"? The *truth* of who you are? If you know me as well as you claim, you should know that these are precisely the sorts of questions that I have no interest in beginning with.

Responsibility:

I thought you were all about how the subject is constituted in games of truth.[11]

Foucault:

Why yes of course. As I am sure you know, "I believe too much in the truth not to suppose that there are different truths and different ways of speaking the truth."[12] We must remember that these *games of truth* you mentioned are also practices of power. And these relations of knowledge and power must be analyzed in order to get us to the problem of the relationship between the subject and truth.[13]

Responsibility:

Well let's get to it then. I've got to get to the bottom of this.

Foucault:

Responsibility, I know I invited you here, but I am not sure if I can offer you the sort of help you seem to want. I don't tend to analyze that which is hidden deep below a surface, like what is deep inside your head, or in this case, with that *yes* you said that indicates what is deep inside your heart. I tend to focus on that which remains on the surface, where power circulates.[14]

Responsibility:

Crap Foucault that was totally just a figure of speech. I didn't mean that I wanted to literally get to the bottom as in root, origin, capital T Truth. As I said, I try to mind your precautions, and I know that you advise a radical skepticism,[15]a sort of permanent questioning that is not an attempt to permanently try to locate the truth, but to permanently analyze truth claims in circulation in relations to power.[16] I mean, I get that it's not what is the Truth of reality that matters necessarily but it's the *how* of the way we perceive reality—its truths and falsities, its goods and evils or whatever other objects and subjects are put together in ways that seem natural and precious. [17]

Foucault:

But?

Responsibility:

But nothing. I get it. It is just hard to *not* think of power as just this repressive force that acts on us and tells us no.[18] You know, like I want to think it as productive, as strategic relations that make thinkable only certain ways of being human, really, but it is so stinking difficult.[19]

Foucault:

Well, of course it is. Games of truth aren't exactly played out in some space of thought where ideas exist to be analyzed totally removed from practices. It's helpful to start with that which has already become problematic—something that has lost its familiarity already.

Responsibility:

Yeah, so okay, but that doesn't necessarily make it any easier, like with this situation that happened with one of my friends the other day.

Foucault:

Are you going off on a tangent Responsibility? We are short of time, you know. Couldn't you just refer to the situation which brought us here—the one with Love—that has already become problematic and has already made you appear so frazzled, as you said.

Responsibility:

Not a tangent, I promise. It relates to my confusion with that *yes* I said. So just let me speak, will you?

Foucault:

Sorry.

Responsibility:

So this friend was telling me just the other day that she and her husband were going to *have* to join a church if they were going to make it in this new town they moved to. I was listening to her and thinking, "Oh come on, that can't be the truth" and I was asking her all these questions like, "How do you know that is true?" and saying things like "It isn't like someone is holding a gun to your head and forcing you to join" and stuff like that. Anyway, so, I had to stop and *think* Foucault, so-to-speak.

Foucault:

I thought I told you I didn't like that kind of "Foucault thinks this" kind of speak. I *have* put forth the idea before that we ought only get to cite an author twice and then we must speak in ambiguities. Such a rule might help you stop looking for some *one* voice, one Foucault.[20] So I think you've had enough Foucault citations for the evening.

Responsibility:

I am choosing to ignore you right now. At any rate, so this friend had told me all this stuff that was "true" and I had to remind myself that we didn't necessarily have to focus on *what* was true, like whether or not she and her family *had* to go to church in order to make it in that town. Some little birdy inside my head was reminding me that this might be a good place to look at *how* truth was circulating as the real, you know, since my friend was already struggling not against a person, so-to-speak, but against a technique of power that was subjecting her. I do mean subject in the double sense of course. Of 1. Being subject to some sort of control and dependence and 2. Being tied to an identity by some self-knowledge or conscious.[21] You know, I mean a focus on how subjects are made through relations of power. It "categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him that he must recognize and others have to recognize in him,"[22] not to directly cite anyone or anything.

Foucault:

Very funny, Responsibility. Loved your use of air quotes there. So what happened, when you put forth this proposition to focus on the *how,* that is?

Responsibility:

Well, my friend didn't love it. You know, she was saying how she was already feeling marginalized by this Christian privilege in that community and in the US, and wasn't really wanting to rework the truth as a truth claim, so-to-speak.[23] I was saying stuff about how we didn't have to look at it so broadly, like about the super pervasiveness of Christianity as a totalizing force that she could become free from. But maybe if we looked at how it was individualizing, like the multiple ways that my friend was supposed to become known as a Christian, that we might be able to find some spaces for movement, a little space for refusing what we are, you know?[24]

Foucault:

Yes, I know. Like how she spent her time, I imagine, and how her family spent their time could be seen as a certain criteria of evidence that might render her claims as a Christian true or false.[25]

Responsibility:

Exactly. You know her daughter is not even old enough to talk, but this practice of going to church enabled other church goers to see her as a good potential playmate. A positive affiliation if you know what I mean. [26] It's not like this practice was exclusive to her community or anything, but it meant something specific there—meaning, should you or should you not do business or play with these types of people? Anyway, so in the end, it was sort of a *so what* kind of thing. Like so what I am supposed to do now because I still *feel* oppressed by this Christian community.

Foucault:

Oh I see. So this is what you meant by it being difficult to use this instrument of power-knowledge to help you think the subject and truth. I can see how this is very related to your predicament with Love. But before we talk about that, would you mind telling me the story yourself since I've only heard piecemeal from Freire, who, as you noted, was quite interested in why you didn't lay your beliefs on the table, as you put it earlier.

Responsibility:

Sure, sure. I'll tell you the story of my *yes/not yes*, as I have started calling it in my head just now. But mind you, I remember it a little differently every time I try to remember it. So here goes the right now version. So Caputo had just left the table to catch a ride with Derrida over here and I was helping Love clean up the dinner plates and stuff. She was in a terrible hurry, mumbling off and on about how she was supposed to be somewhere else, so I thought I'd offer a hand. Anyway, so out of nowhere it seemed, right when I was helping her fold the table cloth, she said, "You *are* a believer right?" And out of nowhere, it seemed, this *yes* just escaped my mouth. Looking back on it, I feel pretty certain it had something to do with this glow that seemed to be emanating from Love's face at the exact moment when she had asked that question about me *being* a believer. And, you know, that glow had also been there sometimes during the dinner conversation with Caputo. I mean there were all these times when I was feeling chills all over my body when she'd talk about loving God or feeling certain about her purpose in the world.

So I keep trying to make sense of this all. It's like I want to believe that the glow was a product of Jesus literally being inside of her, using her body as a lamp like I had learned about in those Sunday school songs I sang as a child.[27] I mean, I believed that when I said *yes*. But now,

that just seems impossible, especially when I think about some of the things Love said that made me cringe, like her claims that children living in poverty didn't have enough love, for instance.[28] Anyway, but I still said *yes* and I meant it when I said it. I was a believer when I answered**.** I blame the glow.

Foucault:

Hmm, interesting. Freire had not even mentioned the glow in his version of the story, but perhaps we should start with that considering you seem to have placed it as a high priority given your decision to blame it for the whole snafu, as you called it earlier. You might be surprised to find that I am quite interested in the body, not in the truth of what the body is or isn't, but how the body acts as site for struggle and conflict.[29] The body gets quite caught up in the games of truth, you know.

Responsibility:

Oh yes, I know. The other day, I was reading some Bronwyn Davies, an Australian scholar who studies gender production and preschool children, among other things, and she draws upon some research that says that contrary to conventional ideas of gender and bodies, that our body's production of hormones isn't necessarily devoid of social and historical contexts. So for instance, she was saying, that aggressive behavior actually produces hormones that produce even more aggressive behavior, even though it is typically believed to be the other way around. It isn't a matter of whether the body is male or female, but how the body becomes inscribed as such. So, yeah, how we come to understand the body is wrapped up in truth games.[30] But, here, Foucault, I seem to be stuck asking, *Is Love's body really that of a believer?* Or really, *is mine?*

Foucault:

I see. Well, if you will remember from some of your readings of my earlier work, I did not ask what is a mental patient, a criminal, or sexual deviant, but *how* madness, criminality, or sexuality became concepts through which a human body could be read and judged. Today, it is normal, for instance, to ask how to reform a criminal instead of punish a crime, but as you know this wasn't always the case.[31] So perhaps we should start by not asking what is a believer, but how belief became a concept through which Love's body, and yours, can be read and judged, by herself, you, and others?

Responsibility:

That's kind of a huge question, don't you think?

Foucault:

Well, I am not suggesting we tackle it as a generality. Let's start with your *yes*. You doubted its truth, so you said, but not the truth of Love's status as a believer?

Responsibility:

Right. She *was* glowing.

Love:

Hey, sorry I'm late. I had to help a kid with her homework. That poor kid. She has so many needs. I am just so glad that I could make a difference. You know, give her the love she needed.

Responsibility:

Yup. It's late. Time to head home, isn't it?

Endnotes

[1] The acronym, snafu, according to the urbandictionary.com stands for *situation normal: all fucked up*, or to put less crudely, *situation normal all fouled up*. I noted this acronym after using it to describe an event that occurred after an interview with a participant that this conversation is, in part, based upon. I had intended to use the acronym to re-think an event that will be discussed in its imagined form throughout this conversation. This event felt very much to me like a research snafu. Instead, since time does not permit such a noting, I invite the reader to think the normality of any research method or event in relation to other parts of the text (see Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists for instance).

[2] The data that informed the three direct citations in the paragraph to which this note is attached, "make my beliefs bare," "plain honesty," and "honesty" were pulled from a text written by Paulo Freire and Donaldo Macedo (1995) and published in the *Harvard Educational Review* (p. 388). In the text Freire and Macedo discussed various ideas related to culture, language, and race; among them the idea that teachers should be upfront about their beliefs, practices and not try to hide the fact that teaching necessarily involves influence from that teacher. I have noted this for three reasons. One, I wanted to provide more context for the direct citation in that it has relevance to social justice teacher education since Freire's critical pedagogy is seen as a tool for social justice (Kapustka, Howell, Clayton, & Thomas, 2009). Two, I wanted to explore citational practices in research further in a way that specifically related to the format of this dissertation. Three, I wanted to have an excuse to return the Freire and Macedo's (1995) text to see how it might inform my thinking about this conversation. I address all three here.

Critical Pedagogy

In their review of NCATE accredited institutions who used *social justice* in their conceptual frameworks, Kapustka, Howell, Clayton, and Thomas (2009) noted that critical pedagogy is a commonly used tool for teaching for social justice. Critical pedagogy, according to the editors of *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (Darder, Baltodano, &Torres, 2003), "loosely evolved" out of efforts to draw together various radical ideas and practices aimed at dismantling the social structures that thwarted possibilities social justice democratic participation in the US (p. 2). Although the editors claimed that critical pedagogy does not "begin and end with Freire," they noted that he is often the most closely associated with the practices (p. 20). In brief, these involve the empowerment of culturally and economically marginalized and disenfranchised students through ongoing examination of how schools and economic interests work against the interests of some students and persistent efforts to give voice to the marginalized It also involves an assumption that all knowledge is historically and culturally contingent and open to critique, which can occur through the development of a critical consciousness of the social structures and ideologies that work to embed oppressive behaviors and practices in the personalities of people (pp.10-16). Freire's (e.g., 1999) comes contributes to this work through his notion of dialogue as a process of learning for all involved.

Freirian dialogue involves an effort to re-see and re-know and object of knowledge with others (Freire & Macedo, 1995). It is not merely sharing experiences with another but is a "political project with the objective of dismantling oppressive structures and mechanisms prevalent to both in education and society" (Macedo in Freire & Macedo, 1995, p. 380). The practice relies on the assumptions that human beings are curious by nature and the willingness to openly engage with the reconstruction of knowledge (Freire & Macedo, 1995). The importance of "honesty" comes in to play when considering the role of the facilitator in relation to human curiosity. Freire asserted, for instance, that if all humans are curious then making one's beliefs "bare" does not necessarily constitute an imposition (in Freire & Macedo, 1995, p. 388). An imposition would involve an educator who did *not* provide students with the necessary tools to "read the world as well as the world" (Freire in Freire & Macedo, 1995, p. 388).

Talking Text

Freire and Macedo's (1995) text that I have referenced above took the form of a talking text, which Freire has done quite a few of with various authors (e.g., Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor & Freire, 1987). In these texts, Freire talks back and forth with his accompanying authors, often feeding off of one another to critique societal structures and even to address critiques aimed toward the authors. In Freire and Macedo's text, for instance, Macedo is able to bring up common critiques of Freire and have Freire respond to these. While there is not much information about how these texts were written, reading it again, I was reminded of my own writing experiences co-

authoring papers. In a paper being revised with Hilary Hughes-Decatur, for instance, the two of us wrote various vignettes based in conversations we had previously encountered with others or had with one another. In writing these though, it did not seem to matter who said what or even who wrote what. It only seemed to matter that idea was presented. We wrote many of the vignettes during a long day at a coffee shop in which the two of us sat apart from one another, for instance. We would reconvene ever so often and divvy out what we thought we might like write about. Thinking this, it felt strange to cite Freire alone when in fact, those words were in Macedo's section of the talking text. In this way, I cited incorrectly. Yet, I made the choice to cite my character Freire, presuming perhaps, that he might parade Macedo's words as his own. While I am not sure what to make of this at the moment, I decided to write about it for further exploration at a later date.

At any rate, returning to this talking text, I was reminded of the writing I had done in the Apéritif /Digestif, Citing Theorists, in relation to the positioning of multiple characters and how the taking up of positions with or against their others actively produces these characters as certain persons. It also actively produces the categories to which they claim membership and to which others place them in. More specifically, I thought of this positioning in relation to the role of facilitator (something I wanted to talk about in Dinner Conversations, Appetizers, Uninvited Guest 7 and 11 but did not allow myself to do there). As mentioned above, Freire and Macedo (1995) discussed the role of facilitator directly in their text as it related to the idea of indoctrinating or pushing views. Both ascribed to the notion that it is impossible not to teach (and have influence) as a teacher and in fact, this is the goal of teaching. What interests me here though is that the facilitator is supposed to be a continuous learner. The facilitator is to be open to multiple ways of knowing. In this conversation though, Responsibility was so open, in a sense, to Responsibility's way of viewing the world that she could not understand the world in any other way. How might this move relate to understandings of facilitating in education? Thinking these two ideas together—questioning who to cite from a conversation and questioning when facilitation ends—has brought me to question when openness ends and begins.

[3] Foucault, 1977, p. 209

[4] A problematization, according to Rose and Rabinow (1981), is an "ensemble of discursive and non-discursive practices that make something enter into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought" (p. xviii).

[5] Foucault (1985) said: "There are times in one's life when the question of knowing if one can think differently than one thinks, and perceive differently than one sees, is absolutely necessary if one is to go on looking and reflecting at all" (Foucault, 1985, p. 8)

[6] See Apéritif/Digestif, Citing God

[7] I noted this to add in a citation to a text in which I thought Foucault was talking (in an interview, perhaps) about his name being taken up and used often because it was easy to pronounce. He was joking, as I recalled and it reminded me of an experience I had during a reading group I was a part of during my doctoral program and also a story I heard about a well-known poststructural scholar—both related to Foucault's name. The former was a situation where a new professor came to join the reading group on a day we were reading Foucault and consistently pronounced Foucault's name as Fuckoh instead of Foocoh as I more often hear it. The second was a story of the well-known scholar giving her first presentation on Foucault and calling him Michael Foucault for the entirety of the presentation. While these stories might seem tangential I bring them up here because they point to type of nomadic inquiry that can happen in writing that continuously complicate citational practices. In the conversation above, perhaps I wrote Foucault in what appears like a humble state because I was giggling at these stories. At any rate, such writing affects the way the character can be taken up by the reader and the relationship between Foucault and Responsibility. It also affects what happens in the writing, sending it off into unplanned directions (Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists). In this case, by the time I returned to this note to find the exact citation, the remainder of the conversation had been written and I was long past the stage where I allowed myself to rework entire conversations based on one move as I had done previously in this very spot. Hence, I leave in this "citation" although I am Foucault ever said anything of the sort.

[8] Sara Mills (2003), in her text entitled *Michel Foucault*, referred to a quote from Foucault that described what he said to people who claim that he contradicts himself (p.3):

> Well, you thought this a few years ago and now you say something else", my answer is "well, do you think I have worked [like a dog] all those years to say the same thing and not be changed? (Foucault, 1988b, p. 14)

What interests me about this quote is how Mills inserted "like a dog" to Foucault's quote. Since, I have always thought of Foucault as saying this, as thinking with phrases like, "like a dog. " I am not sure if this matters for the context of this study, but it makes me wonder how words are inserted in ways that produce different images of persons. It makes me wonder what I have inserted along the way. It also makes me curious to return to the conversations and continue to read and reread them and watch data proliferate, as St. Pierre (1997c) said. I hope that this proliferation can invite readers to draw upon their own insertions as a space for exploration of the (im)possibilities of being open to the other.

[9] Foucault, 1978, pp. 92-103

[10] I came across an interesting quote from Cixous (1993) in one of Davies (2009) texts that I thought of while reading this. I excerpt the Davies (2009) text below as an invitation for further thinking when time permits:

> As Cixous (1993) says, it is in experimentation with language that one can learn to 'unlie'. In learning to unlie one comes to know oneself as human, as a reflection, an instance of the human, and in moving beyond the known and the readily knowable, the individual glimpses the condition of humanity. In abandoning the self-conscious I, and the possibility of representation, the author is set adrift as and with/in an immanent plane of composition. In choosing to write a play, rather than, say, an ethnography of the Cross, I felt free to shed the burden of old habits, and the sticky surface of familiar language, to experience, and experiment with, language, in the struggle to make language unlie. My writing of the play was just such an experiment in breaking down my own sedimented perceptions, to make my own practice of language unlie" (pp. 199-200).

[11] Foucault, 1983, p. 290:

> "What I wanted to try to show was how the subject constituted itself, in one specific form or another, as a mad or a healthy subject, as a delinquent or nondelinquent subject, through certain practices that were also games of truth, practices of power, and so on." Foucault is talking about how he did not start out with an a priori theory of a subject and based on the theory asking how knowledge was possible. He rejected this in order to analyze the relationships that "may exist between the constitution of the subject or different forms of the subject and games of truth, practices of power, and so on.

[12] This quote is an example of my writing partner, Jessica's, influence on the writing of this conversation. I had not thought this quote before and she inserted it in a comment on an earlier draft. This sparked a returning to Foucault's (1988) text and reading around the quote and eventually inserting it here, thus altering the direction of the conversation. The Foucault (1988) quote is, "I believe too much in truth not to suppose that there are different truths and different ways of speaking the truth" (pp. 51-52). See Apéritif/Digestif, Citing Theorists for further discussion of incidences such as these.

[13]

[14] Foucault (1984) described his genealogical approach as a combination of descent and emergence, where starting with a present battle or problem, lines of descent (multiple, overlapping, and often contradictory discursive threads) are drawn to moments of emergence. These emergences are not origins, but are spaces where contradictory meanings are played out in various ways. In locating these spaces (or other battles) where discourse seems to have shifted away from dominant thought an analyst can see how the deployment of processes, practices, and power relations invite or necessities new ways of thinking, acting, and being that require the governing of selves in certain ways (Foucault, 1981). By focusing on how truth and power work together historically through "a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts '' (Foucault, 1980, p. 97), an analyst can show how existing practices have often occurred by happenstance or arbitrary logic and thus can be reinvented.

[15] Foucault, 1991, p. 83

[16] See Rajchman (1985) for discussion of Foucault's work as ongoing critique.

[17] The following is excerpted from a radio interview conducted by Jacque Chancel in 1975 (Foucault (1989/1975, p. 137):

> Q: You've always said that one should refrain from thinking in terms of good and evil. How do you feel now about this maxim?
>
> MF: All those who say you should stop thinking in terms of good and evil are themselves thinking entirely in terms of good and evil!
>
> Q: Nietzsche
>
> MF: Of course. Fortunately he provides his own example [laughter]. Who better than Nietzsche could say what was good and what was evil? To want not to think in terms of good and evil is to want not to think in terms of this good and that evil, in their *current* meaning. I think it is important to shift the boundaries, to make them indefinite, shake them up, make them fragile, to allow for crossover and osmosis. It isn't possible not to think in terms of good and evil, true and false. But you have to say every time: and if I were the opposite, what if the lines were elsewhere…

[18] See Foucault (1978) for discussion of sexuality in relation to repression and a different notion of power.

[19] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7

[20] See Mills, 2003, pp, 1-7 for discussion of taking up Foucault and reinventing him.

[21] See Apéritif/Digestif, Uninvited Guest 7

[22] Foucault, 1982, p. 130

[23] See Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1

[24] Foucault, 1982, p. 216

[25] Rose & Rabinow, 1994, p. xii

[26] See Dinner Conversations, Preparations, Uninvited Guest 5

[27] I am referring here to a song called "This little light of mine." From Wikepedia I pulled the following excerpt (This Little Light of Mine, retrieved April 1, 2010):

> Often thought of as a Negro spiritual, it does not, however, appear in any collection of jubilee or plantation songs from the nineteenth century:
>
> > *Depending on the source, the song may take its theme from Matthew 5:16, "Let your light shine before men, that they may see your fine works and give glory to your Father who is in the heaven." Or, it may refer to the words of Jesus in Luke 11:33, where he said, "No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light." Or, it may be based on Matthew 5:14-15, where Jesus said, "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.*

> **(**"The New Sounds for Christ in Zimbabwe - This Little Light Of Mine." *The Daily Kos*, October 6, 2008. Accessed June 7, 2009)

It has often been published with a set of hand movements to be used for the instruction of children.

[28] See Dinner Conversations, Omitted, Uninvited Guest 1

[29] Foucault's genealogical work (see Dinner Conversations, Dessert, Uninvited Guest 14) is interested in how the body is inscribed in history.

[30] Davies, 2003, pp. 8-12

[31] Foucault, 1975

CHAPTER 8

TELEPHONE TWO: TIME LAPSE

This conversation takes place between Responsibility, a teacher educator who yearns for social justice although she often sees it with a poststructural twist—as an open construct which cannot be tied down. Responsibility is on the telephone with an unknown other who is marked by an ellipses[1] The author does not have access to the thoughts, feelings, and identities of the unknown character. Responsibility has just left the progressive dinner she has planned and is on the way home after a long evening. The conversation picks up after the characters have already been chatting for quite some time.

Responsibility:

…

I wasn't even trying to do that. It wasn't about *the* answers.

…

Right, it was about beginnings.

…

Ha, ha, real funny. You know how much I love beginnings.

Endnote

[1] See Dinner Conversations, Telephone One, Uninvited Guest 1 for exploration of the ellipses

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer phenomenology: Orientations, objects, others*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Allen, J., & Hermann-Wilmarth, J. (2004). Cultural construction zones. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(3), 214-226.

Amatucci, K. (2010). *Teacher undone*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Digital Dissertations and Theses Database.

Anfara, V., Brown, K. & Mangione, T. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher, 31*(7), 28-38.

Anzandula, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new mestizo*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Apple, M. (2001). Markets, standards, teaching, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(3), 182-196.

Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God and inequality* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Artiles, A. J., Harry, B., Reschly, D. J., & Chinn, P. C. (2002). Over-identification of students of color in special education: A critical overview. *Multicultural Perspectives,* 4(1), 3-10.

Audi, R. (Ed.). (1999). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Augusto, J. S. (2009). *Case studies of EdD and PhD dissertation in educational administration*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Ayers, W., Quinn, T., & Stovall, D. (2009). Preface. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.). *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. xiii-xv). New York: Routledge.

Badley, G. (2009). *Academic writing: contested knowledge in the making? Quality Assurance in Education, 17*(2), 104-117.

Badey, G. (2011). Case notes for the impeachment of an ability traitor: A textor's inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry, 17*(1), 93-98.

Baker, F. J., & Giacchino-Baker, R. (2000). *Building an international student teaching program: A California/Mexico experience*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED449143.

Bancroft, R. (1952). Recruitment for elementary school teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 3*, 193-196.

Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Reichert, A. Zeichner, K., LePage, P., Darling-Hammond, L., Duffy, H., with McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, S. (2000). Five holiday letter: A fiction. *Qualitative Inquiry, 6*(3), 392-405.

Barone, T. (1987). Research out of the shadows: A reply to rist. Curriculum Inquiry, 17(4), 453-463.

Barone, T. (2001). Science, art, and the predispositions of educational researchers. Educational Researcher, 30(7), 24-28.

Barrett, D. B., & Johnson, T. M. (2006) Status of global mission, 2006, in the status of 20th and

Baurain, B. (2007). Christian witness and respect for persons. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education,6*(3), 201-219.

Beatty, E. (1969). Teacher recruitment on college campuses? *The Elementary School Journal, 69*(6), 283-289.

Behar, R. (1993). *Translated woman: Crossing the border with Esperanza'a story*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Bennington, G., & Derrida, J. (1993). *Jacques Derrida* (G. Bennington, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berbary, L. (2011). Poststructural writerly representation: Screenplay as creative analytic practice. *Qualitative Inquiry, 17*(2), 186-196.

Biesta, G. (2001). Preparing for the incalculable" Deconstruction, justice, and the question of education. In G. J. J. Biesta & D. Egéa-Kuehne (Eds.), *Derrida and education* (pp. 32-54). London/New York: Routledge.

Biesta. G., & Egéa-Kuehne, D. (2001). (Eds.). *Derrida and education*. London/New York: Routledge.

Blumenfeld, W. J. (2006). Christian privilege and the promotion of 'secular' and not-so 'secular' mainline Christianity in schooling and the larger society. *Equity and Excellence in Education,* 2006, *39*(3), 195–210.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bondy, E., & McKenzie, J. (1999). Resilience building and social reconstructionist teaching: A first-year teachers story. *The Elementary School Journal, 100*(2),129-150.

Boston, R. (2005). Our taxes keep funding "faith-based" religious discrimination. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 70*(9), 19-24.

Brady, J. (2006). Justice for the poor in a land of plenty: A place at the table. *Religious Education, 101*(3), 347-367.

Brady, J. (2008). Letty M. Russell: A feminist liberation approach to educating for justice. *The Religious Education Association, 103*(2), 1-13.

Bridges, S. (2003). Mexican hair: Was the answer right in front of my face? In B. S. Bisplinghoff, M. Commeyras, & J. Olson (Eds.), *Teachers as readers: Perspectives on the importance of reading in teachers' classroom lives* (pp. 40-52). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Bridges, S. (2005, December). *Multiple meanings, multiple Méxicos: Connecting photographs and writing to understand self and other exhibition of arts-based research*. Poster presentation at the College of Education, UGA, Athens, GA.

Bridges-Rhoads, S. (2010). The SMART Board as an adolescent technology. In K. Lee & M. Vagle (Eds.), *Developmentalism in early childhood and middle grades education: Critical conversations on readiness and responsiveness* (pp. 169-182). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bridges-Rhoads, S., & Hughes-Decatur, H. (2010, December). *Are we qualified yet?: Developmentalism and data analysis in qualitative research.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University of Georgia Student Qualitative Inquiry Group, Athens, GA.

Bridges-Rhoads, S., & Parks, A. N. (2009). It's time for an absurdity: Scripted curricula and educational change. In Burdick, J., Sandlin, J. & Daspit, T. (Eds.) *Complicated conversations and confirmed commitments: Revitalizing education for democracy.* (pp. 127-144). Troy, NY: Educator's International Press, Inc.

Britzman, D. P. (1994). Is there a problem with knowing thyself? toward a poststructuralist view of teacher identity. In T. Shanahan (Ed.), *Teachers thinking, teachers knowing: Reflections on literacy and language education* (pp. 53-75). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Britzman, D. (2000). "The question of belief": Writing poststructual ethnography. In E. St. Pierre & W. Pillow (Eds.), Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education (pp. 27-40). New York: Routledge.

Brown, E., & Saltman, K. (Eds.). (2005). *The critical middle school reader*. New York: Routledge.

Burbules, N. (2000). Aporias, webs, and passages: Doubt as an opportunity to learn. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 30(2), 171-187.

Butler, J. (1992). Contingent foundations: Feminism and the question of "postmodernism." In J. Butler & J. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 3-21). New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1995). For a careful reading. In S. Benhabib, J. Butler, D. Cornell, N. Fraser (Eds.), *Feminist contentions: A philosophical exchange* (pp. 127-143). New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1990)

Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Butler, J. P. (1993). "Gender is burning: Questions of appropriation and subversion" and "Critically queer." In *Bodies that matter* (pp. 121-140, 223-242). London and New York: Routledge.

Cappello, M. (2005). Photo interviews: Eliciting data through conversations with children. *Field Methods*, *17*(2), 170-182.

Caputo, J. (1987). *Radical hermeneutics: Repetition, deconstruction, and the hermeneutic project*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.

Caputo, J. (1997). *Deconstruction in a nutshell: A conversation with Jacques Derrida*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Caputo, J. (2004a). Jacques Derrida, (1930-2004). *Journal of Cultural and Religious Theory, 6*(1), 6-9.

Caputo, J. (2004b). Love among the deconstructibles: A response to Gregg Lambert. *Journal of Cultural and Religious Theory*, *5*(2), 37-57.

Caputo, J. (2007). *What would Jesus deconstruct?: The good news of Postmodernity for the church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Caputo, J. D. (2001). *On religion*. New York: Routledge.

Caputo, J., & Raschke, C. (2002). Loosening philosophy's tongue: A conversation with Jack Caputo. *Journal of Cultural and Religious Theory***,** 3(2).

Carey, K. (2004). *The funding gap 2004*. Washington, DC: The Education Trust.

Carter, C. (2009). Priest, prostitute, plummer? The construction of teachers as saints. *English Education, 42*(1), 61-90.

Chambliss, Bong, Greene, Kaufmass, Loyens, & Van Meter (2010). Building trust by eliminating plagiarism: White paper from the ad hoc committee on plagiarism. Contemporary *Educational Psychology 35*, 103–107.

Chater, M. (2005). The personal and the political: notes on teachers' vocations and values. *Journal of Beliefs & Values, 26*(3), 249–259.

Chubbuck, S. (2007). Socially just teaching and the complimentarity of Ignation pedagogy and critical pedagogy. *Christian Higher Education, 6*, 239-265.

Cillier, P. (1999). Justice, law and philosophy. An interview with Jacques Derrida. *South African Journal of Philosophy, 18*(3), 279-286.

Cixous, H. (1993). *Three steps on the ladder of writing* (Trans. S. Cornell and S. Sellers) New York: Columbia University Press.

Cixous, H. (1994). Preface. In S. Sellars (Ed.), *The Hélène Cixous reader* (pp. xv-xxiii). London: Routledge.

Cixous, H., & Calle-Gruber, M. (1997). *Rootprints: Memory and life writing*. New York: Routledge.

Clough, P. (1998). *The end(s) of ethnography: From realism to social criticism* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Teaching quality matters. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 54, 95-98.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity and social justice in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2006). Stayers, leavers, lovers, and dreamers: Insights about teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(5), 387-392.

Cochran-Smith, M, Barnatt, J., Lahann, R., Shakman, K., & Terrell, D. (2009). In W. Ayres, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 625-639). New York: Taylor and Francis Publishers.

Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Lahann, R., Shakman, K., & Terrell, D. (2009). Teacher education for social justice: Critiquing the critiques. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *The handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 625-639). London: Taylor & Francis.

Compton-Lilly, C. (2004). *Confronting racism, poverty, and power: Classroom strategies to change the world*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Conklin, H. (2008). Modeling compassion in critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(4), 652-674.

Cookson, P. (2005). Why teach? *Teaching PreK-8, 36*(3), 14-16.

Cooling, T. (2010). Transforming faith: Teaching as a christian vocation in a secular, worldview-diverse culture, *JE&CB 14*(1), 19–32.

Cooper, B., & Randell, V. (2008) Fear and privatization. *Educational Policy, 22*(1), 204-227.

Corwin, G. (2000). The message of short-term missions. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly, 36*(4)422-423.

Crouch, A. (2007). Unexpected global lessons. *Christianity Today, 51*(12) *3-33.*

Culler, J. (Ed.). (1982). *On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching Policy.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Darbyshire, P., MacDougall, C., & Schiller, W. (2005). Multiple methods in qualitative research with children: More insight or just more? *Qualitative Research, 5*(4), 417-436.

Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Darder, A. Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Davies, B. (2000). *A body of writing: 1990-1999*. Walnut Creek, CA: AlfaMira Press.

Davies, B. (2003). *Frogs and snails and feminist tales: Preschool children and gender* (2nd ed.). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Davies, B. (2004). *Inventions of teaching: A genealogy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Davies, B. (2009). Life in Kings Cross: A play of voices. In I. Massei, & A. Youngblood (Eds.), *Voice in qualitative inquiry: Challenging conventional, interpretive, and critical conceptions in qualitative research* (pp. 197-220). New York: Routledge.

Davies, B. & Harré, R. (2000). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour,* 20(1), 43-63. Reprinted in Davies, B. (2000). *A Body of Writing*, AltaMira Press

Davies, B., Browne, J., Gannon, S., Hopkins, L., McCann, H., & Wihlborg, M. (2006). Constituting 'the subject' in poststructuralist discourse. *Feminism & Psychology, 16*(1), 87-103.

Davies, B. (2010) The struggle between the individualised subject of phenomenology and the multiplicities of the poststructuralist subject: the problem of agency. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology 1*(1) 54-68.

Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God decision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Foucault* (S. Hand, Ed. and Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1986).

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations: 1972-1990*. (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1990).

Deleuze, G., & Foucault, M. (1977) . Intellectuals and power. In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, countermemory, practice: Selected essays and interviews* (pp. 205± 217) . (D. F. Bouchard & S. Simon, Trans.). Ithaca, NY : Cornell University Press. (Discussion recorded March 4, 1972 and reprinted from *L' Arc*, no date, *49*, 3± 10)

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1980).

Denzin, N. (1997a). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. (1997b, March). *The sixth moment, voice and ethics of qualitative inquiry.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005a). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005b). Epilogue: The eighth and ninth moments—Qualitative research in/and the fractured future. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1115-1126). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Derrida, J. (1970). Structure, sign, and play in the discourse of the human sciences. In R. Macksey & E. Donato (Eds.), *The structuralist controversy: The languages of criticism and the sciences of man* (R. Macksey & E. Donato, Trans.) (pp. 247-272). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Lecture delivered 1966).

Derrida, J. (1974). *Of grammatology*. (G. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967).

Derrida, J. (1978). *Structure, sign and play in the discourse of the human sciences. Writing and difference* (A. Bass Trans.) (pp. 278-293). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1984). Deconstruction and the other: An interview with Jacques Derrida. In R. Kearney (Ed.), *Dialogues and contemporary continental thinkers* (pp. 113-135). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Derrida, J. (1991). Letter to a Japanese Friend (Trans. D. Wood and A. Benjamin). In P. Kamuf (Ed.), *A Derrida reader: Between the blinds* (pp. 270-276). London and New York: Harvester.

Derrida, J. (1992). Force of law: The "mystical foundation of authority." In D. Cornell, M. Rosenfeld, & P. Carlson (Eds.), *Deconstruction and the possibility of justice* (pp. 3-67). New York: Routledge. (Original work circulated 1989).

Derrida J. (1993a). Circumfession. In G. Bennington & J. Derrida (Eds.), Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1993b). *Aporias* (T. Dutoit, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Derrida, J. (1994). *Specters of Marx: The state of the debt, the work of mourning, and the new international* (P. Kamuf, Trans.). New York: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1995a). *The gift of death. Religion and postmodernism* (D. Wills, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1997). *Deconstruction in a nutshell*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Derrida, J. (1997). The villanova roundtable: A conversation with Jacques Derrida. In J. Caputo (Ed), *Deconstruction in a nutshell (1997)* (pp. 3-28). New York: Fordham University Press. (Original work published in 1994).

Derrida, J., & Caputo, J. (1997a). *Deconstruction in a nutshell* New York: Fordham University Press.

Derrida, J. (2001). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness* (M. Dooley, M. Hughes Trans.). London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (2005). *Paper machine* (R. Bowlby, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press.

Dick, K., & Kofman, A. (2005). *Screenplay and essays on the film Derrida*. New York: Routledge.

Dolan, J., Ehrlich, R., McIntosh, D., Whitlock, E., & Adams, M. (2007). Review of the year's publications for 2006: Social justice education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*, 331-347.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Edge, J. (2003). Imperial troopers and servants of the Lord: A vision of TESOL for the 21st century. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*, 701-709.

Edgoose, J. (2001). Just decide! Derrida and the ethical aporias of education. In G. Biesta & D. Egea-Kuehne (Eds.), *Derrida & education* (pp. 119-133). London: Routledge.

Educational Research Service. (1995). *Demographic factors in American education*. Arlington, VA: Author.

Edwards, N. (1950). Educational implications of population change in the United States. *Journal of Teacher Education, 1*(1), 3-13.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Altamira.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 50*(3), 279-374.

Elmer, D. (2006). *Cross-cultural servanthood: Serving the world in Christlike humility*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books.

Fairbanks, C., Duffy, G., Faircloth, B., He, Y., Levin, B., Rohr, J., & Stein, C. (2010). Beyond knowledge: Exploring why some teachers are more thoughtfully adaptive than others. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1/2), 161-171.

Fairchild, E. (2009). Christian privilege, history, and trends in U.S. religion. *New Directions for Student Services, 125*, 5-11.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Foleno, T., Duffet, A., & Foley, P. (2000). *A sense of calling: Who teachers and why?* New York, NY: Public Agenda.

Faulconer, T. (2003). *These kids are so bright! Pre-service teacher's insights and discoveries during a three-week student teaching practicum in Mexico*. Paper presented at the 2003 annual meeting of the American educational research association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED482507)

Feinman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055.

Fendler, L. (2003). Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors: Historical influences and political reverberations. *Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 16-25.

Finley, S. (2005). Arts-based inquiry: Performing revolutionary pedagogy. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 695-727) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1966/1970). *The order of things*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: Volume 1: An introduction.* (Robert Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1976).

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge* (pp. 80-105). Brighton: Harvester.

Foucault, M. (1981). So it is important to think? In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.). *The essential Foucault: Selections from The essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (pp. 170-173). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfas, & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed., pp. 208-226). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1983). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In H. L. Dreyfus & R. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp.229-264) Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1984b). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Aesthetics, method, and epistemology* (pp. 369-391). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality* (trans. Robert Hurley). Harmondsworth: Penguin

Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings, 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1991). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader*. London: Penguin. (Original work published 1984).

Foucault, M. (1991). *Governmentality* (trans. Rosi Braidotti) and revised by Colin Gordon. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87–104). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (2000). For an ethic of discomfort. In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Power (the essential works of Michel Foucault, 1954-1984*) (pp. 443-438). New York: New Press. (Original work published in 1979).

Fowler, J. W. (1981). *Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Frank, K. (2000). The management of hunger: Using fiction in writing anthropology. *Qualitative Inquiry, 6*(4), 473-488.

Freedman, S., & Appleman, D. (2009). "In It for the long haul"--: How teacher education can contribute to teacher retention in high-poverty. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*(3), 323-337.

Freeman, M., deMarrais, K.D., Preissle, J., Roulston, K, & St. Pierre, E. (2007). Standards of evidence in qualitative research: An incitement to discourse. *Educational Researcher, 36*(1), 25-32.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving the pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural works: Letters to those who dare teach* (D. K. Macedo & A. Oliveira, Trans.). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1995). A dialogue: Language, culture, race. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(3), 377-402.

Gannon, S. (2005). "The tumbler": Writing an/other in fiction and performance ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry, 11*(4), 622-627.

Gannon, S. (2006). The (im)possibilities of writing the self: French Poststructural theory and autoethnography. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies, 6*(4), 474-495.

Garmon, M. (2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity: What are the critical factors? *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(3), 201-213.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gee, J. P. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Gergen, D. (2005). Dueling for values. *U. S. News & World Report*, 138, 72.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.).New York: Longman.

Glickman, C. (1998). *Revolutionizing America's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J., & McMannon, T. (1997). *The public purpose of education and schooling*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gorski, P. C. (2009). Cognitive dissonance as a strategy in social justice teaching. *Multicultural Education, 17*(1), 54-57.

Grant, C.A., & Agosto, V. (2008). Teacher capacity and social justice in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S., Feiman-Nemser, K. E. Demers, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions and changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 175-200). New York: Co-published by Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group and the Association of Teacher Educators.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination.* Jossey Bass Inc.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hanh, T. N. (1987). *Being peace*. Berkeley, CA: Parallax.

Hanh, T. N. (1993). *Interbeing: Fourteen guidelines for engaged Buddhism*. Berkeley, CA: Parallax.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Harnett, S., & Kline, F. (2005). Preventing the fall from "the call to teach": Rethinking vocation. *Journal of Education and Christian Belief, 9*(1), 9-20.

Harper, D. (2005). What's new visually? In N. K, Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 747-762). California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hartnett, S., & Kline, F. (2005). Preventing the fall from the call to teach: Rethinking vocation. *The Journal of Education and Christian Belief, 9*(1), 9-20.

Heckman, J., & LaFontaine, P. (2007). *The American high school graduation rate: Trends and levels*. Retrieved July 11, 2011 from http://www.nber.org/papers/w13670

Heidegger, M. (1962/2002). The phenomenological method of investigation. (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.) In D. Moran & T. Mooney (Eds.), *The phenomenology reader* (pp. 278-287). London: Routledge.

Henke, R. R., Chen, X., & Geis, S. (2000). *Progress through the teacher pipeline: 1992-93 college graduates and elementary/secondary school teaching as of 1997*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Hermann-Wilmarth, J. (2010). More than book talks: Preservice teacher dialogue after reading gay and lesbian children's literature. *Language Arts, 87*(3), 188-198.

Hoagland, S. (1990). Some concerns about Nel Noddings 'caring.' *Hypatia, 5*(1), 109-114.

Holbrook, T. (2010). An ability traitor at work: A treasonous call to subvert writing from within. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(3), 171–183.

Holbrook, T., Moore, C., & Zoss, M. (2010). Equitable intent: reflections on Universal Design in education as an ethic of care. *Reflective Practice, 11*(5), 681-692.

Honan, E., Knobel, M., Baker, C. & Davies, B. (2000). Producing possible Hannahs: theory and the subject of research. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 6(1), 9-32

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Huerta, G., & Flemmer, L. (2005). Identity, beliefs, and community: LDS (Mormon) pre-service secondary teacher views about diversity. *Intercultural Education, 16*(1), 1-14.

Hughes, H. E. (2010). From anger to awareness: (Re)adjusting pedagogical possibilities in teacher education. In J. G. Mauldin, B. Stodghill, & M. F. He (Eds.), *Engaging the possibilities and complexities of hope: Utterances of curriculum and pedagogy's past, present, and future* (pp. 51-65).

Hughes, H. E. (2011). *Phenomenal bodies, phenomenal girls: How young adolescent girls experience being enough in their bodies* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Digital Dissertation and Theses Database.

Hyland, N. E. (2010). Intersection of race and sexuality in a teacher education course. *Teaching Education, 21*(4), 385-401.

Ingersoll, R. (2001). *Teacher turnover, teacher shortages, and the organization of schools*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Ingersoll, R.M. (2003). Turnover and shortage among science and mathematics teachers in the United States. In J. Rhoton, & P. Bowers (Eds.), *Science teacher retention: Mentoring and renewal*. Arlington, VA: National Science Education Leadership Association and National Science Teachers Association Press.

Irvine, J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Izumi, I., & Coburn, K. (2001). *Facing the classroom challenge: Teacher quality and teacher training in California's schools of education.* San Francisco, CA: Pacific Research.

Jacobs, A. J. (2007). *The year of living biblically: One man's humble quest to follow the Bible as literally as possible*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

James, J. H. (in press), Democracy is the devil's snare: Theological certainty and democratic teacher education. *Theory and Research in Social Education.*

Jeffery, P. (2001). Short-term mission trips. *The Christian Century, 118*(34), 5-6.

Johnson, S. M., Berg, J. H., & Donaldson, M. I. (2005). *Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature on teacher retention*. Boston, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Johnson, S. M., & Kardos, S. M. (2009). The next generation of teachers: Who enters, who stays, and why. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feinman-Nemser, & J. McIntryre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 445-467). New York: Routledge.

Jones, S. (2009). *Engaged intellectuals*. Retrieved July 11, 2011 from http://engagedintellectual.wordpress.com

Jones, S. (2009). Against all odds: A case study of one white, middle-class, female teacher becoming an engaged intellectual. *Changing English, 16*(2), 231-246.

Jones, S., & Enriquez, G. (2009). Engaging the intellectual and moral in critical literacy education: The four-year journeys of two teachers from teacher education to classroom practice. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(2), 145-168.

Juárez, B. G., Smith, D. T., & Hayes, C. (2008). Social justice means just us white people: The diversity paradox in teacher education, *Democracy and Education, 17*(3), 20-25.

Kahn, M. M. (2006). Conservative Christian teachers: Possible consequences for lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Intercultural Education, 17*(4), 359-371.

Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). Focus groups: Strategic articulations of pedagogy, politics, and inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 887-907). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). *Qualitative inquiry: Approaches to language and literacy research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2008). The failure of dissertation advice books: Toward alternative pedaogies for doctoral writing. *Educational Researcher, 37*(8), 507-514.

Kapustka, K., Howell, P., Clayton, C., & Thomas, S. (2009). Social justice in teacher education: A qualitative content analysis of NCATE conceptual frameworks. *Equity and Excellence, 42*(4), 489-505.

Kimball, M. S., Mitchell, C., Thornton, A., & Young-DeMarco, L. (2009). *Empirics on the origins of preferences: The case of college major and religiosity*. (NBER Working Paper #15182).

Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2010). Validity, responsibility, and aporia. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(8), 603-610

Krueger, R. A. (1988). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Krueger, R., & Casey, M. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2009). Teaching teachers to teach queerly. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 718-721). New York: Routledge.

Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Labaree, D. (2010). Teach for America and teacher education: Heads they win, tails we lose. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1/2), 48-55.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159-165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education, 24,* 211-247.

Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools: A descriptive analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(1), 37-62.

Lanway, S. Jun 23, 2004 http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=+give+a+shit

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *Sociological Quarterly, 34*(4), 673-693.

Lather, P. (1996). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(1), 35-57.

Lather, P. (1996). Troubling clarity: The politics of accessible language. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(3), 525-45.

Lather, P. (1997). Creating a multilayered text: Women, AIDS, and angels. In W. Tierney & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice* (pp. 233-258). New York: State University of New York Press.

Lather, P. (2001). *Getting lost: Feminist efforts toward a double(d) science*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(1), 35–57.

Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lawlor, L. (2010). Jacques Derrida. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, E. N. Zalta (Ed.), URL=<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2010/entries/derrida/>

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (1983). *The good high school : Portraits of character and culture*. New York: Basic Books.

Lee, K., & Vagle, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Developmentalism in early childhood and middle grades education: Critical conversations on readiness and responsiveness*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Leo, J. (2005). Class(room) warriors. *U. S. News and World Report, 139*(15): 75.

Levinas, E. (1979). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*. New York: Springer.

Lewy, S. & Betty, S. (2007). How to expose fourth and fifth graders to religion and spirituality in a public school classroom. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality, 12*(3), 325-330.

Lincoln, Y. (1995). The sixth moment: Emerging problems in qualitative research. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction, 19*, 37-55.

Liston, D. P. (2000). Love and despair in teaching. *Educational Theory, 50*(1), 81.

Liston, D., & Garrison, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Teaching, learning, and loving*. New York: Routledge Farmer.

Lovitts, B. (2008). The transition to independent research: Who makes it, who doesn't, and why? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(3), 296-325.

Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2009). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classrooms: Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntryre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 606-636). New York: Routledge.

Mardsen, G. (1998). *The outrageous idea of Christian scholarship*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, C., & Ward, M. (2004). Yes, but. . .: Education leaders discuss social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 14*, 530-563.

Mazzei, L. (2004). Silent listenings: Deconstructive practices in discourse-based research *Educational Researcher, 33*(2), 26-34.

Mazzei, L. (2007). *Inhabited silence in qualitative research: Putting poststructural theory towork*. Peter Lang.

Mazzei, L., & Youngblood, A. (2009). Introduction: The limit of voice. In L. Mazzei & A. Youngblood, *Voice in qualitative inquiry: Challenging conventional, interpretive, and critical conceptions in qualitative research* (pp. 1-13). New York: Routledge.

McDonald, M. & Zeichner, K. (2008). Social justice teacher education. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 595-610). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McIntosh, P. (1990). White privilege: unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School. 49*(2), 31-36.

McWilliam, E. (1997). Performing between the posts: Authority, posture, and contemporary feminist scholarship. In W. Tierney & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice* (pp. 219-232). New York: State University of New York Press.

McWilliam, E. (1999). *Pedagogical pleasures*. New York: Peter Lang Publishers.

McWilliam, E. (2003). Writing up, writing down: Authenticity and irony in educational research, In M. Tamboukou & S. J. Ball (Eds.), *Genealogy and ethnography: fruitful encounters or dangerous liaisons* (pp. 57-68). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Meadmore, D., Hatcher, C., & McWilliam, E. (2000). Getting tense about genealogy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(5), 463-476.

Meiners, E. R., & Quinn, T. M. (2010). Doing and feeling research in public: Queer organizing for public education and justice. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 23*(2), 147-164.

Melnick, S., & Zeichner, K. (1996). The role of community-based field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gome (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 176-196). New York: Teachers College Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). London & New York: Routledge Classics. (Original work published in 1962).

Miller, M. (2007). Introduction: Vision of vocation. In M. Miller (Ed.), *Doing more with life: Connecting Christian higher education to a call to service* (pp. 1-18). Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.

Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. New York: Routledge.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Moule, J. (2004). Safe and growing out of the box: Immersion for social change. In J. Romo, P. Bradfield, & R. Serrano (Eds.), *Working in the margins: Becoming a transformative educator* (pp. 147-171). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice-Hall.

Nagahara, M. (2009). *Teaching as a Christian vocation*. Waco, TX: Center for Christian Ethics at Baylor University.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *Digest of educational statistics*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 180-187.

Nieto, S. (2003). Challenging current notions of "highly qualified teachers" through work in a teachers' inquiry group, *Journal of Teacher Education, 54,* 386-398. .

Nieto, S. (2005a). Public education in the twentieth century and be- yond: High hopes, broken promises, and an uncertain future. *Harvard Educational Review, 75*(1), 43-64.

Nieto, S. (2005b). *Why we teach.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (1995). *Philosophy of education.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2008). The new outspoken atheism and education. *Harvard Educational Review 78*(2), 369-390.

Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Olson, G. A., & Gale, I. (Eds.). (1991). *(Inter)views: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on rhetoric and literacy*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2005). *Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Palmer, P. (1999). *Let your life speak: Listening for the voice of vocation.* Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. (2003). Teaching with heart and soul: Reflections on spirituality in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(5), 376-385.

Parks, A. N. (2007). *Discursive possibilities: Re-imagining reform and equity in elementary mathematics*. Unpublished dissertation (Michigan State University, East Lansing).

Parks, A. N. (2009). Doomsday device: Rethinking the deployment of the 'achievement gap' in equity arguments. *For the Learning of Mathematics, 29*(1), 14-19.

Passe, J., & Willox, L. (2009). Teaching religion in America's public schools: A necessary disruption. *The Social Studies, 100*(3), 102-106.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). CA: Sage Publications.

Pence, H., & Macgillivray, I. (2008). The impact of an international field experience on preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24* 14–25.

Pennycook, A., & Coutand-Marin, S. (2003). Teaching English as a missionary language. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 24*, 337–353.

Peske, H. G., & Haycock, K. (2006). *Teaching equality: How poor and minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality*. Retrieved July 11, 2011 from http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/010DBD9F-CED8-4D2B-9E0D-91B446746ED3/0/TQReportJune2006.pdf

Peters, M. (1996). *Poststructuralism, politics and education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Peters, M. A., & Burbules, N. (2004). *Poststructuralism and educational research.* Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Plaucher, W. (Ed.). (2005). *Callings: Twenty centuries of Christian wisdom on vocation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Popkewitz, T. (2004). The alchemy of the mathematics curriculum: Inscriptions and fabrications of the child. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(1), 3-34

Powers, E. (2006). *A spirited disposition debate*. Retrieved April 16, 2011 from http://www.insidehighed.com/news/2006/06/06/disposition

Quartz, K., Olsen, B., Anderson, L., & Lyons, K. (2009). *Make a difference: Developing meaningful careers in education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2003). Introduction. In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.). *The essential Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984.* (pp. vii-xxv.)

Rajchman, J. (1985). *Michel Foucault: The freedom of philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Renner, A., Brown, M., Steins, G., & Burton, S. (2010). A reciprocal global education: Working towards a more humanizing pedagogy through critical literacy. *Intercultural Education, 21*(1), 41-54.

Reynolds, J. (2002). Habituality and undecidability: A comparison of Merleau-Ponty and Derrida on the decisión. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies, 10*(4), 449-466.

Richardson, L. (1990). Writing strategies: Reaching diverse audiences. *Qualitative Research Methods, 21*.

Richardson, L. (1993). Poetics, dramatics, and transgressive validity: The case of the skipped line. *The Sociologist Quarterly, 34*(4), 31-44.

Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 516-529). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Richardson, L. (2001). Getting personal: Writing stories. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(1), 33-38.

Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 959-978) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richert, A., Donahue, D., & LaBoskey, V. K. (2009). Preparing white teachers to teach in a racist nation: What do they need to know and be able to do? In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.). *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 640-653). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rosaen, C., & Florio-Ruane, S. (2008). The metaphors by which we teach: Experience, metaphor and culture in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyer (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 706-731). Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.

Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2003). Introduction. In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (pp. vii-xxv).

Rowling, J. K. (1998). *Harry Potter and the chamber of secrets*. Jefferson City, MO: Scholastic, Inc.

Royle, N. (2000). What is deconstruction? In N. Royle (Ed.). *Deconstructions: A user's guide*. (pp. 1-13). New York: Palgrave.

Royle, N. (2003). *Jacques Derrida*. New York: Routledge.

Saldaña, J. (2003). Dramatizing data: A primer. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9*(2), 218-236.

Sato, M., & Lensmire, T. (2009). Poverty and Payne: Supporting teachers to work with children of poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(5), 365-370.

Scott, J. (1990). *A matter of record: Documentary sources in social research*. Boston, MA: Polity Press.

Schmeichel, M. (2010), *Discourse and discourse analysis: What the Foucault?* Unpublished manuscript.

Schuurman, D. (2004). *Vocation: Discerning our callings in life*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Schwartz, G. (2004). Short-term mission trips: Maximizing the benefits. *Mission Frontiers, March/April*, 12-13..

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Sizer, T. (1987). Horace's hope: Horace's frustration. *The English Journal, 86*(5), 20-24.

Schroeder, E. H. (1995). The short-term missions boom. *Missiology,22,* 544-545.

Slattery, P. (2003). Troubling the contours of Arts-Based Educational Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(2), 192-197.

Sleeter, C. (2008). Preparing White teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntryre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 559-582). New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. (2009). Teacher education, neoliberalism, and social justice. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 611-624). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Smith, J. (2006). *Who's afraid of postmodernism: Taking Derrida, Lyotard and Foucault to church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Snow, D. (2001). *English teaching as Christian mission*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

Sondergaard, D. (2002). Poststructural approaches to empirical analysis. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 15*(2), 187-204.

Spalding, E., Klecka, C., Lin, E., Odell, S., & Wang, J. (2010). Social justice and teacher education: A hammer, a bell, and a song. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1), 191-196.

Spector, K. (2007). God on the gallows: Reading the Holocaust through narratives of redemption. *Research in the Teaching of English, 42*(1), 7-55.

Spivak, G. C. (1974). Translator's preface. In J. Derrida (Ed.), *Of grammatology* (G. Spivak Trans.). (pp. ix-xc). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Spivak, G. C., with Rooney, E. (1997). In a word interview. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *The second wave: A reader in feminist theory* (pp. 356-378). New York: Routledge. (Original work published in 1989).

Springgay, S., Irwin, R., Kind, S. (2005). A/r/tography as living inquiry through art and text. *Qualitative Inquiry 11*(6), 897-912.

Stenberg, S. (2006). Liberation theology and liberatory pedagogies: Renewing the dialogue. *College English, 68*(3), 271-291.

Stout, J. (1952). Deficiencies of beginning teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 3,* 43-46.

St. Pierre, E. (1997a). Circling the text: Nomadic writing practices. *Qualitative Inquiry, 3*(4), 403-417.

St. Pierre, E. A. (1997b). Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 10*(2), 175-189.

St. Pierre, E. (1997c). Nomadic inquiry in the smooth spaces of the field: A preface. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 10*(3), 365-383.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(5), 477-515.

St. Pierre, E. (2006). Scientifically based research in education: Epistemology and ethics. *Adult Education Quarterly, 56*(4) 239-26.

St. Pierre, E. (2009). Afterword: Decentering voice in qualitative research. In I. Mazzei & A. Youngblood (Eds.), *Voice in qualitative inquiry: Challenging conventional, interpretive, and critical conceptions in qualitative research* (pp. 221-236). New York: Routledge.

St. Pierre, E. (in press). Post qualitative research: The critique and the coming after. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

St. Pierre, E., & Pillow, W. (2000). *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education*. New York: Routledge.

Stern, S., Stipe, M., Ohoven, M., & Vince, W. (Producers), & Dannelly, B. (Director). (2004). *Saved* [motion picture]. United States: Single Cell Pictures & Infinity Media.

Subedi, B. (2006). Preservice teachers' beliefs and practices: Religion and religious diversity. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 39,* 227-238.

Symonds, P. (1954). Teaching as a function of a teacher's personality. *Journal of Teacher Education, 5,* 79-83.

Tamboukou, M. (1999).Writing genealogies: an exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 20*(2), 201-218.

Tataki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little Brown.

Thandeka, R. (2001). *Learning to be White: Money, race, and God in America*. New York: Continuum.

Theophane, S. (1958). The ideal English teacher as seen by his colleagues. *Journal of Teacher Education, 9*(1), 54-58.

Tierney, W. (1998). Life history's history: Subjects foretold. *Qualitative Inquiry, 4,* 49-70.

Trifonas, P., & Peters, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Derrida, deconstruction, and education: Ethics of pedagogy and research.* Oxford: Blackwell.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *The condition of education: 2001*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The secretary's annual report on teacher quality*. Washington, DC: Author.

Vagle, M. (2009). Validity as intended: "Bursting forth toward" bridling in phenomenological research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 22,* 585-605.

Van Engen, J. (2000). The cost of short term mission trips. *The Other Side, January/February,* 20-23.

Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002a). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20-32.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002b). *Educating culturally responsive teachers.* Albany: NY: SUNY Press.

Walling, S, Eriksson, C., Mess, K, Ciovica, A. & Gorton, D. (2006) Cultural Identity and Reentry in Short-Term Student Missionaries. *Journal of Psychology and Theology,* 22.

Weah, W., Simmons, V., & McClellan, H. (2000). Service-learning and multicultural/multiethnic perspectives: From diversity to equity. *Phi Delta Kappan, May,* 673-676.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Wiedeman, C. R. (2002). Teacher preparation, social justice, equity: A review of the literature. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35,* 200-211.

Whitcomb, J., Borko, H., & Liston, D. (2008a). Why teach? Part II. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(3), 3-9.

Whitcomb, J., Borko, H., & Liston, D. (2008b). Why teach? Part II. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 59(4), 267-272.

White, K. (2007). *Religion matters: how teachers' religious orientations influence teaching identities in public school classrooms*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

White, K. (2009). Connecting religion and teacher identity: The unexplored relationship between teachers and religion in public schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(6), 857-866.

Will, G. (2006, January 16). Ed schools vs. education. *Newsweek, 147*(3), 98.

Willard-Holt, C. (2001). The impact of a short-term international experience for preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 505–517.

Zeichner, K. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Zembylas, M. (2005). Discursive practices, genealogies, and emotional rules: A poststructuralist view on emotion and identity in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21,* 935-948.

Zumwalt, K. & Craig, E. (2009). Who is teaching? Does it matter? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntryre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 404-423). New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A

INVITATION TO FORGO EXPECTATIONS AIMED AT CONVENTIONAL DISSERTATIONS

According to the sixth edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2009), an appendix contains content that is considered "distracting or inappropriate" in the body of the main text (p. 38). Relegating the sometimes complex and detailed information to a space away from the main text presumably helps readability. This appendix is written for such a purpose as my intent here is to affect readability by providing you, the reader, with information that will, in general, tell you how to read this dissertation and, in particular, how to make sense of its format. Although I believe such guidance is necessary if I want you to continue to read this dissertation whose format is likely unrecognizable, I place this information in this appendix because I anticipate its content to be both distracting and inappropriate to the content of the main text. In short, I worry that the information I will provide here might divert attention from the deconstruction ongoing in the text—the format of the dissertation, for example, is an effect of a deconstructing research process, where I found myself over and over again documenting struggles with the categories, structures, and identities that refused to be tied down as I researched, that fell apart under my fingers, and that refused easy definition.

I use this appendix as an invitation for you to forgo expectations aimed at conventional dissertations in lieu of a format that I believe invites the sort of discomfort that can arise from the removal of familiar foundations and recognizable categories. I realize that asking you to deal in the unrecognizable, unknown, and uncomfortable is counter to the clarity most readers desire when encountering a text. Indeed, I myself desired such clarity in trying to construct this text, which became a pursuit not only to make sense of my research project but also to be responsible to the complexity that emerged throughout the research process. However, such clarity is in conflict with that sense of responsibility, so I ask you, reader, to allow me this space to write a

bridge that I hope will give you an access point to this discomfort text in order to possibly allow for different knowledge to be produced when the structures and conventions that comfort us are examined for what they enable and exclude. This is my best effort to prepare you for what is to come while still honoring the complexity and refusing to take away the experience of the space you will find yourself in the reading.

To create this bridge and make the format and content of the dissertation more intellible to its readers, I focus on one convention that makes the dissertation recognizable, the title, and more specifically, the title of *this* dissertation—*Pursuing responsibilty: Writing and citing poststructural qualitative inquiry, social justice, and Christianity*. The aim here is not to detail exactly what the title represents but rather to demonstrate the work that a title can do in closing down and opening up ideas of what a text, a study, a researcher, and even a reader might mean. I explore the work of my title below as a means of providing information that can invite and prepare you to read this dissertation in certain way while also drawing attention to the impossiblity of fully understanding a text that is still and always will be in process. I begin below with a vignette written after my dissertation defense meeting that resulted in a passed dissertation with suggested revisions, including the decision that I write a new title for the dissertation and a small section that provides the reader with information such as what the dissertation is about, how to read it, and how to judge its value. The story addresses my struggle to come to terms with the necessity for this new title, a change that made a different claim to the content of the dissertation itself and affected the type of information I would provide for the reader. I believe the inclusion of this vignette will ease you into a dissertation where you will find similar attention to the paradoxes, conflicts, and stuck places that have riddled this study and have continued to produce it as a project that is always in the middle of becoming something different.

I also include it because it is an example of a kind of text that is not typically recognized as academic, and you will encounter several such examples in the dissertation. Thus, it is both an explanation and an enactment of the theory that has produced the entire study and its representation.

The Pursuit of the Title

I heard the demand for the *about* but I was not sure if I was the one making it. *What is this dissertation about?* The text that sat mockingly on the table in front of me had somehow failed to produce an answer that satisfied. Yet, I, the one who claimed authorship, was there to defend it. I was there to claim responsibility. I tried to calm my fingers as they grasped at a chunk of the dissertation's body and then another, pleading for the recognizable. Which part would tell me what the dissertation was about? I had not written the traditional chapters that organized the text in ways familiar to readers of dissertations. There was no section, for instance, that claimed itself a literature review and cleared a space for research methods, questions, and findings. My "preface" had turned into a one hundred and twenty page document that, in its length, had still refused its function of telling about the text that would follow in a way that would guide its reader to understand the author's intended message. Furthermore, my attempts to be what a committee member referred to as "hyper explicit" about the research methodology throughout the dissertation had rendered the topic of the dissertation questionable. Was it *about* mission work, Christianity, social justice, and teacher education, as I had claimed in the title that I had written for this defense? Or was it *about* research methodology?

I flipped to a convention mandated by the graduate school, the title page, and gave it my best stare of reproof as the word *about* ran through my head. Where were the words like *qualitative methodology, poststructural, or writing as a method of inquiry*? Had I revised

those words out at some point—another attempt to not list separately the methodology that had repeatedly refused to inaccurately become untangled from any part of the research project? Would inserting those sorts of words now sufficiently induce the clarity yearned for and enable a title that would better match name and text—one that would claim more explicitly to be about methodology *and* whatever object of knowledge I had written of in my dissertation proposal long ago? Sitting, still staring, and starting to seethe, I could not make the questioning cease. What was I to do? How was I even to *think* a new title without embarking on a whole new analysis that could not easily ignore the response data (St. Pierre, 1997) I was collecting as I listened to some of its readers claim its content as mostly about methodology? What kind of analysis would produce this title and what or who would help me think it? Where was it to fit in a dissertation already quite possibly too full of theory and method? And more importantly, would I be ready to claim responsibility for the new dissertation this title might make thinkable?

These questions and many more populated my head, mocking me in their demands for meaning, their insistence that I create for my dissertation what Foucault (1976/1978) called a "grid of intelligibility" (p. 93) that would determine for the reader in advance what they could see, hear, understand, and produce in the reading of this dissertation and discipline the text. These questions, although perhaps seductive, are produced out of a theory different than those that produced my dissertation and which guide my work. However, I recognized the value if not in determining meaning in advance for readers, at least in providing some kind of guide for approaching this unconventional text that might be off-putting because of its form and lead a reader to question not only what it is about but why it mattered.

The first step in creating this guide was to fashion a new title, a cue to the reader about what she might expect in the pages that followed. A title is supposed to be self-explanatory,

summarizing the main idea and identifying not only the issues investigated but also the relationship between these (APA, 2009, p. 23). The new title I created-- *Pursuing responsibilty: Writing and citing poststructural qualitative inquiry, social justice, and Christianity*—contains several signposts that both indicate the content of the dissertation as well as a relationship between them. Although I provide evidence below to support this choice in title as a representation of the text I have written, as mentioned above, my aim is to explore what type of reading this title makes possible since this is the type of exploration you will find in the dissertation. Thus, I also will demonstrate how this title can provide spaces for multiple meanings and new knowledge production with each reading, rendering its ability to be entirely explanatory unfinished. I do begin by explaining the piece that identifies the relationship between the content areas of the text—Pursuing responsibility.

The Pursuit of Responsibility

My pursuit of responsibility took many forms in the writing of this dissertation, and I will explicitly address those listed in the title: Poststructural qualitative inquiry, Christianity, and social justice. The first, poststructural qualitative inquiry, signals the methodology that informed this research project. Poststructural theories remind me that responsibility is one of those impossible but necessary categories that can never be reached, but we must continue striving for (e.g., Derrida in Cilliers, 1999). And so responsibility is always a pursuit, a to-come. The pursuit was to be responsible to the research itself to not reduce its complexity in the name of clarity, to honor confusion and recognize and even highlight that, as Lather (1996) explained, transparency does not equal innocence and neutrality. St. Pierre (in press) called this work a "rigorous re-imagining of a capacious science that cannot be defined in advance and is never the same" (p. 9). The hope is that through continuously re-envisioning science, including what I categorize in the

title as qualitative inquiry, previously unthought and hopefully more just relations between participants and researcher, teacher and student, reader and writer, and so on can become thinkable *and* doable.

A result of this pursuit was a format that was not planned in advance but whose function had to be theorized along the way. To help me think and explain the format of the dissertation, I use the metaphor of a progressive dinner. A progressive dinner is a traveling meal, so-to-speak, where different courses are eaten in different locations. In accordance with this metaphor, I have theorized the three main sections of the dissertation as follows: *Apéritif/digestif*, which is both a preparation for the text that is to come and a reflection on the text after the fact; *Dinner Conversations*, which take the form of dialogues between characters that are based on the interview and focus group data I collected, as well as other data collected in writing (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005); and *Uninvited Guests*, which take the form of endnotes (and occasionally appendices such as this one when endnotes are not allowed) that are my attempt to account for the many stuck places and paradoxes that occurred in the research process and interrupted my attempts to produce a text that might be more palatable for a reader. While the structure of the dinner necessitates a progression from one beginning point to the next and one location to the next, the *Apéritif/Digestif* and *Uninvited Guests* function, in part, to complicate the story of progress as I use them to pull in data from various moments in time that were useful for writing *Dinner Conversations.* I also use them to refer the reader to spaces that arrive later in the text. Additionally, graduate school formatting guidelines for the dissertation required that I organize the text into chapters. I have done so to meet those requirements but describe the text below as three intersecting sections. What follows are explanations of how I took up the pursuit of responsibility in each of these sections.

Chapter One: Apéritif/digestif

I take up the pursuit of responsibility as it relates to poststructural qualitative inquiry explicitly in the section entitled *Apéritif/digestif*. It functions in part as a writing story of the dissertation study and was written after the main section of dinner conversations. Following a brief introduction that explores the use of writing as a method of inquiry (Richardon & St. Pierre, 2005) as it relates to poststructural critiques of language and the subsequent burden of authorship, I provide three separate writing stories, arranged to allow the reader to get a sense of the scope of the research—even as the scope of the research continues to become. Each story proceeds from a methodological stuck place, an aporia, which has greatly impacted the work I have done in this study and the writing of this dissertation. I call these aporias of responsibility, following Koro- Ljungberg's (2010) call to turn validity toward ethics, taken in the Derridian sense that responsibility is always unfinished. Like all aporias (an impass as the Greek translation suggests), these required a decision about what is *just* at the very moment when one does not know how to proceed.

The first aporia involves an entry from my dissertation log, a document I used to collect and analyze data throughout the study. In it, I explore an aporia that I call *Citing God*, which involves my difficulty with the subject/object binary as it specifically relates the researcher/participant and its complication through citations of God. The second involves an excerpt from the second chapter in the dissertation that I use to explore the difficulties I have had with *Citing Theorists.* In particular, I describe the impossibility of claiming responsible citational practices in the face of what felt like the interminable blurring of theorists with other data. Finally, the third, *Citing Selves* relates to the decision not to treat individual participants as my

locus of analysis but instead to write characters as spaces where thoughts could happen and from which data collection and analysis could proceed.

All three of these stories overlap. They also contradict each other as I wrote through multiple beginning points for the study and tried to make sense of moments where I did not know how to proceed. These were my attempts to put the writing of the dissertation at the forefront, a move that Davies (2009) said can allow one to grapple with the "almost irresistible" desire to try to present the real. It is also a move that invites the imagination to take "free reign" as the author works from the "body's deep surfaces as places to be read," working within and against the "weight of familiar language uses and patterns" (p. 199). As such, I have watched the linearity of both planned research process and conventional text unravel and deconstruct as I have written. This section, in the process, became a space to address an object of knowledge that I did not set out to address—the production of the qualitative researcher and qualitative research when writing is used as a method of inquiry.

Chapter Two - Eight: Dinner Conversations

In *Dinner Conversations,* the pursuit of responsibility relates to the field of teacher education and more specifically teacher education that claims a social justice agenda that Zeichner (2009) said is concerned first and foremost with the preparation of teachers for cultural diversity. Among other things, a well-prepared teacher for cultural diversity should affirm students diverse backgrounds and should see herself as responsible for making schools more equitable (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). A teacher educator, in turn, should model these desired characteristics by attending to her own biases and shortcomings as they relate to her own students diverse backgrounds (Zeichner, 2009). Religion is not often mentioned in the social justice literature but is quickly becoming recognized as an important influence on pre-service

teachers' lives and decisions (White, 2009). As a teacher educator myself, I wondered what possibilities for responsible relations might arise if conversations about religion were explored.

I took on this exploration through the writing of conversations between characters whose construction was informed by data I collected and analyzed throughout the study, including data from individual interviews and focus group interviews with Christian pre-service teachers, articles and books related to social justice teacher education and poststructural theories, and out-of-category data (St. Pierre, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c) I collected in my research journal related more broadly to claims about a pursuit of a Christian God and/or social justice. There are three conversations, Appetizers, Dinner, and Dessert, involving different characters and with different hosts. In addition, there are four in-between texts, which I call "Time Lapses" because they mark a space of the unplanned. These conversations do not take place in an educational setting, although two of the characters are in a teacher preparation program and one character is a teacher educator. This decision was made in part because determining how to talk about religion in educational settings is highly contested (Noddings, 2009) and I wanted to make a clear move away from a familiar setting that is saturated with mandates and instead situate these characters in a space that would not constrict conversation.

This section was a space where I struggled with the desire to try to present and re-present the real. Instead of functioning as representations of the data I collected and analyzed in the dissertation project, including individual participants, authors, or theorists, the conversations were invitations for exploring what can and cannot be said when characters make claims about themselves and others. I wrote a character named Responsibility, for example, who cited herself as a social justice teacher educator but was unsure that social justice, as a thing, could be reached. As such, I did not necessarily set out to describe what Responsibility *meant* by social

justice nor did I envision that she necessarily knew either. Instead, she tried to live up to the sort of vision for culturally responsive teaching mentioned above. She wanted to do this in her work as a teacher educator but also in her daily interactions with others, such as during her interactions with a Christian pre-service teacher, Love, whom she had met in a coffee shop and had subsequently invited to dinner.

As these conversations function as spaces for Responsibility and other characters to try out different ways of being when faced with others' desires and claims, they invite an exploration of myself as author of these characters and my subjectivity in relation to the possible claims that other characters might make. More specifically they functioned as a space to explore those moments when I felt myself *wanting* distance between myself and others (specifically my participants)—when I caught myself wanting to be able to cite myself as *not* another. This had particular importance for me as a teacher educator (or a pre-service teacher educator) who would most likely have multiple Christians in my classrooms over the years—multiple Christians who I imagined I would align myself with at some moments and try to distance myself from at others. I would also possibly have multiple students who I might see as other characters in the conversations such as a *Freire* or *Derrida* or *Caputo* or *Foucault*, and I might produce them as members of certain categories as they worked to take up and resist those categories. My pursuit of responsibility in this section becomes a way of thinking and rethinking myself as a teacher educator, a former teacher with social justice aims, a researcher, and a sometimes Christian both with and against participants who also take up these various categories. Further, my pursuit of responsibility to my participants led me to write them and the data they produced in interviews and focus groups as composite characters. Rather than serving these women up as individuals to be analyzed, judged, and made into cases by both myself as the researcher and any readers who

may come upon this text, I wanted to instead look at discourses that were being deployed and that produced these women as Christian preservice teachers. Further, I knew it would be impossible to fully represent these women, so I chose to explicitly recognize that in the creation of composite characters.

To that end, I created two main characters Responsibility and Love, who represent the sometimes contradictory discourses of Christianity and social justice. In these conversations, and with the help of characters, like Derrida, Freire, and Caputo, I help Responsibility theorize conceptions of love as they relate to ideas of responsibility and openness to others and attempt to enact these theories with Love. Concurrently, Love struggles with her own attempts to understand what God is calling her to do and how she must both love and be responsible to others and to God. Although the content of these conversations might at times feel a bit hokey, they help to illustrate that despite the differences in supposed aims of social justice and Christianity, there is much to be gained from opening this dialogue.

The conversations begin with a telephone conversation between Responsibility and an unknown other in which she is trying to decide what to do about the assumptions she recognizes herself making about others, and in particular a young woman, Love, mentioned above. She wants to show love and openness to this woman but is unsure how and ultimately decides to plan a dinner and invite others who she believes will help her think about being responsive to others. The second conversation involves appetizers with two characters Freire and Derrida in which Responsibility picks their brains for advice about how to think differently about Love. The three explore images of the concept love and discuss how these might inform interactions with others. The third conversation takes place between meals at Love's home where she is preparing for guests to arrive for the main course. She and another pre-service teacher discuss Love's

impending decision to either honor her commitment to the dinner party she is hosting or go help a neighbor child with her homework. Although the decision might seem small, Love struggles to come to terms with what she believes God is calling her to do. The fourth conversation takes place over dinner which Love and Responsibility share with another character, Caputo. The three discuss the limits of openness to each other and the categories that help enable these limits. The fifth section marks a space for a conversation I wrote between Love and her neighbor, who she decided to quickly help with her homework in between courses. The reader only has access to a brief summary of the conversation and an endnote exploring my decision to omit it from the dissertation. The sixth conversation occurs over dessert between a character called Foucault and Responsibility in which Responsibility replays a moment that occurred between her and Love while they were cleaning up from the dinner course (before Love went to her neighbors'). Responsibility must come to terms with what she feels like is a surpassing of limits of openness to the other. The final section is a brief phone conversation between Responsibility and the unknown other in which she frustratedly contends with the uncertainty produced by the dinner conversations.

Uninvited Guests

The two chapters mentioned above intersect with one another and with data I have collected and analyzed throughout the dissertation in the spaces of multiple endnotes. I call these endnotes *Unvited Guests* because they signal the moments where I wanted to explore various ideas or I hit a methodological stuck point. In short, these were unplanned. And as such, the writing in them takes on the form of an exploration of what might occur if these guests—these interruptions catalyzed by anything from the words of theorists or participants to attention to

mandated conventions and everything in between—were allotted space in the text and allowed to take off. As a result, they often read as a pursuit, as a search for something unthought.

More specifically, these endnotes were in line with the responsibility I pursued above as I aimed to open spaces for complexity, uncertainty, and unimagined possibilites as they relate to qualitative inquiry and teacher education. They became spaces, for instance, to explicitly attend to how I was coming to think differently as a teacher educator as I had to write myself in and out of specific moments in the conversations and explore the multiple intersections between my characters (and indeed my participants) and myself. They further acted as spaces for me explore the detailed intricacies of the research process I was experiencing and the difficulties in determining how to contain that process on a page.

In addition, these *Uninvited Guests* signal a pursuit of responsibility in relation to the reader and an anticipation of the needs of the reader. They became spaces, for instance, to ensure that the reader (in particular my dissertation committee) had access to the information they might need in order to be able to "sign off" on my successful "completion" of a dissertation. That is, the endnotes contain small literature reviews on a variety of topics that demonstrate the depth and breadth of my reading and knowledge as well as allow me the authority to make claims that situate my work within the larger field and bodies of literature. These endnotes also function as invitations that invite the reader to various other parts of the text to explore with me the continuous deconstruction of the categories and characters of the conversations as well as the research itself (including the researcher!). These signals to other parts of the text often provide added detail to a concept or an alternative way to think about the content, including reference to other literature reviews, interview transcripts, or quotations from theorists.

Validity, Rigor, and the Pursuit of Responsibility

While I have provided a description of the format and a theorization of how it can function as evidence for a title that represents the content, as promised above, I still must offer guidance as to how to judge this work. It is this guidance, in particular, that will highlight that the title cannot possibly tell *all* that the dissertation is about. I put forth a conception of validity that requires hospitality from the reader and in turn renders the title's ability to capture the content of the dissertation unknown and unfinished. In other words, I want to claim the subject of the pursuit of responsibility in the title also as you, but I do not how or if you will take up that invitation. In order to explain, I will first present the conception of validity at work in the dissertation, and I will then issue an invitation to you to take up the reading of the text.

The purpose of research and writing in the realms of the unknown is to "produce different knowledge and produce knowledge differently" (St. Pierre, 2005, p. 175), and it requires a different concept of validity than conventional qualitative research—a validity that is unfinished and denies the author permission to say "This is valid!" (Vagle, 2009, p. 603). Validity becomes a series of decisions that do not end in an assured location. Instead, like deconstruction, it is the work of beginning, again and again, in the multiple spaces where we find ourselves (Derrida, 1967/1974). Koro-Ljungberg (2010) described a notion of validity, for instance, that involves attention to the aporias that researchers experience throughout the research process. According to Koro-Ljungberg (2010) the possibility for validity becomes available in the face of these stuck places, "at the times of theoretical confusion, loss of power, privilege, and logic, and at the times of methodological uncertainty" (p. 609). These sticking points become moments of beginning, where deconstruction *happens,* and the researcher must make a decision how to proceed responsibly. These are not easy spaces where simple choices could be made between two

possible just, right, or responsible options (Derrida, 1992). These are the moments when we must continue on with so many choices that it seems that there are no choices at all, so many beginnings that it seems as though we are always in the middle, and so many unknowns for the unthinkable to be thought.

This certainly requires a different type of writing, one that follows the words of Derrida (1992) who said that in troubling "the norms and the etiquette of academic writing" one can hope to "exhibit their finality, what they are protecting and excluding" (p. 85). Still, academic writing is the structure that is mandated, and so this writing seeks to work within and against that structure, not to reveal its error but instead to rethink the possible. Although there is widespread agreement spanning multiple theoretical paradigms that good research is forthcoming about how knowledge is produced throughout the research, descriptions of this production often conform to the structures mandated by many academic texts. These structures that often mimic the chapters of a conventional dissertation (Introduction, Literature Review, Research Methodology, Findings, and Implications) presume a linear, untangled research process that can and should be separated from the content of the research. I struggled to find models of texts where research did not go as planned, where things fell apart, and where each new move made by the researcher, rather than solving problems and simplifying the research task, instead created more data, increased complexity, and made more obvious the idea that there, in fact, was no such thing as *conventional* qualitative research. I further looked for texts whose form echoed the process and itself was as complex as the research that produced it, but I was disappointed. I found no such models. In this dissertation, the writing itself became a marker of a paradox of responsibility—one which I had to encounter again and again as I proceeded in a study where ethical concerns and methodological conundrums abound. As a result, the sections of the dissertation do not look

like conventional representations of research and cannot be read with the same kind of eye or understood by the same measures of validity.

In addition to a new conception of validity, this kind of text requires a different type of reader, one who is willing to forgo answers in favor of becomings. And so what is left is an invitation to the reader. I invite you to find what is recognizable in the dissertation and to struggle with things that are not. In this sense, validity becomes an invitation. It is up to you to decide if I have achieved what I set out to do—write a text that deconstructs itself in the reading, a text that is about social justice and teacher education and Christianity and qualitative inquiry and poststructural theory, a text that is about more than what I, as the author, can even think, a text that invites questions, and most importantly a text that enacts responsibility to everything I've detailed above and more. Perhaps when you've finished reading, you might tell me what it was about.

APPENDIX B

TIMELINE

This timeline includes some events that took place during the dissertation study.

January 5, 2010	IRB approval; Beginning of dissertation log (intensive reading and writing each day); sent recruitment email
January 15	Individual interview; Transcription occurred during the week following each interview
January 19	Individual interview
January 22	Individual interview
January 23	Individual interview
April 14	Two individual interviews
April 15	Individual interview
April 22	Dissertation proposal meeting
May 7	Follow-up interview
May 15	Took photographs at participants' college
May 18	Follow-up interview
May 21	Follow-up interview
May 25	IRB amendment to include supplemental interviews with professors and graduate assistants
June	Begin listening to or reading at least one interview/day in combination with writing and additional reading
August 5	Follow-up interview
August 14	Focus group 1
August 18	Supplemental interview with graduate assistant
August 19	Follow-up interview
August 23	Supplemental interview with graduate assistant
August 26	Supplemental interview with professor
August 29	Focus group 2
September 9	Supplemental interview with professor
November, 2010	Dissertation log ends; Begin "Real writing" (See Preface, note 14); stop listening/reading one interview/day Begin bi-weekly meetings with Mark to share drafts and discuss writing
April 23, 2011	End "Real writing" and submit dissertation to committee
May 12, 2011	Defend

APPENDIX C

INDEX OF ENDNOTES

The following is a list of the endnotes the reader will find in each section of the dissertation. I have provided only a brief hint at the contents of each endnote to act a reminder to readers if necessary. The blank spaces indicate the endnotes that I used to refer to other places in the dissertation.

APÉRITIF/DIGESTIF

1	Poststructuralism as a category that deconstructs
2	Denzin and Lincoln's (2005) moments in qualitative research; includes example of me coming to St. Pierre's (1997a, b, c) texts as a means to highlight ethical dilemmas that mark Denzin & Lincoln's 8th moment.
3	Derrida's (1967/1974) critique of presence; includes discussion of the social world as a text and descriptions of poststructural work as it relates to social action
4	Rethinking the author by way of arts-based research and a reconfigured autoethnography (Gannon, 2006)
5	Deconstruction is X; excerpt from Cilliers & Derrida, 1999; an incitement to validity
6	Brief list of authors who use alternative writing (including dissertations)
7	Foucault's (1982) notion of power in relation to the subject and discourse
8	Emotions as discursive constructs
9	Noddings (2005) ethics of care as it relates to social justice teacher education and love
10	
11	Citational trail of finding Holbrook (2010) with discussion of nonlinear research processes
12	Difficulty with responsible citation
13	
14	Deconstruction of data collection/analysis and writing/real writing; includes a description of PhDness (Bridges-Rhoads & Hughes, 2010) as it relates to research
15	
16	Timeline's placement in the appendix
17	Discussion of short term mission trips in relation to interview participants; note about anonymity
18	
19	Preservice teachers as deficient; Theorization of stopping point of collection/analysis
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	Vocation as an ambiguous concept
28	Exploration of *when* is the field as it relates to transformative education and all children

29	Not citing the Bible as a means to explore purposes of study
30	Discussion of data, data collection/analysis, and the dissertation log
31	Social justice and Social Justice Teacher education; includes Responsibility as character
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	Interview protocol
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	Love
46	
47	Documents
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	Writing partners as acknowledgements; includes discussion of validity and making work public
58	Paragraph on metaphysics and what positions get us
59	
60	
61	
62	The omission of details as invitation for readers to insert their own
63	
64	
65	
66	Undecidabilty
67	Metaphysics
68	Discussion of use and function of individual interviews and focus group interviews
69	
70	Additional individual interviews and site of the research

CHAPTER TWO

1	Responsiveness as unfinished business
2	Effects of stating one's purpose
3	Exploration of cursing in relation to discourse (give a shit)
4	Wine drinking and researcher role; using and erasing of Christianity
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	Difficulty determining site of research and participants
10	Caputo
11	Apple
12	
13	Noddings
14	NCATE's omission of social justice
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Progressive dinner in relation to linearity

CHAPTER THREE

1	Capitalization of love in relation to missionaries
2	Implications for finding experts
3	Making a difference
4	Checking self in relation to religion as dangerous
5	
6	Trouble with citations of love; thinking in relation to religion
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Hospitality
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	Military language in Christianity
27	Christian as a weapon
28	Foucault as a weapon

CHAPTER FOUR

1	Vocation
2	
3	
4	
5	Privilege/Blessing and the writing of Impossibility
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Shaping Impossible and interviews
14	Messy citations expand the field
15	
16	Researcher status as Christian
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

CHAPTER FIVE

1	Sharing and witnessing
2	Inviting participants
3	
4	
5	

6	
7	Limits of hospitality
8	
9	
10	Caputo (1997) and nutshells
11	
12	
13	Caputo (1997) and the gift
14	Quote about love
15	Saved citation
16	
17	
18	
19	Unconditional
20	Jesus everywhere
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	Wanting Freire and Foucault to talk power
30	
31	Wanting to liberate participants (St. Pierre, 1997c)
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	

CHAPTER SIX

1	Witnessing

CHAPTER SEVEN

1	
2	Freire and Critical Pedagogy
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	Citing Foucault
8	Inserting data
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Foucault and genealogy
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	

CHAPTER EIGHT

1	